



Industrie Service

Choose certainty.  
Add value.

# Validation Report

**AgCert International PLC**

VALIDATION OF THE CDM-PROJECT:  
AWMS METHANE RECOVERY PROJECT MX07-S-  
110, CHIHUAHUA, MÉXICO.

REPORT NO. 949521

**January 16<sup>th</sup>, 2008.**

TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH

Carbon Management Service  
Westendstr. 199 - 80686 Munich – GERMANY

Report No.	Date of first issue	Revision No.	Date of this revision	Certificate No.
949521	2008-01-03	1	2008-01-16	-

<b>Subject:</b> Validation of a CDM Project			
<b>Accredited TÜV SÜD Unit:</b> TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH Certification Body "climate and energy" Westendstr. 199 - 80686 Munich FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY		<b>TÜV SÜD Contract Partner:</b> TÜV SÜD America de México. J. Cantu Leal No.652 Col. Buenos Aires Monterrey, Nuevo León, México	
<b>Client:</b> AgCert International PLC Apex Building, Blackthorn Road, Sanyford Business Park Dublin 18, IRELAND		<b>Project Site(s):</b> Rancho Productor de Leche Zaragoza Hermanos, in Chihuahua, Mexico	
<b>Project Title:</b> AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, México			
<b>Applied Methodology / Version:</b>		AMS III.D version 11	<b>Scope(s):</b> 15
<b>First PDD Version:</b> Date of issuance: 2007-01-25 Version No.: 1 Starting Date of GSP 2007-01-31		<b>Final PDD version:</b> Date of issuance: 2007-12-28 Version No.: 3	
<b>Estimated Annual Emission Reduction:</b>		35,484 tons CO <sub>2e</sub>	
<b>Assessment Team Leader:</b> Javier Castro		<b>Further Assessment Team Members:</b> Guadalupe Avendaño Reyes (GHG Auditor) Sergio Degener (GHG Auditor)	
<b>Summary of the Validation Opinion:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of all stated criteria. In our opinion, the project meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM. Hence TÜV SÜD will recommend the project for registration by the CDM Executive Board in case letters of approval of all Parties involved will be available before the expiring date of the applied methodology(ies) or the applied methodology version respectively.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have not provided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of all stated criteria. Hence TÜV SÜD will not recommend the project for registration by the CDM Executive Board and will inform the project participants and the CDM Executive Board on this decision.</li> </ul>			

## Abbreviations

<b>ACM</b>	Approved Consolidated Methodology
<b>AM</b>	Approved Methodology
<b>AWMS</b>	Animal Waste Management System
<b>CAR</b>	Corrective Action Request
<b>CDM</b>	Clean Development Mechanism
<b>CER</b>	Certified Emission Reduction
<b>CR</b>	Clarification Request
<b>DNA</b>	Designated National Authority
<b>DOE</b>	Designated Operational Entity
<b>EB</b>	Executive Board
<b>EIA / EA</b>	Environmental Impact Assessment / Environmental Assessment
<b>ER</b>	Emission reduction
<b>GHG</b>	Greenhouse gas(es)
<b>KP</b>	Kyoto Protocol
<b>MP</b>	Monitoring Plan
<b>NGO</b>	Non Governmental Organisation
<b>PDD</b>	Project Design Document
<b>PP</b>	Project Participant
<b>TÜV SÜD</b>	TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH
<b>UNFCCC</b>	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
<b>VVM</b>	Validation and Verification Manual

<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
1 INTRODUCTION .....	4
1.1 Objective	4
1.2 Scope	4
2 METHODOLOGY .....	5
2.1 Appointment of the Assessment Team	7
2.2 Review of Documents	8
2.3 Follow-up Interviews	8
2.4 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests	8
2.5 Internal Quality Control	8
3 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS .....	9
4 COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOS .....	11
5 VALIDATION OPINION .....	12

Annex 1: Validation Protocol

Annex 2: Information Reference List

## 1 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Objective

The validation objective is an independent assessment by a Third Party (Designated Operational Entity = DOE) of a proposed project activity against all defined criteria set for the registration under the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). Validation is part of the CDM project cycle and will finally result in a conclusion by the executing DOE whether a project activity is valid and should be submitted for registration to the CDM-EB. The ultimate decision on the registration of a proposed project activity rests at the CDM Executive Board and the Parties involved.

The project activity discussed by this validation report has been submitted under the project title:  
AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, México

### 1.2 Scope

The scope of any assessment is defined by the underlying legislation, regulation and guidance given by relevant entities or authorities. In the case of CDM project activities the scope is set by:

- The Kyoto Protocol, in particular § 12
- Decision 2/CMP1 and Decision 3/CMP.1 (Marrakech Accords)
- Further COP/MOP decisions with reference to the CDM (e.g. decisions 4 – 8/CMP.1)
- Decisions by the EB published under <http://cdm.unfccc.int>
- Specific guidance by the EB published under <http://cdm.unfccc.int>
- Guidelines for Completing the Project Design Document (CDM-PDD), and the Proposed New Baseline and Monitoring Methodology (CDM-NM)
- The applied approved methodology
- The technical environment of the project (technical scope)
- Internal and national standards on monitoring and QA/QC
- Technical guideline and information on best practice

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.

Once TÜV SÜD receives a first PDD version, it is made publicly available on the internet at TÜV SÜD's webpage as well as on the UNFCCC CDM-WebPages for starting a 30 day global stakeholder consultation process (GSP). In case of any request a PDD might be revised (under certain conditions the GSP will be repeated) and the final PDD will form the basis for the final evaluation as presented by this report. Information on the first and on the final PDD version is presented at page 1.

The only purpose of a validation is its use during the registration process as part of the CDM project cycle. Hence, TÜV SÜD 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.

## 2 METHODOLOGY

The project assessment aims at being a risk based approach and is based on the methodology developed in the Validation and Verification Manual, an initiative of Designated and Applicant Entities, which aims to harmonize the approach and quality of all such assessments.

In order to ensure transparency, a validation protocol was customised for the project. TÜV SÜD developed a “cook-book” for methodology-specific checklists and protocol based on the templates presented by the Validation and Verification Manual. The protocol shows, in a transparent manner, criteria (requirements), the discussion of each criterion by the assessment team and the results from validating the identified criteria. The validation protocol serves the following purposes:

- It organises, details and clarifies the requirements a CDM project is expected to meet;
- It ensures a transparent validation process where the validator will document how a particular requirement has been validated and the result of the validation.

The validation protocol consists of three tables. The different columns in these tables are described in the figure below.

As for this specific project the final PDD was applying a different version of the CDM-SSC-PDD format than the first one, a table 1a and a table 1b are presented reflecting the changes by the CDM-SSC-PDD version 2 and the CDM-SCC-PDD version 3.

Request from Table 1a are resumed and solved in Table 2a. Request from Table 1b are resumed and solved in Table 2b.

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

<b>Validation Protocol Table 1: Conformity of Project Activity and PDD</b>				
<b>Checklist Topic / Question</b>	<b>Reference</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>PDD in GSP</b>	<b>Final PDD</b>
<i>The checklist is organised in sections following the arrangement of the applied PDD version. Each section is then further subdivided. The lowest level constitutes a checklist question / criterion.</i>	<i>Gives reference to documents where the answer to the checklist question or item is found in case the comment refers to documents other than the PDD.</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. In some cases sub-checklist are applied indicating yes/no decisions on the compliance with the stated criterion. Any <b>Request</b> has to be substantiated within this column</i>	<i>Conclusions are presented based on the assessment of the first PDD version. This is either acceptable based on evidence provided (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) , or a <b>Corrective Action Request (CAR)</b> due to non-compliance with the checklist question (See below). <b>Clarification Request (CR)</b> is used when the validation team has identified a need for further clarification.</i>	<i>Conclusions are presented in the same manner based on the assessment of the final PDD version.</i>

<b>Validation Protocol Table 2: Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests</b>			
<b>Clarifications and corrective action requests</b>	<b>Ref. to table 1</b>	<b>Summary of project owner response</b>	<b>Validation team conclusion</b>
<i>If the conclusions from table 1 are either a Corrective Action Request or a Clarification Request, these should be listed in this section.</i>	<i>Reference to the checklist question number in Table 1 where the Corrective Action Request or Clarification Request is explained.</i>	<i>The responses given by the client or other project participants during the communications with the validation team should be summarised in this section.</i>	<i>This section should summarise the validation team's responses and final conclusions. The conclusions should also be included in Table 1, under "Final PDD".</i>

In case of a denial of the project activity more detailed information on this decision will be presented in table 3.

<b>Validation Protocol Table 3: Unresolved Corrective Action and Clarification Requests</b>		
<b>Clarifications and corrective action requests</b>	<b>Id. of CAR/CR 1</b>	<b>Explanation of the Conclusion for Denial</b>
<i>If the final conclusions from table 2 results in a denial the referenced request should be listed in this section.</i>	<i>Identifier of the Request.</i>	<i>This section should present a detail explanation, why the project is finally considered not to be in compliance with a criterion.</i>

## 2.1 Appointment of the Assessment Team

According to the technical scopes and experiences in the sectoral or national business environment TÜV SÜD has composed a project team in accordance with the appointment rules of the TÜV SÜD certification body “climate and energy”. The composition of an assessment team has to be approved by the Certification Body ensuring that the required skills are covered by the team. The Certification Body TÜV SÜD operates four qualification levels for team members that are assigned by formal appointment rules:

- Assessment Team Leader (ATL)
- Greenhouse Gas Auditor (GHG-A)
- Greenhouse Gas Auditor Trainee (T)
- Experts (E)

It is required that the sectoral scope linked to the methodology has to be covered by the assessment team.

The validation team was consisting of the following experts (the responsible Assessment Team Leader is written in bold letters):

Name	Qualification	Coverage of technical scope	Coverage of sectoral expertise	Host country experience
<b>Javier Castro</b>	ATL	☑	☑	☑
Guadalupe Avendaño	GHG-A	☑	☑	☑
Sergio Degener	GHG-A	☑	☑	

**Javier Castro** is deputy head of the certification body “Climate and Energy” at TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH. He has an academic background in chemical engineering and energy systems. In his position he participates as project manager the validation, verification and certifications processes for GHG mitigation projects. He has received extensive training in the CDM and JI validation processes, and participated in many validation and verification of CDM projects.

**Guadalupe Avendaño** has an academic background in electronic and communications engineering. She has participated as local auditor in the audit and functioned as local expert. Guadalupe Avendaño has received extensive training and participated in the CDM validation and verification processes.

**Sergio Degener** is a GHG auditor-trainee for environmental management systems at the “Carbon Management Service” in the head office of TÜV Industrie Service GmbH, Germany. Mr. Degener studied environmental engineer at the University of Applied Science in Bingen, Germany. Beside his main focus in studies of environmental economics and law, he dealt with environmental management and environmental controlling issues.



## 2.2 Review of Documents

The first PDD version submitted by the client and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline were reviewed as initial step of the validation process. A complete list of all documents and proofs reviewed is attached as annex 2 to this report.

## 2.3 Follow-up Interviews

On February 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2007 TÜV SÜD performed interviews on-site with project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the first document review. The table below provides a list of all persons interviewed in the context of this on-site visit.

Name	Organisation
Erasmó Juárez Reyes	Ecology Manager of Rancho Productor de Leche Zaragoza Hermanos Farm
Danae Díaz	AgCert México
Eduardo Saldaña	AgCert México

## 2.4 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the validation is to resolve the requests for corrective actions and clarifications and any other outstanding issues which needed to be clarified for TÜV SÜD's positive conclusion on the project design. The Corrective Action Requests and Clarification Requests raised by TÜV SÜD were resolved during communication between the client and TÜV SÜD. To guarantee the transparency of the validation process, the concerns raised and responses that have been given are summarised in chapter 3 below and documented in more detail in the validation protocol in annex 1.

## 2.5 Internal Quality Control

As final step of the validation process, the validation report and the protocol have to undergo and internal quality control procedure by the Certification Body "climate and energy", i.e. each report has to be approved either by the head of the certification body or his deputy. In case one of these two persons is part of the assessment team approval can only be given by the other one.

It rests at the decision of TÜV SÜD's Certification Body whether a project will be submitted for re-requesting registration by the EB or not.

### 3 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The following description of the project as per PDD could be verified during the on-site audit:

The purpose of this project is to mitigate and recover animal effluent related GHG by improving AWMS practices.

This project proposes to apply the Methane Recovery methodology identified in Section III.D, of the Indicative Simplified Baseline and Monitoring Methodologies for Small-Scale CDM Project Activity Categories, to dairy cattle CAFOs (Confined Animal Feeding Operations) located in Chihuahua, México. The proposed project activities will mitigate and recover AWMS GHG emissions in an economically sustainable manner, and will result in other environmental benefits, such as improved water quality and reduced odor. In simple terms, the project proposes to move from a high-GHG AWMS practice, an open air lagoon, to a lower-GHG AWMS practice, an ambient temperature anaerobic digester with capture and combustion of resulting biogas. The validation team confirmed on site that there was a solid separator in use in the farm; therefore a deduction of 33% was taken on account in the baseline calculation.

As informed above all findings are summarized in tables 2a and 2b of the attached validation protocol.

#### Table 2a

In total the assessment team expressed 4 Corrective Action Requests and 6 Clarification Requests:

The required documents (Letter of Intention, inventories), have been submitted to the DOE and the information is been included in the final version of the PDD [CAR2, CAR4].

Regarding the more formal aspects of the proposed project (name, actual AWMS) this information has been corrected and added to the PDD finally [CAR1, CAR3].

Furthermore the technical information which were missing or have to be adjusted, such as

- the time schedule of implementation of the proposed project [CR3],
- further information on baseline (CEE) and monitoring (EF) parameters [CR5]
- efficiency of the flaring system [CR1, CR4, CR6]
- project emissions (the use of pumps and blowers) [CR2].

#### Table 2b

In total the assessment team expressed 3 Corrective Action Requests and 1 Clarification Request:

Regarding the more formal aspects of the proposed project (GPS coordinates) this information has been corrected and added to the PDD finally [CAR2].

Furthermore the technical information which were missing or have to be adjusted, such as

- further information on baseline emissions (due to the solid separators) [CR1, CAR1]
- project emissions (calculation) [CAR3].

The above information was corrected, defined and/or added in the final version of the PDD.

### **Additionality**

The DOE confirms that the project activity comprises only flaring of the captured methane and there is not regulation in Mexico obliging the project owner to collect and flare or use the methane from open lagoons. Therefore there is no economic incentive to realise the activity without CERs revenues. As thus the only incentive to realise this kind of activities in Mexico is to generate CERs and sell them it is evident that the project is additional.

The investment barrier has been validated based on different points:

- The size of the farm clearly shows the difficulty to invest in any kind of activities that are not directly related to the meat production
- There is not economical interest investing in a biodigester to flare the biogas, which is the project activity, as there is no remuneration for this activity if not conducted as a CDM activity.

Therefore a logical conclusion is that not any bank would be willing to give a credit for an activity that has no monetary revenues (without CDM).

The technological barrier is based on the lack of skilled and properly trained labour to operate and maintain the system in order to achieve a long-term operation. This barrier is affected by the financial barrier but not based on it.

The prevailing practice is based on the fact that the activity is first of its kind. As all similar activities in Mexico are also CDM activities, the relation to the regulatory framework is a reference to show that there is no requirement to collect and combust the biogas.

### **Emission Reduction**

The methodology foresees the measurement of the emission reductions based on the methane captured and combusted and is not based on the number of animals presented in the farm. Nevertheless the amount of animals presented in the PDD is the average of a year period therefore it is not an approximate value, but a real counted value.

The lagoon designs presented include the possibility to have more than one lagoon, the final situation will be determined before construction of the biodigester. In any case if there are two or more lagoons in the system and only one has a biodigester this also does not affect the activity or the calculation of emission reduction as the emission reductions are based on the measurement of the methane captured and combusted and all the methane that could be emitted from the other lagoons is the same as in the baseline situation.

### **Debundling**

The debundling issue has been verified based on GPS data included in a google earth file, which includes all the AgCert large and small scale projects/farms and for each farm included in a small scale project, it is confirmed that no other farm, included in any of the projects presented by AgCert to UNFCCC, is located in less than 1 km not even near to 1 km distance. As TÜV SÜD is used as only validating DOE by the project participants, we have got all GPS data of all farms included in all project. This database is used in each validation.

### **Emission Factor of the grid**

The revised PDD uses the emission factor from the most recent registered project in Mexico that uses the ex-ante approach. This value is appropriate to be used in this project activity.

Due to the previous explanations, the project complies with the requirements.

#### 4 COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOS

TÜV SÜD published the project documents on UNFCCC website by installing a link to TÜV SÜD's own website and invited comments by Parties, stakeholders and non-governmental organisations during a period of 30 days.

The following table presents all key information on this process:

<b>webpage:</b> <a href="http://www.netinform.de/KE/Wegweiser/Guide2_1.aspx?ID=2556&amp;Ebene1_ID=26&amp;Ebene2_ID=760&amp;mode=1">http://www.netinform.de/KE/Wegweiser/Guide2_1.aspx?ID=2556&amp;Ebene1_ID=26&amp;Ebene2_ID=760&amp;mode=1</a>	
<b>Starting date of the global stakeholder consultation process:</b> 2007-01-31	
<b>Comment submitted by:</b> none	<b>Issues raised:</b> -
<b>Response by TÜV SÜD:</b> -	

## 5 VALIDATION OPINION

TÜV SÜD has performed a validation of the following proposed CDM project activity:

AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, México

The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of stated criteria. In our opinion, the project meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM. Hence TÜV SÜD will recommend the project for registration by the CDM Executive Board.

An analysis as provided by the applied methodology demonstrates that the proposed project activity is 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. Given that the project is implemented as designed, the project is likely to achieve the estimated amount of emission reductions as specified within the final PDD version.

The validation is based on the information made available to us and the engagement conditions detailed in this 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, TÜV SÜD 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.

Munich, 2008-01-16

Munich, , 2008-01-16



---

Certification Body "climate and energy"  
TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH



---

Assessment Team Leader

Validation of the CDM Project:  
AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, México



Industrie Service

## **Annex 1: Validation Protocol**

# Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

Table 1a PDD

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
<b>A. General Description of Project Activity</b>					
<b>A.1. Project Title</b>					
A.1.1. Does the used project title clearly enable to identify the unique CDM activity?	5	DR, I	Yes, the project is clearly defined in the title and explained in the PDD and Bundling Form.  <b><u>Corrective Action Request No.1.</u></b> Please correct the projects name in the files of the digester design and awms-Zaragoza, from MX06-S-110, to MX07-S-110.	CAR 1	
A.1.2. Are there an indication of a revision number and the date of the revision?		DR, I	Yes, the document ID, revision number and date of the PDD are posted on the front cover.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
A.1.3. Is this in consistency with the time line of the project's history?	3	DR, I	<b><u>Corrective Action Request No.2.</u></b> According to the PDD information, the project's starting date is March 5 <sup>th</sup> , 2007. This information do not corresponds with the Lol signing date, which is September 29 <sup>th</sup> , 2006. Please correct this issue.	CAR 2	
<b>A.2. Description of the project activity</b>					
A.2.1. Is the description delivering a transparent over-view of the project activities?		DR, I	Yes, the project activity is clearly defined in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
A.2.2. Is all information provided in compliance with actual situation or planning?		DR,	Yes, the purpose of the project and the contribution to the sustainable development are	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
		I	in compliance with the actual situation.		
A.2.3. Are proofs available evidencing all information with relevance for the validity, for the determination of baseline and project emissions and for emission projections?		DR, I	The information given in the PDD, e.g. the animal population, was confirmed in the main during the on-site visit.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
A.2.4. Is all information provided in consistency with details provided by further chapters of the PDD?		DR, I	Yes, the information is consistent with the details provided in the following chapters.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>A.3. Project Participants</b>					
A.3.1. Is the form required for the indication of project participants correctly applied?		DR, I	Yes, it is correctly applied.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
A.3.2. Is the voluntary participation of all listed entities or Parties confirmed by each of them?		DR, I	Yes, it was confirmed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
A.3.3. Is all information provided in consistency with details provided by further chapters of the PDD (in particular annex 1)?	5,8	DR, I	<b><u>Corrective Action Request No.3.</u></b> The solid separators and their use are not described in the PDD, section A.4.1.4. Please correct the description of the site's AWMS.	CAR 3	
<b>A.4. Technical description of the project activity</b>					
A.4.1. Does the information provided on the location of the project activity allow for a clear identification of the site(s)?		DR, I	Yes, the address of the farm location is clearly and correctly defined.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
A.4.2. Do the project participants possess ownership or licenses which will allow the implementation		DR, I	Yes, all the participants have the documents of the ownership of sites.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	



## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
of the project at that site / those sites?					
A.4.3. Is the category (ies) of the project activity correctly identified?		DR, I	The category of the bundling are clearly identified in the PDD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
A.4.4. Does the project design engineering reflect current good practices?	4	DR, I	<b><u>Clarification Request No. 1</u></b> The technology should be better explained; especially the functioning and controlling of enclose flaring system and the blower equipment.	CR 1	
A.4.5. Does the description of the technology to be applied provide sufficient and transparent input to evaluate its impact on the greenhouse gas balance?	4	DR, I	<b><u>Clarification Request No. 2</u></b> Please clarify why the blower operation per day is 12 hours, beside 24 hours.	CR 2	
A.4.6. Is the brief explanation how the project will reduce greenhouse gas emission transparent and suitable?		DR, I	Yes, the explanation on how the technology used will reduce the greenhouse gas emissions is clear and transparent. See comments above.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
A.4.7. Is all information provided in compliance with actual situation or planning as available by the project participants?		DR, I	Yes, is the information submitted is in accordance with the project participants information.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
A.4.8. 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?		DR, I	Yes, the technology to be employed by the project activity includes the installation of new covered lagoons creating an anaerobic digester. The project will improve the practice.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
A.4.9. Is the project technology likely to be substituted by other or more efficient technologies within the project period?		DR, I	No, this technology is not common in the host country and it will not be substituted within the project period.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A.4.10. Does the project require extensive initial training and maintenance efforts in order to work as presumed during the project period?		DR, I	Yes, the training and a maintenance plan are considered. A manual in the host country language with this information was submitted to the validator.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
A.4.11. Does the project make provisions for meeting training and maintenance needs?		DR, I	Yes, the know-how transfer is duly taken into account in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
A.4.12. Is a schedule available on the implementation of the project and are there any risks for delays?	5	DR, I	Yes, the construction of the project is implemented under schedule.  <b><u>Clarification Request No. 3</u></b> The project schedule is missing, this document needs to be submitted to the validator.	CR 3	
A.4.13. Is the form required for the indication of projected emission reductions correctly applied?		DR, I	Yes, the form is correct.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>A.5. Public Funding</b>					
A.5.1. Is all information on public funding provided in compliance with actual situation or planning as available by the project participants?		DR, I	The project does not use any public funding.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
A.5.2. Is all information provided in consistency with details provided by further chapters of the PDD (in particular annex 2)?		DR, I	Yes, see above.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>B. Baseline Methodology</b>					
<b>B.1. Choice and Applicability</b>					
B.1.1. Is the baseline methodology previously approved by the CDM Methodology Panel?		DR, I	Yes, the project uses an approve methodology, AMS III.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
B.1.2. Is the choice of the methodology correctly justified by the PDD?		DR, I	Yes, the complete justification is addressed in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
B.1.3. Is the baseline methodology the one deemed most applicable for this project?		DR, I	Yes, the methodology AMS III. D. is the only approved small-scale methodology applicable for this project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
B.1.4. Is the project in conformance with all applicability criteria of the applied methodology?		DR, I	Yes, the PDD is updated to the version 11 of the methodology, which is valid until January 8, 2008..	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>B.2. Application of the Baseline Methodology / Identification of the Baseline Scenario</b>					
B.2.1. Is the application of the methodology and the discussion and determination of the chosen baseline transparent?		DR, I	Yes, the application is correct and the discussion on the baseline sufficiently transparent.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
B.2.2. Does the application consider all potential baseline scenarios in the discussion?		DR, I	Yes, all scenarios have been considered.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
B.2.3. Is conservativeness addressed in the way of identifying the baseline?		DR, I	Yes, the baseline has been identified with sufficient conservativeness.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
B.2.4. Has the baseline been established on a project-specific basis?		DR, I	Yes, the baseline for this project activity is defined as the amount of methane that would be emitted to the atmosphere during the crediting period in the absence of the project activity.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
B.2.5. Does the baseline scenario sufficiently take into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies, macro-economic trends and political aspirations?		DR, I	Yes, all relevant investment, technology and legal barriers have been taken into account together with legal constraints and common practice.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
B.2.6. Is the baseline determination compatible with the available data?	5	DR, I	<b><u>Corrective Action Request No.4.</u></b> Please correct: The data of inventories was provided at the moment of the visit. The information of lactating and dry cows is completely equal to the PDD information. The inventories of heifers is little different, not significant. The inventories of calves are completely different.	CAR 4	
B.2.7. Does the selected baseline represent the most likely scenario among other possible and/or discussed scenarios?		DR, I	Yes the selected baseline is the most suitable for the selected project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
B.2.8. Does the PDD follow the approach for identifying the baseline scenario as given by the approved methodology?		DR, I	Yes, the approach for identifying the baseline scenario has been clearly followed in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
B.2.9. Is all literature and sources clearly referenced?		DR, I	Yes, they are clearly referenced.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>B.3. Additionality</b>					
B.3.1. Is the discussion of how emission reductions are archived by the project scenario in comparison to the identified project scenario provided in a transparent manner?		DR, I	Yes, the information is provided in a transparent manner.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
B.3.2. In case of using calculation models in order to demonstrate emission reductions: Are all formulae and input data based on provable records?		DR, I	Not applicable		
B.3.3. Does the PDD clearly demonstrate the additionality using the approach as given by the me-		DR, I	Yes, the barriers approach is used to demonstrate the additionality.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
thodology?					
B.3.4. In case of using the additionality tool: Are all steps followed in a transparent and provable manner?		DR, I	Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
B.3.5. Does the discussion sufficiently take into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies, macro-economic trends and political aspirations?		DR, I	Yes. National policies are included in the discussion.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
B.3.6. Does the CDM registration have any impact on the implementation of the project?		DR, I	Yes, without CDM project activities the proposed project activity will not be adopted on a national or worldwide scale due to many barriers as described in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
B.3.7. Is the approach for demonstrating additionality provided by the most recent (or still applicable) methodology correctly applied?		DR, I	Yes, the approach is correct and updated.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
B.3.8. Are other proofs than anecdotal evidence for all assumptions and statements used by the additionality discussion?		DR, I	Assumptions are confirmed during the visit on-site.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>B.4. Project Boundary</b>					
B.4.1. Are all emission related to the baseline scenario clearly identified and described in a complete manner?		DR, I	Yes, the emissions of the baseline are clear identified in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
B.4.2. In case of grid connected electricity projects: Is the relevant grid correctly identified due to the EB guidance and the underlying methodology?		DR, I	Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
B.4.3. Are all emission related to the project scenario clearly identified and described in a complete manner?		DR, I	See CR 2 and CAR 4	Open	

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
B.4.4. Are all emission related to leakage clearly identified and described in a complete manner?		DR, I	There is no leakage in this project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>B.5. Detailed Baseline Information</b>					
B.5.1. Is there any indication of a date when determine the baseline?		DR, I	The baseline for the farm Rancho Productor de Leche Zaragoza Hermanos is determined within the inventories from October 2005 to September 2006.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
B.5.2. Is this in consistency with the time line of the PDD history?		DR, I	Yes, the date is consistent with the timeline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
B.5.3. Is all data required provided in a complete manner by annex 3 of the PDD?		DR, I	The baseline is given in the methodology. Small scale projects do not have an annex 3; annex 3 is used in the PDD for the Monitoring Plan.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
B.5.4. Is all data given in compliance with the methodology?		DR, I	Yes, the data are in compliance with the methodology III.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
B.5.5. Is all data evidence by official data sources or replicable records?		DR, I	Yes, the data are replicable and based on official data sources.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
B.5.6. Is the vintage of the baseline data correct?		DR, I	See CAR 4	Open	
<b>C. Duration of the Project / Crediting Period</b>					
C.1.1. Are the project's starting date and operational lifetime clearly defined and reasonable?		DR, I	Yes, the dates are reasonable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
C.1.2. Is the assumed crediting time clearly defined and reasonable (renewable crediting period of		DR, I	Yes, fixed crediting period of 10 years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
max 7 years with potential for 2 renewals or fixed crediting period of max. 10 years)?					
<b>D. Monitoring Plan</b>					
<b>D.1. Monitoring Methodology</b>					
D.1.1. Is the monitoring methodology previously approved by the CDM Methodology Panel?		DR, I	Yes, the project use and a proved methodology, which is clearly identified in the PDD. AMS-III.D./Ver 11, Methane recovery in agricultural and agro industrial activities.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.1.2. Is the choice of the methodology correctly justified by the PDD?		DR, I	Yes, the simplified monitoring methodology is applicable because it provides a method to accurately measure and record the GHG emissions that will be captured and combusted by the project activity.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.1.3. Is the project in conformance with all applicability criteria of the applied methodology?		DR, I	Yes, all applicability criteria are met.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.1.4. Does the monitoring methodology provide a consistent approach in the context of all parameter to be monitored and further information provided by the PDD?	4,5	DR, I	<b>Clarification Request No. 4</b> It should be clear how the flare efficiency is measured. Accord the information reviewed a enclose flare will be use. Please send to the Validator the design of the enclose flare. In the PDD is not described the efficiency of the equipment.	CR 4	
D.1.5. Does the monitoring methodology apply consistently the choice of the option selected for monitoring?		DR, I	Yes as far as the latest EB decisions are taking into account.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
toring both of project and baseline emissions?					
<b>D.2. Monitoring of Project Emissions (if applied)</b>					
D.2.1. Does the monitoring plan provide for the collection and archiving of all relevant data necessary for estimation or measuring the greenhouse gas emissions within the project boundary during the crediting period?		DR, I	The monitoring plan does include relevant parameters to determine project emissions. Due to the choice made regarding the monitoring approach only the relevant parameters have been selected.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.2.2. Are the choices of project GHG indicators reasonable and in conformance with the requirements set by the approved methodology applied?		DR, I	Yes. Due to the choice made regarding the monitoring approach only the relevant parameters have been selected.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.2.3. Will it be possible to determine the specified project GHG indicators?		DR, I	Yes, it is possible to monitor and/or measure the currently specified GHG indicators. The indicators which are not measured can be obtained from IPCC documents. Data is collected by the AgCert Regional Maintenance Technician and transferred to AgCert headquarters as stated in section 6.0 of the AgCert O&M Plan.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.2.4. Will the indicators enable comparison of project data and performance over time?		DR, I	Yes, they will enable comparison of data.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.2.5. Is the information given for each monitoring variable by the presented table sufficient to ensure the verification of a proper implementation of the monitoring plan?	4		<b><u>Clarification Request No. 5</u></b> Please give more information about variable "3. CEE" of the monitoring plan, specify how will be determined when the flare is out of service.	CR 5	



## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
D.2.6. Is the information given for each monitoring variable by the presented table sufficient to ensure the delivery of high quality data free of potential for biases or intended or unintended changes in data records?		DR, I	Yes, AgCert has designed and implemented a unique set of data management tools to efficiently capture and report data throughout the project lifecycle.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.2.7. Is the monitoring approach in line with current good practice, i.e. will it deliver data in a reliable and reasonably acceptable accuracy?		DR, I	Yes, the monitoring approach reflects good practices.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.2.8. Are all formulae used to determine project emission clearly indicated and in compliance with the monitoring methodology.		DR, I	Yes, all the formulas are clearly stated.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>D.3. Monitoring of Baseline Emissions (if applied)</b>					
D.3.1. Does the monitoring plan provide for the collection and archiving of all relevant data necessary for estimation or measuring the greenhouse gas emissions of the baseline emissions during the crediting period?		DR, I	Yes, the monitoring plan does include all relevant parameters to determine project emissions. Due to the choice made regarding the monitoring approach only the relevant parameters have been selected.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.3.2. Are the choices of project GHG indicators reasonable and in conformance with the requirements set by the approved methodology applied?		DR, I	Yes. Due to the choice made regarding the monitoring approach only the relevant parameters have been selected.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.3.3. Will it be possible to determine the specified project GHG indicators?		DR, I	Yes, it is possible to monitor and/or measure the currently specified GHG indicators. The indicators which are not measured can be obtained from IPCC documents.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.3.4. Is the information given for each monitoring variable by the presented table sufficient to ensure the verification of a proper implementation of the		DR, I	See CR 5	Open	

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
monitoring plan?					
D.3.5. Is the information given for each monitoring variable by the presented table sufficient to ensure the delivery of high quality data free of potential for biases or intended or unintended changes in data records?		DR, I	Yes, AgCert has designed and implemented a unique set of data management tools to efficiently capture and report data throughout the project lifecycle.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.3.6. Is the monitoring approach in line with current good practice, i.e. will it deliver data in a reliable and reasonably acceptable accuracy?		DR, I	Yes, the monitoring approach reflects good practices.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.3.7. Are all formulas used to determine baseline emission clearly indicated and in compliance with the monitoring methodology.		DR, I	Yes, all the formulas are clearly stated.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>D.4. Direct Monitoring of Emission Reductions (if applied)</b>					
D.4.1. Does the monitoring plan provide for the collection and archiving of all relevant data necessary for estimation or measuring directly the greenhouse gas emissions reductions during the crediting period?		DR, I	The monitoring plan provided in annex 3 does include relevant parameters to determine project emissions. Due to the choice made regarding the monitoring approach only the relevant parameters have been selected.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.4.2. Are the choices of project GHG indicators reasonable and in conformance with the requirements set by the approved methodology applied?		DR, I	Yes. Due to the choice made regarding the monitoring approach only the relevant parameters have been selected.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.4.3. Will it be possible to determine the specified project GHG indicators?		DR, I	Yes, it is possible to monitor and/or measure the currently specified GHG indicators. The indicators which are not measured can be obtained from IPCC documents. Data is collected by the AgCert Regional Maintenance Technician and transferred to	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			AgCert headquarters as stated in section 6.0 of the AgCert O&M Plan.		
D.4.4. Is the information given for each monitoring variable by the presented table sufficient to ensure the verification of a proper implementation of the monitoring plan?		DR, I	See CR 5	Open	
D.4.5. Is the information given for each monitoring variable by the presented table sufficient to ensure the delivery of high quality data free of potential for biases or intended or unintended changes in data records?		DR, I	Yes, AgCert has designed and implemented a unique set of data management tools to efficiently capture and report data throughout the project lifecycle.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.4.6. Is the monitoring approach in line with current good practice, i.e. will it deliver data in a reliable and reasonably acceptable accuracy?		DR, I	Yes, the monitoring approach reflects good practices.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.4.7. Are all formulae used to determine project emission reductions clearly indicated and in compliance with the monitoring methodology.		DR, I	Yes, all the formulas are clearly stated.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>D.5. Monitoring of Leakage (if applicable)</b>					
D.5.1. Does the monitoring plan provide for the collection and archiving of all relevant data necessary for estimation or measuring of leakage emissions during the crediting period?		DR, I	No monitoring of leakage is required	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.5.2. Are the choices of project GHG indicators reasonable and in conformance with the requirements set by the approved methodology applied?		DR, I	No monitoring of leakage is required	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.5.3. Will it be possible to determine the specified project GHG indicators?		DR, I	No monitoring of leakage is required	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
D.5.4. Is the information given for each monitoring variable by the presented table sufficient to ensure the verification of a proper implementation of the monitoring plan?		DR, I	No monitoring of leakage is required	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.5.5. Is the information given for each monitoring variable by the presented table sufficient to ensure the delivery of high quality data free of potential for biases or intended or unintended changes in data records?		DR, I	No monitoring of leakage is required	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.5.6. Is the monitoring approach in line with current good practice, i.e. will it deliver data in a reliable and reasonably acceptable accuracy?		DR, I	No monitoring of leakage is required	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.5.7. Are all formulas used to determine leakage emissions clearly indicated and in compliance with the monitoring methodology.		DR, I	No monitoring of leakage is required	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>D.6. Determination of Emission Reductions</b>					
D.6.1. Are all formulas used to determine leakage emissions clearly indicated and in compliance with the monitoring methodology.		DR, I	No monitoring of leakage is required	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.6.2. Is the information given for each calculated variable sufficient to ensure the delivery of high quality data free of potential for biases or intended or unintended changes in data records?		DR, I	No monitoring of leakage is required	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>D.7. Quality Control (QC) and Quality Assurance (QA) Procedures</b>					
D.7.1. Is the selection of data undergoing quality control and quality assurance procedures complete?		DR, I	Yes, AgCert has designed and implemented a unique set of data management tools to efficiently capture and report data throughout the project lifecycle.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
D.7.2. Is the belonging determination of uncertainty levels done correctly for each ID in a correct and reliable manner?		DR, I	Yes, the determination of uncertainty levels is done in a correct and reliable manner.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.7.3. Are quality control procedures and quality assurance procedures sufficiently described to ensure the delivery of high quality data?		DR, I	Yes, all the consideration has been taken to ensure the data quality.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.7.4. Is it ensured that data will be bound to national or internal reference standards?		DR, I	Yes, all references are clearly stated.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.7.5. Is it ensured that data provisions will be free of potential conflicts of interests resulting in a tendency of overestimating emission reductions?		DR, I	Yes, the data have been checked also in the on-site visit.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>D.8. Operational and management structure</b>					
D.8.1. Is the authority and responsibility of project management clearly described?		DR, I	Yes, the authority and responsibility is clearly described in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.8.2. Is the authority and responsibility for registration, monitoring, measurement and reporting clearly described?		DR, I	Yes, AgCert has procedures to perform activities including monitoring and collection of parameters, quality audits, personnel training and equipment inspections.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.8.3. Are procedures identified for training of monitoring personnel?		DR, I	Yes, AgCert has procedures to perform activities including monitoring and collection of parameters, quality audits, personnel training and equipment inspections.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.8.4. Are procedures identified for emergency preparedness for cases where emergencies can cause unintended emissions?		DR, I	Yes, procedures are described in the monitoring plan in annex 3 of the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
<b>D.9. Monitoring Plan (Annex 4)</b>					
D.9.1. Is the monitoring plan developed in a project specific manner clearly addressing the unique features of the CDM activity?		DR, I	Even if annex 4 is not required, a monitoring plan has been provided in annex 3 to the PDD and clearly addresses the CDM activity.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.9.2. Does the monitoring plan completely describes all measures to be implemented for monitoring all parameter required?		DR, I	Yes, all measures to be implemented for monitoring all parameters are described.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.9.3. Does the monitoring plan completely describes all measures to be implemented for ensuring data quality of all parameter to be monitored?		DR, I	Yes, all measures are clearly described.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.9.4. Does the monitoring plan provide information on monitoring equipment and respective positioning in order to safeguard a proper installation?		DR, I	Yes, indications on the proper installation of the devices are provided.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.9.5. Are procedures identified for calibration of monitoring equipment?		DR, I	Yes, correct procedures are identified.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.9.6. Are procedures identified for maintenance of monitoring equipment and installations?		DR, I	Yes, correct procedures for maintenance are identified.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.9.7. Are procedures identified for monitoring, measurements and reporting?		DR, I	Yes, correct procedures for monitoring, measurements and reporting are identified.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.9.8. Are procedures identified for day-to-day records handling (including what records to keep, storage area of records and how to process performance documentation)		DR, I	Yes, correct procedures are identified.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.9.9. Are procedures identified for dealing with possible monitoring data adjustments and uncertain-		DR,	Yes, correct procedures for data uncertain-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
ties?		I	ties are identified.		
D.9.10. Does the monitoring plan provide procedures identified for troubleshooting allowing redundant reconstruction of data in case of monitoring problems?		DR, I	Yes, correct procedures are identified.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.9.11. Are procedures identified for review of reported results/data?		DR, I	Yes, a correct procedure is identified for data review.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.9.12. Are procedures identified for internal audits of GHG project compliance with operational requirements where applicable?		DR, I	Yes, internal audits will be performed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.9.13. Are procedures identified for project performance reviews before data is submitted for verification, internally or externally?		DR, I	Yes, correct procedures are identified.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.9.14. Are procedures identified for corrective actions in order to provide for more accurate future monitoring and reporting?		DR, I	Yes, correct procedures are identified.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>E. Calculation of GHG Emissions by Source</b>					
<b>E.1. Predicted Project GHG Emissions</b>					
E.1.1. Are all aspects related to direct and indirect GHG emissions captured in the project design?		DR, I	Yes, all aspects are dealt with and no indirect GHG emissions are expected.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
E.1.2. Are the GHG calculations documented in a complete and transparent manner?	5	DR, I	<b>Clarification Request No. 6</b> In the PDD there is a consideration of the emission from the flare, please specify if it is from the flare inefficiency and make a description of the determination of the flare	CR 6	



## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			efficiency process.		
E.1.3. Have conservative assumptions been used to calculate project GHG emissions?		DR, I	See CR 2 and CR 6	Open	
E.1.4. Are uncertainties in the GHG emissions estimates properly addressed in the documentation?		DR, I	Yes, as far as above CARs and CRs are solved.	Open	
E.1.5. Is the projection based on same procedures as used for later monitoring or acceptable alternative models?		DR, I	Yes, the projection is based on same procedures as used for later monitoring.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
E.1.6. Is the projection based on provable input parameter?		DR, I	The projection is based on historical inventory data.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>E.2. Leakage</b>					
E.2.1. Are potential leakage effects beyond the chosen project boundaries properly identified?		DR, I	No monitoring of leakage is required	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
E.2.2. Have these leakage effects been properly accounted for in calculations?		DR, I	No monitoring of leakage is required	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
E.2.3. Have conservative assumptions been used to calculate leakage emissions?		DR, I	No monitoring of leakage is required	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
E.2.4. Are uncertainties in the leakage estimates properly addressed in the documentation?		DR, I	No monitoring of leakage is required	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
E.2.5. Is the projection based on same procedures as used for later monitoring or acceptable alternative models?		DR, I	No monitoring of leakage is required	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
E.2.6. Is the projection based on provable input parameter?		DR, I	No monitoring of leakage is required	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	



## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
<b>E.3. Baseline Emissions</b>					
E.3.1. Have the most relevant and likely operational characteristics and baseline indicators been chosen as reference for baseline emissions?		DR, I	Yes, the relevant operation characteristics indicators have been chosen.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
E.3.2. Are the baseline boundaries clearly defined and do they sufficiently cover sources and sinks for baseline emissions?		DR, I	Yes, the baseline boundaries are clearly identified.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
E.3.3. Are the GHG calculations documented in a complete and transparent manner?		DR, I	Yes all the calculations are documented in a transparent manner.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
E.3.4. Have conservative assumptions been used when calculating baseline emissions?		DR,I	See CR 6	Open	
E.3.5. Are uncertainties in the GHG emission estimates properly addressed in the documentation?		DR, I	Yes, uncertainties are clearly addressed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
E.3.6. Is the projection based on same procedures as used for later monitoring or acceptable alternative models?		DR, I	Yes, the projection is based on same procedures as used for later monitoring.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
E.3.7. Is the projection based on provable input parameter?		DR, I	Yes, the calculations are based on the historical animal population, the decrees or increase of capacity production will be monitored as specified in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>E.4. Emission Reductions</b>					
E.4.1. Will the project result in fewer GHG emissions than the baseline scenario?		DR, I	Yes, the emissions will be lower.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
E.4.2. Is the form/table required for the indication of		DR,	Yes, the form is correctly applied.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
projected emission reductions correctly applied?		I			
E.4.3. Is the projection in line with the envisioned time schedule for the project's implementation and the indicated crediting period?		DR, I	Yes, the projection is compliant with the schedule.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>F. Environmental Impacts</b>					
F.1.1. Has an analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity been sufficiently described?		DR, I	Yes, the project has only positive effects on the environment.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
F.1.2. Are there any Host Party requirements for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and if yes, is an EIA approved?		DR, I	An EIA is not necessary.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
F.1.3. Will the project create any adverse environmental effects?		DR, I	No negative environmental impacts are expected from the proposed project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
F.1.4. Are transboundary environmental impacts considered in the analysis?		DR, I	Yes, there are no transboundary environmental impacts.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
F.1.5. Have identified environmental impacts been addressed in the project design?		DR, I	Yes, all environmental impacts are considered in the project design.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
F.1.6. Does the project comply with environmental legislation in the host country?		DR, I	Yes, the project respects the host country's environmental legislation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>G. Stakeholder Comments</b>					
G.1.1. Have relevant stakeholders been consulted?		DR, I	Yes, stakeholder meetings have been held.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
G.1.2. Have appropriate media been used to invite comments by local stakeholders?		DR, I	Yes, information on the meetings has been provided through newspapers.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
G.1.3. 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?		DR, I	Yes, the stakeholder consultation process had been carried out in accordance with host country regulations/laws.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
G.1.4. Is the undertaken stakeholder process described in a complete and transparent manner?		DR, I	Yes, it is clearly described in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
G.1.5. Is a summary of the stakeholder comments received provided?		DR, I	No relevant comments arrived from the stakeholders.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
G.1.6. Has due account been taken of any stakeholder comments received?		DR, I	No relevant comments was received form the stakeholders.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

**Table 1b PDD**

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
<b>A. General description of small-scale project activity</b>				
<b>A.1. Title of the small-scale project activity</b>				
A.1.1. Does the used project title clearly enable to identify the unique CDM activity?		Yes, the project is clearly defined in the title and explained in the PDD and Bundling Form.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.1.2. Are there any indication concerning the revision number and the date of the revision?		Yes, the document ID, revision number and date of the PDD are posted on the front cover.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.1.3. Is this consistent with the time line of the project's history?		Yes, the date of the revision is consistent with the time line of the project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>A.2. Description of the small-scale project activity</b>				
A.2.1. Is the description delivering a transparent overview of the project activities?		Yes, the project activity is clearly defined in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.2.2. What proofs are available demonstrating that the project description is in compliance with the actual situation or planning?	1	Yes, the purpose of the project and the contribution to the sustainable development are in compliance with the actual situation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.2.3. Is the information provided by these proofs consistent with the information provided by the PDD?	1	Yes. The information given in the PDD, e.g. the animal population, number of lagoons, barns, location, was confirmed in the main during the on-site visit.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.2.4. Is all information presented consistent with details provided by further chapters of the PDD?		Yes, the information is consistent with the details provided in the following chapters.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.2.5. Describe the type of Waste Management System (WMS) used in the site (e. g. Anaerobic lagoon, composting, solid separator, etc.)	1	The farm is divided into three areas; each of them has corrals and a milking room, and a holding room. Altogether, they are 5 paved corrals, 3 milking rooms, and 3 holding areas. Manure from these areas is flushed 3 -4 times a day and then it is pumped to a series	CR CAR	

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
		<p>of solid separators, that consists on 3 separators, one for each of the three areas, and a final separator that receives all the manure from the other separators. Finally it is pumped to a Primary Lagoon.</p> <p>A covered anaerobic digester for capture and combustion of Bio-gas will be the Waste Management System used in the visited farm.</p> <p><b><u>Clarification Request No. 1</u></b></p> <p>In figure B.2, it is indicated that a 33% of the manure is separated due to the solid separator. Please clarify if this percentage increases due to the 2 step solid separator. Please correct as it is necessary.</p> <p><b><u>Corrective Action Request No.1.</u></b></p> <p>In section B.3 it is mentioned that the results ranged averaged 14% Vs reduction by the stationary inclined screen separator. On the other hand, figure B.2 shows the average of volatile solids reduction is 33%. Please clarify this inconsistency and correct as it is necessary.</p>		
A.2.6. Does the description of the technology to be applied provide sufficient and transparent input to evaluate its impact on the greenhouse gas balance?		Yes. The technology description in the PDD provides a transparent input in the in the project impact on the greenhouse gas balance.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.2.7. Is the brief explanation how the project will reduce greenhouse gas emission transparent and suitable?		Yes. An explanation is included on the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
<b>A.3. Project participants</b>				
A.3.1. Is the form required for the indication of project participants correctly applied?		Yes, it is correctly applied.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.3.2. Is the participation of the listed entities or Parties confirmed by each one of them?	3	Yes, it was confirmed with the Letter of Intend.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.3.3. Is all information on participants / Parties provided in consistency with details provided by further chapters of the PDD (in particular annex 1)?		Yes. The information about the project participants is consistent with further chapters of the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>A.4. Technical description of the small-scale project activity</b>				
<i>A.4.1. Location of the small-scale project activity</i>				
A.4.1.1. Does the information provided on the location of the project activity allow for a clear identification of the site(s)?	1	<p>The address provided in the PDD was corroborated on site. Nevertheless see correction request below.</p> <p><b><u>Corrective Action Request No.2.</u></b></p> <p>The GPS information provided in the PDD is not correct. During the on-site visit it was measured as follows:  N 28° 08' 46.3" W 105° 24' 57.8"  Please correct the GPS information.</p>	CAR	
A.4.1.2. How is it ensured and/or demonstrated, that the project proponents can implement the project at this site (ownership, licenses, contracts etc.)?		Yes, the participant has the documents of the ownership of sites.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>A.4.2. Type and category(ies) and technology/measure of the small-scale project activity</i>				
A.4.2.1. To which type(s) does the project activity belong to? Is the type correctly identi-		The project activity is classified as Type III, other project activities. It is correctly indicated in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
fied and indicated?				
A.4.2.2. To which category (ies) does the project activity belong to? Is the category correctly identified and indicated?		Category III.D, Methane recovery in agricultural and agro industrial activities, is correctly indicated in chapter A.4.2 of the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4.2.3. Does the technical design of the project activity reflect current good practices?	10	Yes. The technical design and the technology used in the project activity reflect good practices.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4.2.4. Does the implementation of the project activity require any technology transfer from Annex-I-countries to the host country (ies)?		No. The used technology will be sourced from the host country	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4.2.5. Is the technology implemented by the project activity environmentally safe?	6	Yes, the implemented technology is environmentally safe.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4.2.6. Is the information provided in compliance with actual situation or planning?	1	Yes, the information provided are in compliance with the actual situation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4.2.7. Does the project use state of the art technology and / or does the technology result in a significantly better performance than any commonly used technologies in the host country?		Yes, the technology to be employed by the project activity includes the installation of new covered lagoons creating an anaerobic digester. The project will improve the practice.	??	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4.2.8. Is the project technology likely to be substituted by other or more efficient technologies within the project period?		No, this technology is not common in the host country and it will not be substituted within the project period.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4.2.9. Does the project require extensive initial training and maintenance efforts in order to be carried out as scheduled during the project period?	4	Yes, the project make considerations about training and maintenance to keep the normal operations during the project period,	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4.2.10. Is information available on the demand and requirements for training and main-		Yes, the know-how transfer is duly taken into account in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
tenance?				
A.4.2.11. Is a schedule available for the implementation of the project and are there any risks for delays?		Yes, the construction of the project is implemented under schedule. The PDD indicates the start and finish date of construction.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>A.4.3. Estimated amount of emission reductions over the chosen crediting period</b>				
A.4.3.1. Is the form required for the indication of projected emission reductions correctly applied?		Yes, the form to show project emission reductions is correctly applied on chapter A.4.3 of the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4.3.2. Are the figures provided consistent with other data presented in the PDD?	8	Information showed in figures of sections A.4.3 and B.6.4 is the same. Nevertheless see correction request below.  <b><u>Corrective Action Request No.3.</u></b> Project Activity Emissions in Table B.6 do not correspond to the calculations in Table B.4; therefore Estimated Emission Reductions are not correct.	CAR	
A.4.3.3. Are the figures consistent with the small-scale criteria for the used Type?	7	Yes, the estimated annual emission reductions are consistent with the small scale criteria, since they do not exceed 60ktCO <sub>2</sub> e yearly.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>A.4.4. Public funding of the small-scale project activity</b>				
A.4.4.1. Is the information provided on public funding provided in compliance with the actual situation or planning as available by the project participants?		No applicable. The project does not use public funding.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4.4.2. Is all information provided consistent with the details given in remaining chapters of the PDD (in particular annex 2)?		Yes. See comments above.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>A.4.5. Confirmation that the small-scale project activity is not a debundled component of a large scale project activity</b>				



## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD										
A.4.5.1. Is there a registered small-scale CDM site of a project activity or an application to register another small-scale CDM project activity: with the following characteristics:		<table><tr><td>Debundling checklist</td><td>Yes / No</td></tr><tr><td>the same project participants?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>In the same project category and technology/measure?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Registered within previous two years? Or in registration process?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Whose boundary is within 1 km of the project boundary of the small scale project activity (sites) under consideration?</td><td>No</td></tr></table>	Debundling checklist	Yes / No	the same project participants?	Yes	In the same project category and technology/measure?	Yes	Registered within previous two years? Or in registration process?	Yes	Whose boundary is within 1 km of the project boundary of the small scale project activity (sites) under consideration?	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Debundling checklist	Yes / No													
the same project participants?	Yes													
In the same project category and technology/measure?	Yes													
Registered within previous two years? Or in registration process?	Yes													
Whose boundary is within 1 km of the project boundary of the small scale project activity (sites) under consideration?	No													
A.4.5.2. If the answer to all the above question is 'Yes' then does the total size of the small scale project activity combined with previously registered small scale CDM project activity exceeds the limits of small scale CDM project activities?		No applicable. The project is not a debundled component of a large scale project activity.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>										
B. Application of a baseline and monitoring methodology														
B.1. Title and reference of the approved baseline and monitoring methodology applied to the small-scale project activity														
B.1.1.1.Are reference number, version number, and title of the baseline and monitoring methodology clearly indicated?		Yes, this information is clearly indicated in section B.1 on the PDD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>										
B.1.1.2.Is the applied version the most recent one and / or is this version still applicable?	7,11	Yes, the PDD is updated to the version 11 of the methodology, which is valid until January 8, 2008.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>										
B.2. Justification of the choice of the project category														
B.2.1. Is the applied methodology considered the most appropriate one?		Yes, see criteria below.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>										

# Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD								
Integrate the required amount of sub-checklists on the applicability criteria as given by the applied methodology and comment on at least every line answered with “No”; Replace blue text												
<p>B.2.1.1.Criterion 1:</p> <p>Does the project category comprise methane recovery from manure and wastes from agricultural or agro-industrial activities by</p> <p>(a) installing methane recovery and combustion system to an existing source of methane emissions, or</p> <p>(b) changing the management practice of a biogenic waste or raw material in order to achieve the controlled anaerobic digestion equipped with methane recovery and combustion system?</p>		<table><tr><td>Applicability checklist</td><td>Yes / No / NA</td></tr><tr><td>Criterion discussed in the PDD?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Compliance provable?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Compliance verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>	Applicability checklist	Yes / No / NA	Criterion discussed in the PDD?	Yes	Compliance provable?	Yes	Compliance verified?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Applicability checklist	Yes / No / NA											
Criterion discussed in the PDD?	Yes											
Compliance provable?	Yes											
Compliance verified?	Yes											
<p>B.2.1.2.Criterion 2:</p> <p>Does the project are not recovering methane from landfills or waste water treatment?</p>		<table><tr><td>Applicability checklist</td><td>Yes / No / NA</td></tr><tr><td>Criterion discussed in the PDD?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Compliance provable?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Compliance verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>	Applicability checklist	Yes / No / NA	Criterion discussed in the PDD?	Yes	Compliance provable?	Yes	Compliance verified?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Applicability checklist	Yes / No / NA											
Criterion discussed in the PDD?	Yes											
Compliance provable?	Yes											
Compliance verified?	Yes											
<p>B.2.1.3.Criterion 3:</p> <p>Are the measures limited to those that result in emission reductions of less than or equal to 60 kt CO2 equivalent annually?</p>		<table><tr><td>Applicability checklist</td><td>Yes / No / NA</td></tr><tr><td>Criterion discussed in the PDD?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Compliance provable?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Compliance verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>	Applicability checklist	Yes / No / NA	Criterion discussed in the PDD?	Yes	Compliance provable?	Yes	Compliance verified?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Applicability checklist	Yes / No / NA											
Criterion discussed in the PDD?	Yes											
Compliance provable?	Yes											
Compliance verified?	Yes											
<p>B.2.1.4.Criterion 4:</p> <p>Are the technical measures being used (e.g. flared,</p>		<table><tr><td>Applicability checklist</td><td>Yes / No / NA</td></tr><tr><td>Criterion discussed in the PDD?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>	Applicability checklist	Yes / No / NA	Criterion discussed in the PDD?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Applicability checklist	Yes / No / NA											
Criterion discussed in the PDD?	Yes											

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS		PPD in GSP	Final PDD
combusted) to ensure that all biogas produced by the digester is destroyed?		Compliance provable?		Yes	
		Compliance verified?		Yes	
B.3. Description of the project boundary					
B.3.1. Does the project boundary include physical, geographical site(s) where the methane recovery facilities are taking place?		Yes. The project boundary is located in the farm.		☑	☑
B.3.2. Do the spatial and technological boundaries as verified on-site comply with the discussion provided by / indication included to the PDD?		See Clarification Request No. 1 and Corrective Action Request No.1		Open	
B.4. Description of baseline and its development					
Integrate questions concerning the determination of the additionality as provided by the methodology applied or insert the module provided when applying the “additionality tool”; Replace blue text, if necessary					
B.4.1. Have all technically feasible baseline scenario alternatives to the project activity been identified and discussed by the PDD? Why can this list be considered as being complete?		Yes. The alternatives have been identified and discussed in the PDD. Alternatives to the project activity without the help of CDM revenues have been discussed.		☑	☑
B.4.2. Does the project identifies correctly and excludes those options not in line with regulatory or legal requirements?		Yes. The legal requirement has been discussed in the PDD.		☑	☑
B.4.3. Have applicable regulatory or legal requirements been identified?		Yes, regulatory requirements have been identified.		☑	☑
B.4.4. Does the PDD identify the most likely baseline scenario in absence of the project		Yes, the common practice is included in the PDD.		☑	☑

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
activity?				
B.4.5. Is this identification supported by official and/or verifiable documents (e.g. studies, web pages, certificates, etc)?		Yes, documentation regarding these options has been submitted to the DOE.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.4.6. Is the identified baseline scenario in line with regulatory or legal requirements?		Yes. The baseline Scenario is in line with the local legal requirements.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>B.5. Description of how the anthropogenic emissions of GHG by sources are reduced below those that would have occurred in the absence of the registered small-scale CDM project activity:</b>				
Integrate questions concerning the determination of the additionality when applying the “additionality tool”; Replace blue text, if necessary				
B.5.1. In case of applying step 2 / investment analysis of the additionality tool: Is the analysis method identified appropriately (step 2a)?		No applicable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.5.2. In case of Option I (simple cost analysis): Is it demonstrated that the activity produces no economic benefits other than CDM income?		No applicable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.5.3. In case of Option II (investment comparison analysis): Is the most suitable financial indicator clearly identified (IRR, NPV, cost benefit ratio, or (levelized) unit cost)?		No applicable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.5.4. In case of Option III (benchmark analysis): Is the most suitable financial indicator clearly identified (IRR, NPV, cost benefit ratio, or (levelized) unit cost)?		No applicable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
B.5.5. In case of Option II or Option III: Is the calculation of financial figures for this indicator correctly done for all alternatives and the project activity?		No applicable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.5.6. In case of Option II or Option III: Is the analysis presented in a transparent manner including publicly available proofs for the utilized data?		No applicable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.5.7. In case of applying step 3 (barrier analysis) of the additionality tool: Is a complete list of barriers developed that prevent the different alternatives to occur?		No applicable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.5.8. In case of applying step 3 (barrier analysis): Is transparent and documented evidence provided on the existence and significance of these barriers?		No applicable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.5.9. In case of applying step 3 (barrier analysis): Is it transparently shown that the execution of at least one of the alternatives is not prevented by the identified barriers?		No applicable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.5.10. Have other activities in the host country / region similar to the project activity been identified and are these activities appropriately analyzed by the PDD (step 4a)?		No applicable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.5.11. If similar activities are occurring: Is it demonstrated that in spite of these similarities the project activity would not be implemented without the CDM component		No applicable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD															
(step 4b)?																			
B.5.12. Is it appropriately explained how the approval of the project activity will help to overcome the economic and financial hurdles or other identified barriers (step 5)?		No applicable.	☑	☑															
If the additionality tool has not been used please answer B.5.13 to B.5.18																			
B.5.13. If the starting date of the project activity is before the date of validation, is evidence available to prove that incentive from the CDM was seriously considered in the decision to proceed with the project activity?		No applicable.	☑	☑															
B.5.14. Is a complete list of barriers developed that prevents the project activity to occur?		Yes, a list with all relevant barriers has been included in the PDD.	☑	☑															
B.5.15. Does this list include at least one of the following barriers?		<table><tr><th>Barrier</th><th>Discussed?</th><th>Verifiable?</th></tr><tr><td>Investment</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Technological</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Due to prevailing practice</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Other</td><td>No</td><td>No</td></tr></table>	Barrier	Discussed?	Verifiable?	Investment	Yes	Yes	Technological	Yes	Yes	Due to prevailing practice	Yes	Yes	Other	No	No	☑	☑
Barrier	Discussed?	Verifiable?																	
Investment	Yes	Yes																	
Technological	Yes	Yes																	
Due to prevailing practice	Yes	Yes																	
Other	No	No																	
B.5.16. Does the discussion sufficiently take into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies?	6	Yes. National Policies and regulations are included in the PDD.	☑	☑															
B.5.17. Is transparent and documented evidence provided on the existence and significance of these barriers?		Yes. Documentation supporting the barriers has been verified by the audit team.	☑	☑															

# Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD						
B.5.18. Is it appropriately explained how the approval of the project activity will help to overcome the identified barriers?		Yes, this issue is appropriately explained.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
B.6. Emissions reductions										
Integrate questions concerning methodological choices and selection of options, if necessary										
B.6.1. Explanation of methodological choices										
B.6.1.1.Is it explained how the procedures provided in the methodology are applied by the proposed project activity?		Yes, formulas and calculations are included in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
B.6.1.2.Is every selection of options offered by the methodology correctly justified and is this justification in line with the situation verified on-site?		Yes, the right options have been chosen and are in line with the situation verified on-site.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
B.6.1.3.Determination of project emissions (Comment on any line answered “No”) if biogas is released to the atmosphere unburned, these methane emissions shall be considered as the project emissions. Project emissions therefore consist of:										
a. Component 1: emissions from methane not captured by the project and released to the atmosphere		<table><tr><td>Project emission checklist</td><td>Yes / No</td></tr><tr><td>Component discussed in the PDD?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Formulae correctly applied?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>	Project emission checklist	Yes / No	Component discussed in the PDD?	Yes	Formulae correctly applied?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Project emission checklist	Yes / No									
Component discussed in the PDD?	Yes									
Formulae correctly applied?	Yes									
b. Component 2: emissions from methane captured and not flared (e.g. physical leakage, flare inefficiency, flare availability)		<table><tr><td>Project emission checklist</td><td>Yes / No</td></tr><tr><td>Component discussed in the PDD?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Formulae correctly applied?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>	Project emission checklist	Yes / No	Component discussed in the PDD?	Yes	Formulae correctly applied?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Project emission checklist	Yes / No									
Component discussed in the PDD?	Yes									
Formulae correctly applied?	Yes									

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD						
c. Component 3: emissions from CO2 emissions from combustion of non-biogenic methane;		<table><tr><td>Project emission checklist</td><td>Yes / No</td></tr><tr><td>Component discussed in the PDD?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Formulae correctly applied?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>	Project emission checklist	Yes / No	Component discussed in the PDD?	Yes	Formulae correctly applied?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Project emission checklist	Yes / No									
Component discussed in the PDD?	Yes									
Formulae correctly applied?	Yes									
d. Component 4: emissions from CO2 emissions from use of fossil fuels or electricity for the operation of the facility		<table><tr><td>Project emission checklist</td><td>Yes / No</td></tr><tr><td>Component discussed in the PDD?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Formulae correctly applied?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>	Project emission checklist	Yes / No	Component discussed in the PDD?	Yes	Formulae correctly applied?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Project emission checklist	Yes / No									
Component discussed in the PDD?	Yes									
Formulae correctly applied?	Yes									
e. Component 5: emissions from the aerobic treatment and/or proper soil application of the sludge leaving the digesters in the project activity shall also be ensured and monitored. If the sludge is treated and/or disposed anaerobically, the resulting methane emissions shall be considered as project emissions		<table><tr><td>Project emission checklist</td><td>Yes / No</td></tr><tr><td>Component discussed in the PDD?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Formulae correctly applied?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>	Project emission checklist	Yes / No	Component discussed in the PDD?	Yes	Formulae correctly applied?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Project emission checklist	Yes / No									
Component discussed in the PDD?	Yes									
Formulae correctly applied?	Yes									
B.6.1.4.Are the formulae required for the determination of baseline emissions correctly presented, enabling a complete identification of parameters to be used	7	Yes, the formula is correctly presented and corresponds to the methodology.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						



## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD																		
and / or monitored?																						
B.6.1.5.Are the formulae required for the determination of leakage emissions correctly presented, enabling a complete identification of parameter to be used and / or monitored?	7	Leakage calculations are not required.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																		
B.6.1.6.Are the formulae required for the determination of emission reductions correctly presented?	7	Yes, the formula is correctly presented and corresponds to the methodology.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																		
B.6.2. Data and parameters that are available at validation																						
B.6.2.1.Is the list of parameters presented in chapter B.6.2 considered to be complete with regard to the requirements of the applied methodology?		Yes, the parameters presented are complete.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																		
B.6.2.2.Comment on any line answered with “No”																						
f. Parameter 1: amount of the waste or raw material		<table><tr><th>Data Checklist</th><th>Yes / No / NA</th></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Choice of data correctly justified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>	Data Checklist	Yes / No / NA	Title in line with methodology?	Yes	Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes	Appropriate description of parameter?	Yes	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided?	Yes	Has this value been verified?	Yes	Choice of data correctly justified?	Yes	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Data Checklist	Yes / No / NA																					
Title in line with methodology?	Yes																					
Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes																					
Appropriate description of parameter?	Yes																					
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																					
Correct value provided?	Yes																					
Has this value been verified?	Yes																					
Choice of data correctly justified?	Yes																					
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																					
g. Parameter 2: most recent IPCC tier 2 (i.e. Vs, Bo, MCF)		<table><tr><th>Data Checklist</th><th>Yes / No / NA</th></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>	Data Checklist	Yes / No / NA	Title in line with methodology?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>														
Data Checklist	Yes / No / NA																					
Title in line with methodology?	Yes																					

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS		PPD in GSP	Final PDD																		
		<table><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Choice of data correctly justified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>	Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes	Appropriate description of parameter?	Yes	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided?	Yes	Has this value been verified?	Yes	Choice of data correctly justified?	Yes	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes							
Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes																						
Appropriate description of parameter?	Yes																						
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																						
Correct value provided?	Yes																						
Has this value been verified?	Yes																						
Choice of data correctly justified?	Yes																						
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																						
h. Parameter 3 (only for Animal WMS):population and type of animals.		<table><tr><td>Data Checklist</td><td>Yes / No / NA</td></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Choice of data correctly justified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table> <p>If the recovered methane is used for heat or electricity generation, please include the corresponding protocol</p>	Data Checklist	Yes / No / NA	Title in line with methodology?	Yes	Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes	Appropriate description of parameter?	Yes	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided?	Yes	Has this value been verified?	Yes	Choice of data correctly justified?	Yes	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Data Checklist	Yes / No / NA																						
Title in line with methodology?	Yes																						
Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes																						
Appropriate description of parameter?	Yes																						
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																						
Correct value provided?	Yes																						
Has this value been verified?	Yes																						
Choice of data correctly justified?	Yes																						
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																						
B.6.3. Ex-ante calculation of emission reductions																							
B.6.3.1.Is the projection based on the same procedures as used for future monitoring?		No, as the projection is based on the amount of animal manure and the future monitoring will measure the amount of methane burned.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																		

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
B.6.3.2.Are the GHG calculations documented in a complete and transparent manner?	8	Yes, all GHG calculations are completely documented in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.6.3.3.If there is more than one component of the project activity, then, are emission reduction calculations provided separately for each component?		No applicable, since the project includes one single farm.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.6.3.4.Is the data provided in this section consistent with data as presented in other chapters of the PDD?		No, please refer to Corrective Action Request No.3.	Open	
<b>B.6.4. Summary of the ex-ante estimation of emission reductions</b>				
B.6.4.1.Will the project result in fewer GHG emissions than the baseline scenario?		Yes, emissions will be significantly reduced due to the project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.6.4.2.Is the form/table required for the indication of projected emission reductions correctly applied?		Yes, the form is correctly applied to show emission reductions per year.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.6.4.3.If the project activity involves more than one component, is separate table included for each of the component.		No applicable, since the project includes one single farm.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.6.4.4.Do these values comply with small-scale criteria for every year?	7	Yes, as they are fewer than 60ktCO <sub>2</sub> e	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.6.4.5.Is the projection in line with the envisioned time schedule for the project's implementation and the indicated crediting period?		Yes, the projection is compliant with the schedule.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.6.4.6.Is the data provided in this section in consistency with data as presented in other chapters of the PDD?		No, please refer to Corrective Action Request No.3.	Open	

# Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD																								
B.7. Application of the monitoring methodology and description of the monitoring plan																												
B.7.1. Data and parameters monitored																												
B.7.1.1.Is the list of parameters presented in chapter B.7.1 considered to be complete with regard to the requirements of the applied methodology?		Yes, the list in the PDD is complete.	☑	☑																								
B.7.1.2.Comment on any line answered with “No”																												
i. Parameter 1: biogas flow		<table><tr><th>Monitoring Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	Yes	Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes	Appropriate description of parameter?	Yes	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	Yes	Has this value been verified?	Yes	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes	QA/QC procedures described?	Yes	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes	☑	☑
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	Yes																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	Yes																											
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	Yes																											
Has this value been verified?	Yes																											
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																											
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures described?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																											
j. Parameter 2: biogas temperature		<table><tr><th>Monitoring Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	Yes	Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes	Appropriate description of parameter?	Yes	☑	☑																
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	Yes																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	Yes																											

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS		PPD in GSP	Final PDD																								
		Source clearly referenced?	Yes																										
		Correct value provided for estimation?	Yes																										
		Has this value been verified?	Yes																										
		Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																										
		Correct reference to standards?	Yes																										
		Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes																										
		QA/QC procedures described?	Yes																										
		QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																										
k. Parameter 3: pressure		<table><tr><td>Monitoring Checklist</td><td>Yes / No</td></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>		Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	Yes	Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes	Appropriate description of parameter?	Yes	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	Yes	Has this value been verified?	Yes	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes	QA/QC procedures described?	Yes	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																												
Title in line with methodology?	Yes																												
Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes																												
Appropriate description of parameter?	Yes																												
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																												
Correct value provided for estimation?	Yes																												
Has this value been verified?	Yes																												
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																												
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																												
Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes																												
QA/QC procedures described?	Yes																												
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																												
l. Parameter 4: fraction of CH4		<table><tr><td>Monitoring Checklist</td><td>Yes / No</td></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>		Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																				
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																												
Title in line with methodology?	Yes																												

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS		PPD in GSP	Final PDD																								
		<table><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>	Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes	Appropriate description of parameter?	Yes	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	Yes	Has this value been verified?	Yes	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes	QA/QC procedures described?	Yes	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes							
Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes																												
Appropriate description of parameter?	Yes																												
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																												
Correct value provided for estimation?	Yes																												
Has this value been verified?	Yes																												
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																												
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																												
Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes																												
QA/QC procedures described?	Yes																												
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																												
m. Parameter 5: flare efficiency		<table><tr><td>Monitoring Checklist</td><td>Yes / No</td></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	Yes	Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes	Appropriate description of parameter?	Yes	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	Yes	Has this value been verified?	Yes	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes	QA/QC procedures described?	Yes	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																												
Title in line with methodology?	Yes																												
Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes																												
Appropriate description of parameter?	Yes																												
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																												
Correct value provided for estimation?	Yes																												
Has this value been verified?	Yes																												
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																												
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																												
Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes																												
QA/QC procedures described?	Yes																												
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																												
n. Parameter 6: combusted gas				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																								

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS		PPD in GSP	Final PDD
		Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No		
		Title in line with methodology?	Yes		
		Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes		
		Appropriate description of parameter?	Yes		
		Source clearly referenced?	Yes		
		Correct value provided for estimation?	Yes		
		Has this value been verified?	Yes		
		Measurement method correctly described?	Yes		
		Correct reference to standards?	Yes		
		Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes		
		QA/QC procedures described?	Yes		
		QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes		
		o.           Parameter 7: fraction of time in which the gas is combusted in the flare			
Title in line with methodology?	Yes				
Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes				
Appropriate description of parameter?	Yes				
Source clearly referenced?	Yes				
Correct value provided for estimation?	Yes				
Has this value been verified?	Yes				
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes				
Correct reference to standards?	Yes				
Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes				
QA/QC procedures described?	Yes				
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes				
B.7.2. Description of the monitoring plan					

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
B.7.2.1. Is the operational and management structure clearly described and in compliance with the envisioned situation?		Yes. Management structures are clearly described in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.7.2.2. Are responsibilities and institutional arrangements for data collection and archiving clearly provided?	4	Yes. Responsible and arrangements for monitoring are provided.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.7.2.3. Does the monitoring plan provide current good monitoring practice?	4,10	Yes. The monitoring plan reflects current good practices.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.7.2.4. If applicable: Does annex 4 provide useful information enabling a better understanding of the envisioned monitoring provisions?		Yes, annex 4 provides detailed information about the monitoring procedures and technical data.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>B.8. Date of completion of the application of the baseline study and monitoring methodology on the name of the responsible person(s)/entity(ies)</b>				
B.8.1.1. Is there any indication of a date when the baseline was determined?		Yes, the date is 25/01/2007.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.8.1.2. Has dd/mm/yyyy format been used to indicate the date.		Yes, the correct format was applied.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.8.1.3. Is this consistent with the time line of the PDD history?	5	Yes, as the inventories taken on account are from October 2005 to September 2006.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.8.1.4. Is the information on the person(s) / entity (ies) responsible for the application of the baseline and monitoring methodology provided consistent with the actual situation?	3	Yes, the entity determining the baseline and monitoring methodology is AgCert International plc.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.8.1.5. Is information provided whether this person / entity is also considered a pro-		Yes, it is clearly indicated that AgCert is a project participant.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
ject participant?				
<b>C. Duration of the project activity / crediting period</b>				
<b>C.1. Duration of the project activity</b>				
C.1.1. Are the project's starting date and operational lifetime clearly defined and reasonable?		Yes, the estimated time is reasonable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>C.2. Choice of the crediting period and related information</b>				
C.2.1. Is the assumed crediting time clearly defined and reasonable (renewable crediting period of max 7 years with potential for 2 renewals or fixed crediting period of max. 10 years)?		Yes. The chosen period is a 10 year fixed crediting period.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C.2.2. Has dd/mm/yyyy format been used to indicate the start date of the crediting period.		Yes, the date is 01/07/2007.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>D. Environmental impacts</b>				
<b>D.1. If required by the host Party, documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity:</b>				
D.1.1. Are there any Host Party requirements for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and if yes, has an EIA been approved? If yes answer also D.1.2 to D.1.4	6	An EIA is not necessary.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.2. Has the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity been sufficiently described?	6	No applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.3. Will the project create any adverse environmental effects?	6	No negative environmental impacts are expected from the proposed project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
D.1.4. Were transboundary environmental impacts identified in the analysis?		No applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>D.2. If environmental impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the host Party, please provide conclusions and all references to support documentation of an environmental impact assessment undertaken in accordance with the procedures as required by the host Party</b>				
D.2.1. Have the identified environmental impacts been addressed in the project design sufficiently?		Yes, no environmental impacts. .	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.2.2. Does the project comply with environmental legislation in the host country?		Yes, the project respects the host country's environmental legislation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>E. Stakeholders' comments</b>				
<b>E.1. Brief description how comments by local stakeholders have been invited and compiled</b>				
E.1.1. Have relevant stakeholders been consulted?	12	Yes, stakeholder meetings have been held.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.1.2. Have appropriate media been used to invite comments by local stakeholders?	12	Yes, information on the meetings has been provided through newspapers.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.1.3. 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?	12	Yes, the stakeholder consultation process had been carried out in accordance with host country regulations/laws.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.1.4. Is the undertaken stakeholder process that was carried out described in a complete and transparent manner?	12	Yes, it is clearly described in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
<b>E.2.Summary of the comments received</b>				
E.2.1. Is a summary of the received stakeholder comments provided?	12	No relevant comments was received form the stakeholders.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>E.3.Report on how due account was taken of any comments received</b>				
E.3.1. Has due account been taken of any stakeholder comments received?	12	No relevant comments was received form the stakeholders.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>F. Annexes 1 - 4</b>				
<b>F.1.Annex 1: Contact Information</b>				
F.1.1. Is the information provided consistent with the one given under section A.3?		Yes, the information is consistent in both sections	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
F.1.2. Is the information on all private participants and directly involved Parties presented?		Yes, all involved parties are included.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>F.2.Annex 2: Information regarding public funding</b>				
F.2.1. Is the information provided on the inclusion of public funding (if any) in consistency with the actual situation presented by the project participants?		No public funding was provided for this project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
F.2.2. If necessary: Is an affirmation available that any such funding from Annex-I countries does not result in a diversion of ODA?		See comment above.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>F.3.Annex 3: Baseline information</b>				
F.3.1. If additional background information on baseline data is provided: Is this in-		Yes, the baseline information presented is in line with other sections of the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
formation consistent with data presented by other sections of the PDD?				
F.3.2. Is the data provided verifiable? Has sufficient evidence been provided to the validation team?		The audit team verified these values during the on-site visit.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
F.3.3. Does the additional information substantiate / support statements given in other sections of the PDD?		Yes, the information supports the calculations provided in other sections of the PDD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>F.4. Annex 4: Monitoring information</b>				
F.4.1. If additional background information on monitoring is provided: Is this information consistent with data presented in other sections of the PDD?		Yes, the monitoring information presented is in line with other sections of the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
F.4.2. Is the information provided verifiable? Has sufficient evidence been provided to the validation team?		The audit team verified the information during the on-site visit.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
F.4.3. Do the additional information and / or documented procedures substantiate / support statements given in other sections of the PDD?		Yes, the information given supports other monitoring information given in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

**Table 2a Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests Table 1a**

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in tables 1a	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
<b>CRs</b>			
<b><u>Clarification Request No. 1</u></b> The technology should be better explained; especially the functioning and controlling of enclose flaring system and the blower equipment.	Table 1a A.4.4	#1, PDD updated to include more descriptive text of system operation including functioning and controlling.	The revised PDD is responding to CARS and CRS given by table 1a. Any further new issue or still unresolved issue will be indicated in table 1b. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b><u>Clarification Request No. 2</u></b> Please clarify why the blower operation per day is 12 hours, beside 24 hours.	Table 1a A.4.5 E.1.3	#1, PDD corrected and updated with information based on 24 hours.	The revised PDD is responding to CARS and CRS given by table 1a. Any further new issue or still unresolved issue will be indicated in table 1b. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b><u>Clarification Request No. 3</u></b> The project schedule is missing; this document needs to be submitted to the validator.	Table 1a A.4.12	#1, Construction information is included in the site description area of the PDD.	The revised PDD is responding to CARS and CRS given by table 1a. Any further new issue or still unresolved issue will be indicated in table 1b. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

<b>Clarification Request No. 4</b> It should be clear how the flare efficiency is measured. Accord the information reviewed a enclose flare will be use. Please give send to the Validator the design of the enclose flare. In the PDD is not described the efficiency of the equipment.	Table 1a D.1.4	#1, PDD updated to include more descriptive text of system operation efficiency of equipment.	The revised PDD is responding to CARS and CRS given by table 1a. Any further new issue or still unresolved issue will be indicated in table 1b. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Clarification Request No. 5</b> Please give more information about variable "3. CEE" of the monitoring plan, specify how will be determined when the flare is out of service.	Table 1a D.2.5 D.3.4 D.4.4	#1, PDD updated to include more information of variable 3. CEE, including how it will be determined when the flare is out of service.	The revised PDD is responding to CARS and CRS given by table 1a. Any further new issue or still unresolved issue will be indicated in table 1b. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Clarification Request No. 6</b> In the PDD there is a consideration of the emission from the flare, please specify if it is from the flare inefficiency and make a description of the determination of the flare efficiency process.	Table 1a E.1.2 E.1.3	#1, PDD updated to include more descriptive text of system operation, including flare efficiency.	The revised PDD is responding to CARS and CRS given by table 1a. Any further new issue or still unresolved issue will be indicated in table 1b. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>CARs</b>			
<b>Corrective Action Request No.1.</b> Please correct the projects name in the files of the digester design and awms-Zaragoza, from MX06-S-110, to MX07-S-110.	Table 1a A.1.1	#1, Digester desing updated with correct name and correct PDD number to MX07-S-110. Posted on portal.	The revised PDD is responding to CARS and CRS given by table 1a. Any further new issue or still unresolved issue will be indicated in table 1b. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

<b><u>Corrective Action Request No.2.</u></b> According to the PDD information, the project's starting date is March 5 <sup>th</sup> , 2007. This information do not corresponds with the Lol signing date, which is September 29 <sup>th</sup> , 2006. Please correct this issue.	Table 1a A.1.3	#1, Based on the definition in the UNFCCC Glossary of CDM Terms, Ver 1, start date in the PDD is correct because that's when construction is to begin. LOI date is not used as the starting date of the CDM project activity.	The revised PDD is responding to CARS and CRS given by table 1a. Any further new issue or still unresolved issue will be indicated in table 1b. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b><u>Corrective Action Request No.3.</u></b> The solid separators and their use are not described in the PDD, section A.4.1.4. Please correct the description of the site's AWMS.	Table 1a A.3.3	#1, solid separator description added to PDD section A.4.1.4.	The revised PDD is responding to CARS and CRS given by table 1a. Any further new issue or still unresolved issue will be indicated in table 1b. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b><u>Corrective Action Request No.4.</u></b> Please correct: The data of inventories was provided at the moment of the visit. The information of lactating and dry cows is completely equal to the PDD information. The inventories of heifers is little different, not significant. The inventories of calves are completely different.	Table 1a B.2.6	#1, the correct inventories have been updated on the form B and attached to SMS. Data has been updated in EnviroCert and is included in the PDD.	The revised PDD is responding to CARS and CRS given by table 1a. Any further new issue or still unresolved issue will be indicated in table 1b. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service

**Table 2b Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests Table 1b**

Clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to table 1b	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
CR			
<b>Clarification Request No. 1</b> In figure B.2, it is indicated that a 33% of the manure is separated due to the solid separator. Please clarify if this percentage increases due to the 2 step solid separator. Please correct as it is necessary.	A.2.5	As stated in the PDD "AgCert commissioned third party measurements of six (6) dairy sites in Mexico to determine the impact on Vs. The results ranged averaged 33% Vs reduction by the stationary inclined screen separators common to all these sites". The average value of 33% Vs reduction is a value that is averaged over the various inclined screen separators investigated which would also include 2 step solid separators. As such, the value of 33% accounts for the many variations in separation systems, including 2 step separators. The value of 33% Vs reduction accounts for variations in separation systems including 2 step separators and therefore is valid for the 2 step separator present on the farm. The value of 33% would not be increased due to the 2 step separator.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The last version of the PDD was revised and it is considered to be correct and complete.
CAR			
<b>Corrective Action Request No.1</b> In section B.3 it is mentioned that the results ranged averaged 14% Vs reduction by the stationary inclined screen separator. On the other hand, figure B.2 shows the average of volatile solids reduction is 33%. Please clarify this inconsistency and correct as it is necessary.	A.2.5	Upon review of section B.3, the reference to 14% VS reduction due to stationary inclined screen separator could not be located. The only reference to Vs reduction due to separators was the average value of 33% in figure B.2 and Tables B.3 and B.4 No reference to 14% Vs reduction could be found in section B.3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The last version of the PDD was revised and it is considered to be correct and complete.



## Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, Mexico

Date of Completion: Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

Number of Pages: 51



Industrie Service


<b>Corrective Action Request No.2</b> The GPS information provided in the PDD is not correct. During the on-site visit it was measured as follows: N 28° 08' 46.3" W 105° 24' 57.8" Please correct the GPS information	A.4.1.1	The correct GPS information has been entered onto the PDD. 28.1442N, 105.4215W.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The last version of the PDD was revised and it is considered to be correct and complete.
<b>Corrective Action Request No.3</b> Project Activity Emissions in Table B.6 do not correspond to the calculations in Table B.4; therefore Estimated Emission Reductions are not correct.	A.4.3.2	Tables updated in PDD to reflect correct values.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The last version of the PDD was revised and it is considered to be correct and complete.

**Table 3 Unresolved Corrective Action and Clarification Requests (in case of denials)**

Clarifications and / or corrective action requests by validation team	Id. of CAR/CR	Explanation of Conclusion for Denial
-	-	-



## **Annex 2: Information Reference List**

Final Report 2008-01-03	Validation of the “AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, México”  Information Reference List	Page 1 of 1	 Industrie Service
-------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Reference No.	Document or Type of Information
1	<p><b>On-site interview</b> at the Farm Rancho Productor de Leche Zaragoza Hermanos, February 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2007 by auditing team of TÜV:</p> <p><b>Validation team on site:</b></p> <p>Guadalupe Avendaño Reyes                      TÜV America de Mexico. GHG Auditor</p> <p><b>Interviewed persons:</b></p> <p>Erasmó Juárez Reyes                      Farm’s Ecology Manager</p> <p>Danae Díaz                      AgCert Mexico</p> <p>Eduardo Saldaña                      AgCert Mexico</p>
2	Validation and Verification Manual, IETA/World Bank (PCF), <a href="http://www.vvmanual.info">http://www.vvmanual.info</a>
3	Farm letters of intention Rancho Productor de Leche Zaragoza Hermanos – submitted – September 29 <sup>th</sup> , 2006.
4	Operations and Maintenance Plan for AgCert Operations, DM004en, March 2007.
5	Farm Production Data (confidential - Agcert forms B of the farm)
6	Letter issued by Designated National Authority of Mexico regarding the need for environmental licenses and impact assessments, dated November 3 <sup>rd</sup> , 2006.
7	Approved baseline methodology AMS III.D. “Methane Recovery”, version 11, UNFCCC, 2006
8	Calculation of baseline and project emissions “AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-110, Chihuahua, México”, AgCert, December, 2007
9	IPCC: 2006 Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories
10	IPCC: 2000, Good Practice Guidance
11	Approved monitoring methodology AMS III.D. “Methane Recovery”, version 11, UNFCCC, 2006
12	Stakeholder meeting documentation for meetings performed: Invitation (direct and via e-mail), meeting report, presentation given at the meeting
13	Flare efficiency test procedure, OM002, submitted November 2006.