

Validation Opinion for Post Registration Changes

Report for:
Sindicatum Carbon Capital Ltd

CDM project for
Duerping Coal Mine Methane Utilization Project

LRQA Reference : A20410-B/PRC
Date : 29/11/2012

Verification Team

Name	Competences
Xianxin Yan	CDM lead verifier
Justin Gong	CDM verifier
Jilu Pang	Sector expert

Technical Reviewer	: Wei Song
Sector Expert to technical review	: Wenge Liu
Decision Maker	: Michiaki Chiba



Validation opinion

Lloyd's Register Quality Assurance Limited (LRQA) has been contracted by Sindicatum Carbon Capital Ltd, the project participant (PP), to undertake the 7th verification of the registered project activity Duerping Coal Mine Methane Utilization Project, project reference number 1900 registered as a CDM project activity on 06/03/2009.

LRQA conducted an independent third party assessment of the Post Registration Changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD following the VVS, section IX E and the PS section XII H for Post Registration Changes.

LRQA has verified that the correction made by the PPs in the revised PDD comply with the requirements of the PS and accurately reflects the actual project information. The correction identified is the project geographic coordinates in PDD section A.4.1.4 fixed at validation.

LRQA therefore requests the approval, by the CDM EB, of the post registration changes of the project activity as described above, in accordance to the guidance of the EB in the PCP.

Michiaki Chiba
Climate Change Manager – Asia & Pacific
20/12/2012

Lloyd's Register Quality Assurance Ltd
Hiramford
Middlemarch Office Village
Siskin Drive
Coventry CV3 4FJ, United Kingdom

Registered office:
Lloyd's Register
71 Fenchurch Street
London EC3M 4BS
United Kingdom



Findings

1. Description of the corrections to project information

The revised PDD with corrections completed on the project geographic coordinates in section A.4.1.4. The project coordinates are revised to Latitude: North 37° 46' 52" and Longitude: East 112° 14' 27".

2. Validation findings for corrections

2.1 Corrected information

In the registered PDD section A.4.1.4, the project coordinates are 'Latitude: North 112° 14' 27" and Longitude: East 37° 46' 52"'. The project coordinates are revised to Latitude: North 37° 46' 52" and Longitude: East 112° 14' 27" in this section in the revised PDD.

It can confirm from site visiting through checking the GPS that the geographic coordinates indicated in the PDD is a typo error and north latitude 37°46'52", east longitude 112°14'27" should be the right coordinates.

This correction on project information of the registered PDD does not affect the design of the project activity and this does not require prior approval by the Board as per the CDM project standard Appendix 1.

2.2 Corrected parameters

Not applicable

3. Appendix

Appendix 1: List of documents reviewed

1	Sindicatum Carbon Capital Ltd: Registered PDD for Duerping Coal Mine Methane Utilization Project, Version 04.09, dated 18/02/2009. Sindicatum Carbon Capital Ltd: Revised registered PDD for Duerping Coal Mine Methane Utilization Project considering corrections, Version 04.10, dated 15/11/2012.
2	TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH: Validation report for Duerping Coal Mine Methane Utilization Project, Report No. 927755, dated 27/02/2009.
3	Sindicatum Carbon Capital Ltd: Revised monitoring plan for Duerping Coal Mine Methane Utilization Project, Version 0.1, dated 08/06/2009.
4	TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH: Validation opinion on revised monitoring plan for Duerping Coal Mine Methane Utilization Project, Report No. 600500291, dated 25/08/2009.
5	Executive Board: ACM0008 "Consolidated baseline methodology for coal bed methane and coal mine methane capture and use for power (electrical or motive) and heat and/or destruction by flaring", version 03.
6	CDM Executive Board: CDM Project Standard, Version 02.0.



7	CDM Executive Board: CDM Validation and Verification Standard, Version 03.0.
8	CDM Executive Board: Guidelines for completing the monitoring report form, Version 02.0.

Appendix 2: List of persons interviewed and on site assessment

Date	Location	Team Members on site	Subjects covered	Persons interviewed
09/10/2012 10/10/2012 11/10/2012	Project site	Xianxin Yan; Justin Gong; Jilu Pang	Status of project implementation; Changes and actions implemented after the previous verification; Site tour; Monitoring systems and calibration; Monitoring & reporting procedures; Emission reduction data; QA/QC procedures; Discussion on compliance issues.	Sindicatum Carbon Capital Ltd (the Annex-I country participant of the project activity) • Mr. Ruben Martinez Rubio, CDM Director; • Mr. Jia Baoqiang, CDM Manager; • Ms. Zhang Min, Senior Climate Change Officer; • Mr. Zhang Feifei, CMM/CDM Engineer; • Ms. Luo Lijuan, Junior Technician; • Mr. Xie Chengsen, CDM data Analyst Shanxi Coking Coal Group Company Ltd (project owner) • Mr. Du Guangwen, Manager of the power plant; • Ms. Ma Wenxiang, Operator of the power plant; • Mr. Liu Chunqing, Vice manager of the power plant



Protocol

LLOYDS REGISTER QUALITY ASSURANCE Clean Development Mechanism Post Registration Changes Protocol

This document has been produced by the LRQA Verification Team or the Post Registration changes validation team after the desk review and the site visit, as applicable, have been completed.

It outlines the verified situation in relation to a number of criteria, including those defined in the Validation and Verification Standard (VVS) and the Project Standard (PS) produced by the CDM Executive Board.

Where LRQA has identified issues requiring corrective action or clarification, **a reference is made in the 'Conclusion' column, and details** are stated in the section marked 'Findings'.

- Part 1 Validation of temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan and/or monitoring methodology
 - Part 2 Validation of corrections
 - Part 3 Validation of changes to the start date of the crediting period
 - Part 4 Validation of permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan or monitoring methodology
 - Part 5 Validation of changes to the project design of a registered project activity
- 1- Validation of temporary deviations



Team conclusions	
1-1. Documentation from the PP (Para 136 PCP)	
1-1.1. Is the alternative monitoring proposal completed?	NA
1-1.2. Has the supplemental documentation been submitted as appropriate, especially when further explanation is necessary on the alternative monitoring?	NA
1-2. Level of accuracy (Para 253 of the VVS)	
1-2.1. Determine whether the deviation is likely to lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions: Have the project participants applied conservative assumptions or discount factors to the calculations to the extent required to ensure that emission reductions will not be over-estimated as a result of the deviation?	NA



2- Validation of corrections

Team conclusions	
2-1. Documentation from the PP (Para 136 PCP)	
2-1.1. Is the revised PDD with the corrections completed in clean and track change versions?	Yes, the revised PDD with corrections was completed in clean and track change versions on the project geographic coordinates in section A.4.1.4. In the registered PDD section A.4.1.4, the project coordinates are 'Latitude: North 112° 14' 27" and Longitude: East 37° 46' 52"'. This was a typo mistake in the registered PDD. The project coordinates should be Latitude: North 37° 46' 52" and Longitude: East 112° 14' 27".
2-1.2. Has the supplemental documentation been submitted as appropriate?	There is no supplemental document supplied. The correct site coordinates are confirmed from site through checking the GPS.
2-2. Means of verification (Para 258 of the VVS)	
2-2.1. Determine whether the corrected information is an accurate reflection of actual project information.	It can confirm from site through checking the GPS that the geographic coordinates indicated in the PDD is a typo error and north latitude 37°46'52", east longitude 112°14'27" should be the right coordinates. This correction on project information of the registered PDD does not affect the design of the project activity and this does not require prior approval by the Board as per the CDM project standard Appendix 1.
2-2.2. Determine whether the corrected parameters are in accordance with the applied methodology and/or selected monitoring plan.	NA



3- Validation of changes to the starting date of the crediting period

Team conclusions	
3-1. Documentation from the PP (Para 136 PCP)	
3-1.1. Is a demonstration of no changes to the project activity that would result in a less conservative baseline provided?	NA
3-1.2. Has supplemental documentation been submitted to demonstrate that substantive progress has been made by the project participants to start the project activity?	NA
3-2. Assessment of the demonstration (Para 214 of the PS)	
3-2.1. Determine whether the baseline is affected by the delay in the starting day of the crediting period. If it is affected, verify if the new baseline is less conservative or not.	NA
3-2.2. Assess if the PPs have implemented actions to start the project activity. List these actions and determine if the new start date of the crediting period can be met.	NA



4- Validation of permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan and/or monitoring methodology

Team conclusions	
4-1. Documentation from the PP (Para 136 PCP)	
4-1.1. Does the revised PDD contain a revised monitoring plan completed in clean and track change versions?	NA
4-1.2. Has the supplemental documentation been submitted as appropriate, especially when further explanation is necessary on the revised monitoring plan?	NA
4-2. Level of accuracy (Para 263 VVS)	
4-2.1. Did the revision of the monitoring plan ensure that the level of accuracy in the monitoring and verification process was not reduced as a result of revision? 1) frequency of measurements 2) quality of monitoring equipment 3) calibration requirements 4) QA/QC procedures.	NA
4-3. Completeness (Para 266 VVS)	
4-3.1. Did the revision of the monitoring plan ensure that the completeness in the monitoring and verification process was not reduced as a result of revision?	NA



1) frequency of measurements 2) quality of monitoring equipment 3) calibration requirements 4) QA/QC procedures.	
4-4. Compliance with approved monitoring methodology (Para 264 VVS)	
4-4.1. If the proposed revision refers to a later version of the applied methodology, does the revised monitoring plan ensure that the application does not compromise the conservativeness in the monitoring and verification process and of the ER calculations?	NA
4-5. Findings of previous verification reports	
4-5.1. If there are findings in the previous verifications related to the proposed revision of the monitoring plan, have the findings been taken into account?	NA



5- Validation of changes to the project design of a registered project activity

Team conclusions	
5-1. Background (Section XII.H of the PS)	
5-1.1. Identify concerns related to the conformity of the actual project activity and its operation with the registered PDD.	NA
5-1.2. If the identified changes fall in the following, check the elements in 5-2 below. (a) Changes in the effective output capacity due to increased installed capacity or increased number of units, or installation of units with lower capacity or units with a technology which is less advanced than that described in the PDD (b) Addition of component or extension of technology (c) Removal or addition of one (or more) sites of a project activity registered with multiple sites (d) Different values of those actual operational parameters relevant to determination of emission reduction which are within the control of project	NA



	Team conclusions
<p>participant and which result in the IRR passing the benchmark as described in the registered PDD.</p> <p>(Para 218 of the PS)</p>	
<p>5-1.3. If the identified changes cause a project activity to no longer meet the criteria for small-scale CDM project activities, check the elements in 5-3 below.</p> <p>(Para 219 of the PS)</p>	NA
<p>5-1.4. If the identified changes in the implementation of project activity result in the following, check the elements in 5-4 below.</p> <p>(a) the original methodology would no longer be applicable, or</p> <p>(b) another methodology would have been applicable, or</p> <p>(c) another baseline scenario would be more appropriate.</p> <p>(Para 218 of the PS)</p>	NA
5-2. Changes which may impact the additionality of the project activity	
<p>5-2.1. Check the impact of the change on the additionality of the project activity established at the time of registration and the specific conditions (investment / costs variables, barriers, relevant regulations).</p>	NA



	Team conclusions
5-2.2. Review the investment analysis, if applicable, based on all original input data and check if the PPs have only modified the key parameters in the original spreadsheet calculations.	NA
5-2.3. Check, if applicable, that the barriers are still valid under new circumstances, if only barriers were claimed to demonstrate additionality at the registration stage.	NA
5-3. Changes in the scale of CDM project activity	
5-3.1. Check the changes against the applicable SSC criteria for Type I, Type II or Type III.	NA
5-4. Changes which impact the applicability/application of baseline methodology	
5-4.1. Check the applicability and application of baseline methodology with which the project has been registered.	NA