



Industrie Service

Choose certainty.
Add value.

Validation Report

AgCert International PLC

VALIDATION OF THE CDM-PROJECT:
AWMS METHANE RECOVERY PROJECT MX07-S-
112, SONORA, MÉXICO.

REPORT No.972907

January 13th, 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.
972907	2008-01-05	1	2008-01-13	-

Subject: Validation of a CDM Project			
Accredited TÜV SÜD Unit: TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH Certification Body "climate and energy" Westendstr. 199 - 80686 Munich FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY		TÜV SÜD Contract Partner: TÜV SÜD America de México. J. Cantu Leal No.652 Col. Buenos Aires Monterrey, Nuevo León, México	
Client: AgCert International PLC Apex Building, Blackthorn Road, Sanyford Business Park Dublin 18, IRELAND		Project Site(s): S3-01, S3-02, S3-03, S3-04, S3-05, S3-06, S3-07, S3-08, S3-09, S3-13, S3-15, S3-19, San Manuel, San Raul, in Sonora, Mexico.	
Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México			
Applied Methodology / Version:		AMS III.D version 11	Scope(s): 15
First PDD Version: Date of issuance: 2007-02-27 Version No.: 1 Starting Date of GSP 2007-03-03		Final PDD version: Date of issuance: 2007-12-28 Version No.: 3	
Estimated Annual Emission Reduction:		38,618 tons CO _{2e}	
Assessment Team Leader: Javier Castro		Further Assessment Team Members: Guadalupe Avendaño Reyes (GHG-A) Sergio Degener (GHG-A)	
Summary of the Validation Opinion: <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>			

Abbreviations

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

Table of Contents	Page
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	9
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-112, Sonora, 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.

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

Validation Protocol Table 1: Conformity of Project Activity and PDD				
Checklist Topic / Question	Reference	Comments	PDD in GSP	Final PDD
<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 Request 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 (✓), or a Corrective Action Request (CAR) due to non-compliance with the checklist question (See below). Clarification Request (CR) 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>

Validation Protocol Table 2: Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests			
Clarifications and corrective action requests	Ref. to table 1	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
<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.

Validation Protocol Table 3: Unresolved Corrective Action and Clarification Requests		
Clarifications and corrective action requests	Id. of CAR/CR 1	Explanation of the Conclusion for Denial
<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
Javier Castro	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 SÜD 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

During March 12th, 14th-16th and 19th, 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
Juan Carlos Valdez	Manager of S3-01 Farm
Evaristo Cuencas	Manager of S3-02 Farm
Jose Jesus Ramirez	Manager of S3-03, S3-07 Farms
Victor Pacheco	Manager of S3-04, S3-05, S3-06 Farms
Daniel Felix	Manager of S3-08 Farm
Jose Eusebio Sandoval Miranda	Manager of S3-09 Farm
Francisco Manuel A.R.	Manager of S3-13 Farm
Refugio Marrujo	Manager of S3-15 Farm
Francisco Alfredo Moreno L.	Manager of S3-19 Farm
Sergio Cabrera	Manager of San Manuel, San Raul Farms
Jesus Francisco Puebla	Maintenance Manager of Norson
Ramón Ruiz Zámano	AgCert México
Jaime de la Cruz	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 swine CAFOs (Confined Animal Feeding Operations) located in Sonora, 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 any solid separator in use in the farms; therefore no deduction will be taken on account in the baseline calculation.

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

In total the assessment team expressed 9 Corrective Action Requests and 10 Clarification Requests:

The required documents (Letter of Intention, inventories, IPCC values), have been submitted to the DOE and the information is been included in the final version of the PDD [CR2, CR7, CAR4, CAR5, CAR9].

Regarding the more formal aspects of the proposed project (addresses, geographical coordinates, measures of the lagoons, biodigester designs etc.) this information has been corrected and added to the PDD finally [CR4, CAR1, CAR2].

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

- the time schedule of implementation of the proposed project [CR6, CR8, CAR3],
- further information on baseline (CEE) and monitoring (EF) parameters [CR10, CAR7]
- the final sludge treatment [CR1]
- efficiency of the flaring system [CR3, CR9]
- project emissions (the use of pumps and blowers, parameters) [CR5, CAR6, CAR8].

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 farms 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 farms. 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:

webpage: http://www.netinform.de/KE/Wegweiser/Guide2_1.aspx?ID=2658&Ebene1_ID=26&Ebene2_ID=788&mode=1	
Starting date of the global stakeholder consultation process: 2007-03-03	
Comment submitted by: none	Issues raised: -
Response by TÜV SÜD: -	

5 VALIDATION OPINION

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

AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, 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, 2008-01-13



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

Munich, , 2008-01-13



Assessment Team Leader



Annex 1: Validation Protocol

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Table 1a PDD Conformity of Project activity and PDD (CDM-SSC-PDD version 2)

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A. General Description of Project Activity					
A.1. Project Title					
A.1.1. Does the used project title clearly enable to identify the unique CDM activity?	1-14	DR, I	Yes, the project is clearly defined in the title and explained in the PDD and Bundling Form.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
A.1.2. Are there an indication of a revision number and the date of the revision?	1-14	DR, I	Yes, the document ID, revision number and date of the PDD is 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?	1-14	DR, I	Yes, the date of the revision is consistent with the time line of the project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
A.2. Description of the project activity					
A.2.1. Is the description delivering a transparent over-view of the project activities?	1-14	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?	1-14	DR, I	Yes, the purpose of the project and the contribution to the sustainable development are in compliance with the actual situation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
A.2.3. Are proofs available evidencing all information with relevance for the validity, for the determina-	1-14	DR, I	Clarification Request No. 1 The aerobic treatment and/or proper soil	CR 1	

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
tion of baseline and project emissions and for emission projections?			application of the sludge leaving the digesters in the project activity shall be ensured and monitored. If the sludge is treated and/or disposed anaerobically, the resulting methane emissions shall be considered as project emissions.		
A.2.4. Is all information provided in consistency with details provided by further chapters of the PDD?	1-14	DR, I	Yes, the information is consistent with the details provided in the following chapters.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
A.3. Project Participants					
A.3.1. Is the form required for the indication of project participants correctly applied?	1-14	DR, I	<u>Clarification Request No. 2</u> For all the sites included in this PDD: The Lol does not include the sites of this project.	CR 2	
A.3.2. Is the voluntary participation of all listed entities or Parties confirmed by each of them?	1-14	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)?	1-14	DR, I	<u>Corrective Action Request No.1.</u> In section A.4.1.4, please correct, - S3-01 The PDD mentions there are 2 corrals in the site. As physically seen they are 3 corrals operating in the farm. The draw showed in the form B does not corresponds to the physical area.	CAR 1	

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			<p>- S3-02 The PDD mentions one of the corrals use the hose method. The contact person mentioned both corrals use the pull plug method.</p> <p>- S3-03 The PDD mentions there are 3 corrals in the site. As physically seen they are only two. The draw showed in the form B does not corresponds to the physical area.</p> <p>- S3-04 The draw showed in the form B does not corresponds to the physical area.</p> <p>- S3-05 The tertiary lagoon is not described in the PDD. The measures of the lagoons placed in the PDD are not correct. The correct measures are: Primary Lagoon: 70m x 40m x 2.5m Secondary Lagoon: 40m x 25m x 2.5m Tertiary Lagoon: 40m x 40m x 2.5m The draw showed in the form B does not corresponds to the physical area.</p>		

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			<p>- S3-06</p> <p>The lagoon system is not correctly described. There is a Primary Lagoon and two Secondary Lagoons.</p> <p>The draw showed in the form B does not corresponds to the physical area.</p> <p>- S3-07</p> <p>The correct measures of the Secondary Lagoon are: 40m x 25m x 2.5m</p> <p>The draw showed in the form B does not corresponds to the physical area.</p> <p>- S3-08</p> <p>The tertiary lagoon is not described in the PDD.</p> <p>The measures of the lagoons placed in the PDD are not correct. The correct measures are:</p> <p>Primary Lagoon: 90m x 50m x 2.5m</p> <p>Secondary Lagoon: 50m x 30m x 2.5m</p> <p>Tertiary Lagoon: 50m x 50m x 2m</p> <p>The draw showed in the form B does not corresponds to the physical area.</p> <p>- S3-19</p> <p>The concrete basin is not described in the</p>		

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			<p>PDD.</p> <p>The measures of the lagoons placed in the PDD are not correct. The correct measures are:</p> <p>Primary Lagoon: 150m x 60m x 2.5m</p> <p>Secondary Lagoon: 60m x 40m x 1.5m</p> <p>The draw showed in the form B does not corresponds to the physical area.</p> <p>- San Manuel</p> <p>The concrete basin is not described in the PDD.</p> <p>The measures of the lagoons placed in the PDD are not correct. The correct measures are:</p> <p>Primary Lagoon: 200m x 74m x 2m</p> <p>Secondary Lagoon: 70m x 50m x 2m</p> <p>-San Raul</p> <p>The concrete basin is not described in the PDD.</p>		
A.4. Technical description of the project activity					
A.4.1. Does the information provided on the location of	1-14	DR,	<u>Corrective Action Request No.2.</u>	CAR 2	

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
the project activity allow for a clear identification of the site(s)?		I	<p>For the next farms please correct</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - S3-01 - S3-02 - S3-03 <p>Address provided on the PDD: Saliendo de Hermosillo por la Carretera a Kino se gira al Sur en la Calle 4 Sur, se avanza durante 25 km y se gira al poniente para ingresar al predio "La Cuatro Poniente"</p> <p>Correct address: Calle Cuatro Km. 25, Hermosillo, Sonora, Mexico.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - S3-04 - S3-05 - S3-06 <p>Address provided on the PDD: Saliendo de Hermosillo por la Carretera a Kino se gira al Sur en la Calle 4 Sur, se avanza durante 25 km y se gira al oriente para ingresar al predio "La Cuatro Oriente"</p> <p>Correct address: Calle Cuatro Km. 25, Hermosillo, Sonora, Mexico.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - S3-07 		

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			<p>- S3-08</p> <p>- S3-09</p> <p>Address provided on the PDD: Saliendo de Hermosillo por la Carretera a Kino se gira al Sur en la Calle 4 Sur, se avanza durante 25 km y se gira al poniente para ingresar al predio "La Cuatro Poniente"</p> <p>Correct address: Calle Cuatro Km. 25, Hermosillo, Sonora, Mexico.</p> <p>- S3-13</p> <p>- S3-15</p> <p>- S3-19</p> <p>Address provided on the PDD: Saliendo de Hermosillo por la Carretera a Kino se gira al Sur en la Calle 4 Sur, se avanza hasta llegar a la Calle 13 y se gira al oriente y se avanza por 6 km y se gira al norte para entrar al predio "El 28".</p> <p>Correct address: Calle 13 esquina Calle 26, Hermosillo, Sonora, Mexico.</p> <p>- San Manuel</p> <p>Address provided on the PDD: Domicilio conocido Predio Bacajaquia, Na-</p>		

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			vojoa, Sonora. Correct address: Predio Bacajaquia Lote #14- 4, Navojoa, Sonora, México. - San Raul Address provided on the PDD: Predio Ejido Mumuncuera, Carretera a LA Jaula, al Ejido La union, Navojoa, Sonora Correct address: Carretera La Jaula - La Unión Km. 3, Predio Mumuncuera, Huatabampo, Sonora, México		
A.4.2. Do the project participants possess ownership or licenses which will allow the implementation of the project at that site / those sites?	1-14	DR, I	Yes, all the participants have the documents of the ownership of sites.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
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?	23	DR, I	<u>Clarification Request No. 3</u> The technology should be better explained; especially the functioning and controlling of enclose flaring system. <u>Clarification Request No. 4</u> The biodigester designs of the farms need to be submitted to the validator.	CR 3 CR 4	
A.4.5. Does the description of the technology to be applied provide sufficient and transparent input	1-14	DR,	<u>Clarification Request No. 5</u>	CR 5	

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
to evaluate its impact on the greenhouse gas balance?		I	For all sites included in this project: In the Project Activity site configuration is required a Grinder pump, but according to AgCert's personnel the gravity will be used so as the actual AWMS. If it is so it has to be considered in the calculations.		
A.4.6. Is the brief explanation how the project will reduce greenhouse gas emission transparent and suitable?	1-14	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?	1-14	DR, I	Yes, the information provided are in compliance with the actual situation	<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?	1-14	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?	1-14	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"/>	
A.4.10. Does the project require extensive initial training and maintenance efforts in order to work as presumed during the project period?	17	DR, I	Yes, the project make considerations about training and maintenance to keep the normal operations during the project period,	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
A.4.11. Does the project make provisions for meeting training and maintenance needs?	17	DR,	Yes, the know-how transfer is duly taken in-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
		I	to account in the PDD.		
A.4.12. Is a schedule available on the implementation of the project and are there any risks for delays?	1-14	DR, I	<p>Yes, the construction of the project is implemented under schedule.</p> <p><u>Clarification Request No. 6</u></p> <p>The project schedule is missing, this document needs to be submitted to the validator.</p> <p><u>Corrective Action Request No.3.</u></p> <p>For all the sites included in this project please correct:</p> <p>The dates of start and end of construction showed in the PDD according to the construction schedule.</p> <p><u>Corrective Action Request No.4.</u></p> <p>According to the PDD information, the project's starting date is May 21st, 2007. This information do not corresponds with the Lol signing date, which is April 7th, 2005. Please correct this issue.</p>	CR 6 CAR 3 CAR 4	
A.4.13. Is the form required for the indication of projected emission reductions correctly applied?	1-14	DR, I	Yes, the form is correct.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
A.5. Public Funding					
A.5.1. Is all information on public funding provided in	1-14	DR,	The project does not use any public funding.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
compliance with actual situation or planning as available by the project participants?		I			
A.5.2. Is all information provided in consistency with details provided by further chapters of the PDD (in particular annex 2)?	1-14	DR, I	Yes, see above.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
B. Baseline Methodology					
B.1. Choice and Applicability					
B.1.1. Is the baseline methodology previously approved by the CDM Methodology Panel?	20	DR, I	Yes, the project uses an approve methodology, AMS III.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
B.1.2. Is the choice of the methodology correctly justified by the PDD?	20	DR, I	Yes, the simplified methodology is appropriate because the project activity site is considered an agro-industry and GHG emissions calculations can be estimated using internationally accepted IPCC guidance.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
B.1.3. Is the baseline methodology the one deemed most applicable for this project?	20	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?	20	DR, I	Yes, the PDD is updated to the last version of the methodology, which is version 11.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
B.2. Application of the Baseline Methodology / Identification of the Baseline Scenario					
B.2.1. Is the application of the methodology and the discussion and determination of the chosen baseline transparent?	20	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 base-	20	DR,	Yes, all scenarios have been considered.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
line scenarios in the discussion?		I			
B.2.3. Is conservativeness addressed in the way of identifying the baseline?	20	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?	20	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?	20	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"/>	
B.2.6. Is the baseline determination compatible with the available data?	20	DR, I	<p><u>Corrective Action Request No.5.</u></p> <p>For all the sites included in this project, please correct:</p> <p>The inventories showed in the PDD are from October 2005 to September 2006. All of them represent the amount of animals in the farm the last day of each month, besides the monthly average.</p> <p>At the moment of the visit the inventories were provided, but they are exactly the same as those in the PDD.</p> <p>The correct averages should be provided.</p>	CAR 5	

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
B.2.7. Does the selected baseline represent the most likely scenario among other possible and/or discussed scenarios?	20	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?	20	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?	20	DR, I	<u>Clarification Request No. 7</u> The inventories information shows there are periods when the farms have no animals because of sanitizing. Please clarify the frequency of this situation and if it is a common practice.	CR 7	
B.3. Additionality					
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
B.3.3. Does the PDD clearly demonstrate the additionality using the approach as given by the methodology?		DR, I	Yes, the barriers approach is used to demonstrate the additionality.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
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"/>	

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
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.4. Project Boundary					
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	Yes, all emissions are evaluated.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
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"/>	

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
B.5. Detailed Baseline Information					
B.5.1. Is there any indication of a date when determine the baseline?		DR, I	See CAR 5 For all the farms included in this PDD, the baseline is determined within the inventories from October 2005 to September 2006.	CAR 5	
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 5	Open	
C. Duration of the Project / Crediting Period					
C.1.1. Are the project's starting date and operational lifetime clearly defined and reasonable?		DR, I	See CAR 4 <u>Clarification Request No. 8</u> The bundling form and the PDD, section C.2.1.1, show different dates for start of the the first crediting period; these are 01-Oct-	CAR 4 CR 8	

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			07 and 01-Aug-07, respectively.		
C.1.2. 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)?		DR, I	Yes, renewable crediting period of 7 years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D. Monitoring Plan					
D.1. Monitoring Methodology					
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 10, Methane recovery	<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?		DR, I	<u>Clarification Request No. 9</u> It should be clear how the flare efficiency is measured. Proof of the utilization of the "Tool to determine project emission from flaring gases containing methane" needs to be submitted.	CR 9	

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
D.1.5. Does the monitoring methodology apply consistently the choice of the option selected for monitoring both of project and baseline emissions?		DR, I	Yes as far as the latest EB decisions are taking into account.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
D.2. Monitoring of Project Emissions (if applied)					
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			<u>Clarification Request No. 10</u> Please give more information about variable "3. CEE" of the monitoring plan, specify how	CR 10	

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
monitoring plan?			will be determined when the flare is out of service.		
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"/>	
D.3. Monitoring of Baseline Emissions (if applied)					
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"/>	

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
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 monitoring plan?		DR, I	See CR 10	Open	
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"/>	
D.4. Direct Monitoring of Emission Reductions (if applied)					
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		DR,	Yes, it is possible to monitor and/or meas-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
project GHG indicators?		I	ure 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.		
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 10	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"/>	
D.5. Monitoring of Leakage (if applicable)					
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"/>	

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
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"/>	
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"/>	
D.6. Determination of Emission Reductions					
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		DR,	No monitoring of leakage is required	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
quality data free of potential for biases or intended or unintended changes in data records?		I			
D.7. Quality Control (QC) and Quality Assurance (QA) Procedures					
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"/>	
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 reference 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"/>	
D.8. Operational and management structure					
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"/>	

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
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"/>	
D.9. Monitoring Plan (Annex 4)					
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 address 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"/>	

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
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 uncertainties?		DR, I	Yes, correct procedures for data uncertainties are identified.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
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"/>	

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
E. Calculation of GHG Emissions by Source					
E.1. Predicted Project GHG Emissions					
E.1.1. Are all aspects related to direct and indirect GHG emissions captured in the project design?		DR, I	See CAR 6	Open	
E.1.2. Are the GHG calculations documented in a complete and transparent manner?		DR, I	<p><u>Corrective Action Request No.6.</u></p> <p>According to vers10 of the III.D methodology CO₂ emissions from use of fossil fuels or electricity for the operation of the facility should be taken into account in the calculations. Please additionally describe the equipment including capacity and time of operation.</p> <p><u>Corrective Action Request No.7.</u></p> <p>The Emission Factor of the electricity needs to be calculated with the most recent data from the host country. There is data available from national authorities from the host country of 2004. The EF of the electricity needs to be actualized.</p> <p><u>Corrective Action Request No.8.</u></p> <p>Please give more details about the direct project emission like:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Methane not captured by the project and released to the atmosphere; - Methane captured and not flared (e.g. 	CAR 6 CAR 7 CAR 8 CAR 9	

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			<p>physical leakage, flare inefficiency, flare availability) - CO2 emissions from combustion of non-biogenic methane. Please describe if in addition, the methane conversion factor of the emission reduction calculations include a conservative percentage discount to compensate for intrinsic digester emissions.</p> <p><u>Corrective Action Request No.9.</u></p> <p>The values from the IPCC used in the assumptions should be update with the newest values available (IPCC Guidelines 2006)</p>		
E.1.3. Have conservative assumptions been used to calculate project GHG emissions?		DR, I	See CAR 5, CAR 6, CAR 7, CAR 8 and CAR 9.	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"/>	
E.2. Leakage					
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"/>	

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
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"/>	
E.3. Baseline Emissions					
E.3.1. Have the most relevant and likely operational characteristics and baseline indicators been chosen as reference for baseline emissions?		DR, I	See CAR 5, CAR 6, CAR 7, CAR 8 and CAR 9.	Open	
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 CAR 5	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"/>	

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
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"/>	
E.4. Emission Reductions					
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 projected emission reductions correctly applied?		DR, I	Yes, the form is correctly applied.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
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"/>	
F. Environmental Impacts					
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,	Yes, there are no transboundary environ-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
		I	mental impacts.		
F.1.5. Have identified environmental impacts been addressed in the project design?		DR, I	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
F.1.6. Does the project comply with environmental legislation in the host country?		DR, I	Yes, the project respect the host country's environmental legislation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
G. Stakeholder Comments					
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 have been provided through newspapers.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
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-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

Table 1b PDD Conformity of Project activity and PDD (CDM-SSC-PDD version 3)

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
A. GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF SMALL-SCALE PROJECT ACTIVITY				
A.1. Title of the small-scale project activity				
A.1.1. Does the used project title clearly enable to identify the unique CDM activity?	1-14	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?	1-14	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?	1-14	Yes, the date of the revision is consistent with the time line of the project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.2. Description of the small-scale project activity				
A.2.1. Is the description delivering a transparent overview of the project activities?	1-14	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?	1-14	The actual situation has been checked during the on site visit.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.2.3. Is the information provided by these proofs consistent with the infor-	1-14	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"/>

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
mation provided by the PDD?				
A.2.4. Is all information presented consistent with details provided by further chapters of the PDD?	1-14	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.)	1-14	A covered anaerobic digester for capture and combustion of Biogas will be the Waste Management System used in the visited farms.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	1-14	Yes, the description of the technology in the PDD provides a transparent input 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?	1-14	An explanation is included on the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.3. Project participants				
A.3.1. Is the form required for the indication of project participants correctly applied?	1-14	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?	1-14	Yes, it was confirmed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
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)?	1-14	The information about the project participants is consistent with the further chapters of the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4. Technical description of the small-scale project activity				
A.4.1. Location of the small-scale project activity				
A.4.1.1. Does the information provided on the location of the project activity allow for a clear identification of the site(s)?	1-14	All farms are clearly described in the PDD with address, contact person and GPS coordinates. This information has been checked during the on-site visit.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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.)?	1-14	Yes, all the participants have the documents of the ownership of sites.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4.2. Type and category(ies) and technology/measure of the small-scale project activity				
A.4.2.1. To which type(s) does the project activity belong to? Is the type correctly identified and indicated?	1-14	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"/>
A.4.2.2. To which category (ies) does the project activity belong to? Is the category correctly identified and indicated?	1-14	Category II.D Version 11, 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"/>

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
A.4.2.3. Does the technical design of the project activity reflect current good practices?	23	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)?	1-14	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?	1-14	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?	1-14	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?	1-14	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"/>	<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?	1-14	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	17	Yes, the project makes considerations about training and maintenance to keep the normal operations during the project period.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
out as scheduled during the project period?				
A.4.2.10. Is information available on the demand and requirements for training and maintenance?	17	Yes, the know-how transfer is duly taken into account in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4.2.11. Is a schedule available for the implementation of the project and are there any risks for delays?	1-14	Yes, the construction of the project is implemented under schedule. Schedule documents have been submitted to the validator.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4.3. Estimated amount of emission reductions over the chosen crediting period				
A.4.3.1. Is the form required for the indication of projected emission reductions correctly applied?	1-14	Yes, the project emission reductions are 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?	1-14	The figures provided are consistent with other chapters of the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4.3.3. Are the figures consistent with the small-scale criteria for the used Type?	1-14	Yes, the estimated annual emission reductions are consistent with the small scale criteria.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4.4. Public funding of the small-scale project activity				
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?		The project does not use any public funding.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD										
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 above.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>										
A.4.5. Confirmation that the small-scale project activity is not a debundled component of a large scale project activity														
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:	1-14	<table><tr><th>Debundling checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></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?		Not applicable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>										

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD								
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?	20	Yes, the information is clearly indicated in the PDD.	☑	☑								
B.1.1.2. Is the applied version the most recent one and / or is this version still applicable?	20	Version 11 of the methodology is used and it is still applicable.	☑	☑								
B.2. Justification of the choice of the project category												
B.2.1. Is the applied methodology considered the most appropriate one?	20	Yes, it is because the project activity is considered an agro-industry, and GHG emissions calculations can be estimated using internationally accepted IPCC guidance.	☑	☑								
B.2.1.1. Criterion 1: Does the project category comprise methane recovery from manure and wastes from agricultural or agro-industrial activities by (a) installing methane recovery and combustion system to an existing source of methane emissions, or	20	<table><tr><th>Applicability checklist</th><th>Yes / No / NA</th></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	☑	☑
Applicability checklist	Yes / No / NA											
Criterion discussed in the PDD?	Yes											
Compliance provable?	Yes											
Compliance verified?	Yes											

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD								
(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?												
B.2.1.2. Criterion 2: Does the project are not recovering methane from landfills or waste water treatment?	1-14	<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											
B.2.1.3. Criterion 4: Are the technical measures being used (e.g. flared, combusted) to ensure that all biogas produced by the digester is destroyed?	17, 26	<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											
B.2.1.4. Criterion 3: Are the measures limited to those that result in emission reductions of less than or equal to 60 kt CO2 equivalent annually?	21	<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											
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?	1-14	The project boundary is clearly described in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>								

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
B.3.2. Do the spatial and technological boundaries as verified on-site comply with the discussion provided by / indication included to the PDD?	1-14	The description complies with situation verified during the on-site visit.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.4. Description of baseline and its development				
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?	1-14	The alternatives has been identified and discussed in the PDD. Alternatives to the project activity without the help of CDM revenues have been discussed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.4.2. Does the project identifies correctly and excludes those options not in line with regulatory or legal requirements?	1-14	The legal requirement has been discussed in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.4.3. Have applicable regulatory or legal requirements been identified?	1-14	Yes, regulatory requirements have been identified.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.4.4. Does the PDD identify the most likely baseline scenario in absence of the project activity?	1-14	Yes, the common practice is included in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.4.5. Is this identification supported by official and/or verifiable documents (e.g. studies, web pages, certificates, etc)?	19	Yes, documentation regarding these options has been submitted to the DOE.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD															
B.4.6. Is the identified baseline scenario in line with regulatory or legal requirements?	19	The baseline Scenario is in line with the local legal requirements.	☑	☑															
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.5.1. 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?		N.A.	☑	☑															
B.5.2. Is a complete list of barriers developed that prevents the project activity to occur?	20	Yes, a list with all relevant barriers has been included in the PDD.	☑	☑															
B.5.3. Does this list include at least one of the following barriers?	20	<table><tr><th>Barrier</th><th>Dis-cussed?</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>N.A.</td></tr></table>	Barrier	Dis-cussed?	Verifiable?	Investment	Yes	Yes	Technological	Yes	Yes	Due to prevailing practice	Yes	Yes	Other	No	N.A.	☑	☑
Barrier	Dis-cussed?	Verifiable?																	
Investment	Yes	Yes																	
Technological	Yes	Yes																	
Due to prevailing practice	Yes	Yes																	
Other	No	N.A.																	
B.5.4. Does the discussion suffi-		National Policies and regulations are included in the PDD.	☑	☑															

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
ciently take into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies?				
B.5.5. Is transparent and documented evidence provided on the existence and significance of these barriers?	20	Documentation supporting the barriers have been verified by the audit team.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.5.6. Is it appropriately explained how the approval of the project activity will help to overcome the identified barriers?	20	Yes, this issue is appropriately explained.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.6. Emissions reductions				
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?	20	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?	20	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. Component 1: emissions from methane not captured by the project and released to the atmosphere		Project emission checklist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Component discussed in the PDD?		

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS		PPD in GSP	Final PDD
phere		Formulae correctly applied?	Yes		
B.6.1.4. Component 2: emissions from methane captured and not flared (e.g. physical leakage, flare inefficiency, flare availability)		Project emission checklist	Yes / No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Component discussed in the PDD?	Yes		
		Formulae correctly applied?	Yes		
B.6.1.5. Component 3: emissions from CO2 emissions from combustion of non-biogenic methane;		Project emission checklist	Yes / No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Component discussed in the PDD?	Yes		
		Formulae correctly applied?	Yes		
B.6.1.6. Component 4: emissions from CO2 emissions from use of fossil fuels or electricity for the operation of the facility		Project emission checklist	Yes / No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Component discussed in the PDD?	Yes		
		Formulae correctly applied?	Yes		
B.6.1.7. 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		Project emission checklist	Yes / No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Component discussed in the PDD?	Yes		
		Formulae correctly applied?	Yes		

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
is treated and/or disposed anaerobically, the resulting methane emissions shall be considered as project emissions				
B.6.1.8. Are the formulae required for the determination of baseline emissions correctly presented, enabling a complete identification of parameters to be used and / or monitored?	20	Yes, the formula is correctly presented and corresponds to the methodology.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.6.1.9. Are the formulae required for the determination of leakage emissions correctly presented, enabling a complete identification of parameter to be used and / or monitored?	20	Leakage calculations are not required.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.6.1.10. Are the formulae required for the determination of emission reductions correctly presented?	20	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"/>

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
B.6.2.2. Comment on any line answered with "No"				
B.6.2.3. Parameter 1: amount of the waste or raw material		Data Checklist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Yes / No / NA		
		Title in line with methodology?		
		Yes		
		Data unit correctly expressed?		
		Yes		
		Appropriate description of parameter?		
		Yes		
		Source clearly referenced?		
B.6.2.4. Parameter 2: most recent IPCC tier 2 (i.e. Vs, Bo, MCF)		Yes		
		Correct value provided?		
		Yes		
		Has this value been verified?		
		Yes		
		Choice of data correctly justified?		
		Yes		
		Measurement method correctly described?		
		Yes		
B.6.2.5. Parameter 3 (only for Animal WMS):population and type of ani-		Data Checklist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		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		

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS		PPD in GSP	Final PDD
mals.			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		
		If the recovered methane is used for heat or electricity generation, please include the corresponding protocol			
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?		Yes, the projection used is based in the future monitoring.		☑	☑
B.6.3.2. Are the GHG calculations documented in a complete and transparent manner?		Yes, all GHG calculations are completely documented in the PDD.		☑	☑
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?		Yes, the PDD shows a different table with calculations for each farm.		☑	☑
B.6.3.4. Is the data provided in this		The data provided is consistent with other chapters of the		☑	☑

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
section consistent with data as presented in other chapters of the PDD?		PDD.		
B.6.4. Summary of the ex-ante estimation of emission reductions				
B.6.4.1. Will the project result in fewer GHG emissions than the baseline scenario?		Yes, the emissions will be lower.	<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.	<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.		Yes, in this case the calculations have been done separately for every farm.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.6.4.4. Do these values comply with small-scale criteria for every year?	20	Yes, the values comply with the small scale criteria.	<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?	18	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?		The presented data is consistent.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



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?	24	Yes, all parameters are discussed on the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																										
B.7.1.2. Comment on any line answered with “No”																														
B.7.1.3. 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><tr><td></td><td></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																													
B.7.1.4. Parameter 2: biogas temperature		<table><tr><th>Monitoring Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																						
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																													

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS		PPD in GSP	Final PDD
		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		

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD																								
B.7.1.5. Parameter 3: pressure		<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	<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																											
B.7.1.6. Parameter 4: fraction of CH ₄		<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	<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																											

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS		PPD in GSP	Final PDD
B.7.1.7. Parameter 5: flare efficiency				☑	☑
		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					

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD																								
B.7.1.8. Parameter 6: combusted gas		<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	<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																											
B.7.1.9. Parameter 7: fraction of time in which the gas is combusted in the flare		<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	<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																											

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
B.7.2. Description of the monitoring plan				
B.7.2.1. Is the operational and management structure clearly described and in compliance with the envisioned situation?		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?		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?	23	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.8. Date of completion of the application of the baseline study and monitoring methodology an the name of the responsible person(s)/entity(ies)				
B.8.1.1. Is there any indication of a date when the baseline was determined?		The date and responsible for baseline development is included in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.8.1.2. Has dd/mm/yyyy format been used to indicate the date.		Yes, 09/02/2007	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
B.8.1.3. Is this consistent with the time line of the PDD history?		Yes, it is consistent.	<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?		Yes, the responsible for baseline and monitoring methodology is also the project developer.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.8.1.5. Is information provided whether this person / entity is also considered a project participant?		Yes, see information above.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C. DURATION OF THE PROJECT ACTIVITY / CREDITING PERIOD				
C.1. Duration of the project activity				
C.1.1. Are the project's starting date and operational lifetime clearly defined and reasonable?		Yes, the dates are reasonable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C.2. Choice of the crediting period and related information				
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		Yes, a renewable period of 7 years crediting period has been chosen.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
years)?				
C.2.2. Has dd/mm/yyyy format been used to indicate the start date of the crediting period.		Yes, 19/11/2007	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS				
D.1. If required by the host Party, documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity:				
D.1.1. Are there any Host Party requirements for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and if yes, has an EIA been approved?	19	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?	19	N.A.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.3. Will the project create any adverse environmental effects?	19	No negative environmental impacts are expected from the proposed project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.4. Were transboundary environmental impacts identified in the analysis?	19	N.A.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
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				
D.2.1. Have the identified environmental impacts been addressed in the project design sufficiently?	19	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?	19	Yes, the project respects the host country's environmental legislation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E. STAKEHOLDERS' COMMENTS				
E.1. Brief description how comments by local stakeholders have been invited and compiled				
E.1.1. Have relevant stakeholders been consulted?	25	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?	25	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	25	Yes, the stakeholder consultation process had been carried out in accordance with host country regulations/laws.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
regulations/laws?				
E.1.4. Is the undertaken stakeholder process that was carried out described in a complete and transparent manner?	25	Yes, it is clearly described in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.2. Summary of the comments received				
E.2.1. Is a summary of the received stakeholder comments provided?	25	No relevant comments was received form the stakeholders.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.3. Report on how due account was taken of any comments received				
E.3.1. Has due account been taken of any stakeholder comments received?	25	No relevant comments was received form the stakeholders.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
F. ANNEXES 1 – 4				
Annex 1: Contact Information				
F.1.1. Is the information provided consistent with the one given under section A.3?	16	Yes, the information is consistent.	<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"/>

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
Annex 2: Information regarding public funding				
F.1.3. 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.1.4. 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"/>
Annex 3: Baseline information				
F.1.5. If additional background information on baseline data is provided: Is this information consistent with data presented by other sections of the PDD?		Yes, the baseline information presented is in line with other sections of the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
F.1.6. Is the data provided verifiable? Has sufficient evidence been provided to the validation team?	1-14	The audit team verified these values during the on-site visit.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
F.1.7. Does the additional information substantiate / support statements given in other sections of the PDD?	21	Yes, the information supports the calculations provided in other sections of the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Annex 4: Monitoring information				
F.1.8. If additional background information on monitoring is provided: Is this in-	24	Yes, the monitoring 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-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
formation consistent with data presented in other sections of the PDD?				
F.1.9. Is the information provided verifiable? Has sufficient evidence been provided to the validation team?	1-14	The audit team verified the information during the on-site visit.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
F.1.10. 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"/>

Table 2a Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in tables 1a and 1b	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
CRs			
<u>Clarification Request No. 1</u> The aerobic treatment and/or proper soil application of the sludge leaving the digesters in the project activity shall be ensured and monitored. If the sludge is treated and/or dis-	Table 1a A.2.3	#1, PDD updated to include sludge information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The revised PDD is responding to CARS and CRS given by table 1a. Any further new issue or

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

posed anaerobically, the resulting methane emissions shall be considered as project emissions.			still unresolved issue will be indicated in table 1b.
<u>Clarification Request No. 2</u> For all the sites included in this PDD: The LoI does not include the sites of this project.	Table 1a A.3.1	#1, LOI updated to include sites in this project. LOI posted on auditor portal.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.
<u>Clarification Request No. 3</u> The technology should be better explained; especially the functioning and controlling of enclose flaring system.	Table 1a A.4.4	#1, Technology, functioning, and control of flare is described in Annex 4, ID1, and ID5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.
<u>Clarification Request No. 4</u> The biodigester designs of the farms need to be submitted to the validator.	Table 1a A.4.4	#1, Designs are attached on the auditor portal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.
<u>Clarification Request No. 5</u> For all sites included in this project:	Table 1a A.4.5	#1, The sites of the PDD 112 will use a pumping system. This information was confirmed by field personnel.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The revised PDD is responding to CARS and

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

In the Project Activity site configuration is required a Grinder pump, but according to Ag-Cert's personnel the gravity will be used so as the actual AWMS. If it is so it has to be considered in the calculations.			CRS given by table 1a. Any further new issue or still unresolved issue will be indicated in table 1b.
<u>Clarification Request No. 6</u> The project schedule is missing, this document needs to be submitted to the validator.	Table 1a A.4.12	#1, The project schedule is contained in section A.4.1.4 in each of the site descriptions. <u>Further request form DOE:</u> The date of the last revision of the PDD is October 2 nd 2007. The digesters expected to be completed on 21 st September 2007. Please update the information regarding the construction of the biodigesters considering that the expected dates have past. <u>Further response from the project developer:</u> Construction information updated in PDD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.
<u>Clarification Request No. 7</u> The inventories information shows there are periods when the farms have no animals because of sanitizing. Please clarify the frequency of this situation and if it is a common practice.	Table 1a B.2.9	#1, As a preventive biosecurity action the sites were sanitized in the periods shown in the PDD. However, this practice is not common, because the sanitization depends of the current biosecurity situation of the farms and the legal entity has a strict strategy in this regard.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

<u>Clarification Request No. 8</u> The bundling form and the PDD, section C.2.1.1, show different dates for start of the first crediting period; these are 01-Oct-07 and 01-Aug-07, respectively.	Table 1a C.1.1	#1, PDD and bundling form both show 1 Oct, 2007 as the crediting period.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.
<u>Clarification Request No. 9</u> It should be clear how the flare efficiency is measured. Proof of the utilization of the "Tool to determine project emission from flaring gases containing methane" needs to be submitted.	Table 1a D.1.4	#1, Technology, functioning, and control of flare is described in Annex 4, ID1, and ID5.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.
<u>Clarification Request No. 10</u> 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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.
CARs			
<u>Corrective Action Request No.1.</u> In section A.4.1.4, please correct, - S3-01	Table 1a A.3.3	#1, Section A.4.1.4 has been corrected. Complete PDD is posted on the auditor portal.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The revised PDD is responding to CARS and CRS given by table 1a. Any further new issue or

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

<p>The PDD mentions there are 2 corrals in the site. As physically seen they are 3 corrals operating in the farm.</p> <p>The draw showed in the form B does not corresponds to the physical area.</p> <p>- S3-02</p> <p>The PDD mentions one of the corrals use the hose method. The contact person mentioned both corrals use the pull plug method.</p> <p>- S3-03</p> <p>The PDD mentions there are 3 corrals in the site. As physically seen they are only two.</p> <p>The draw showed in the form B does not corresponds to the physical area.</p> <p>- S3-04</p> <p>The draw showed in the form B does not corresponds to the physical area.</p> <p>- S3-05</p> <p>The tertiary lagoon is not described in the PDD.</p> <p>The measures of the lagoons placed in the PDD are not correct. The correct measures are:</p> <p>Primary Lagoon: 70m x 40m x 2.5m</p> <p>Secondary Lagoon: 40m x 25m x 2.5m</p> <p>Tertiary Lagoon: 40m x 40m x 2.5m</p>			<p>still unresolved issue will be indicated in table 1b.</p>
---	--	--	--

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

The draw showed in the form B does not corresponds to the physical area.

- S3-06

The lagoon system is not correctly described. There is a Primary Lagoon and two Secondary Lagoons.

The draw showed in the form B does not corresponds to the physical area.

- S3-07

The correct measures of the Secondary Lagoon are: 40m x 25m x 2.5m

The draw showed in the form B does not corresponds to the physical area.

- S3-08

The tertiary lagoon is not described in the PDD.

The measures of the lagoons placed in the PDD are not correct. The correct measures are:

Primary Lagoon: 90m x 50m x 2.5m

Secondary Lagoon: 50m x 30m x 2.5m

Tertiary Lagoon: 50m x 50m x 2m

The draw showed in the form B does not corresponds to the physical area.

- S3-19

The concrete basin is not described in the

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

<p>PDD.</p> <p>The measures of the lagoons placed in the PDD are not correct. The correct measures are:</p> <p>Primary Lagoon: 150m x 60m x 2.5m</p> <p>Secondary Lagoon: 60m x 40m x 1.5m</p> <p>The draw showed in the form B does not corresponds to the physical area.</p> <p>- San Manuel</p> <p>The concrete basin is not described in the PDD.</p> <p>The measures of the lagoons placed in the PDD are not correct. The correct measures are:</p> <p>Primary Lagoon: 200m x 74m x 2m</p> <p>Secondary Lagoon: 70m x 50m x 2m</p> <p>-San Raul</p> <p>The concrete basin is not described in the PDD.</p>			
<p><u>Corrective Action Request No.2.</u></p> <p>For the next farms please correct</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - S3-01 - S3-02 - S3-03 	<p>Table 1a A.4.1</p>	<p>#1, The correct address has been updated.</p> <p><u>Further request form DOE:</u></p> <p>S3-13</p> <p>S3-15</p>	<p style="text-align: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The revised PDD is responding to CARS and CRS given by table 1a. Any further new issue or still unresolved issue will</p>

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

<p>Address provided on the PDD: Saliendo de Hermosillo por la Carretera a Kino se gira al Sur en la Calle 4 Sur, se avanza durante 25 km y se gira al poniente para ingresar al predio “La Cuatro Poniente” Correct address: Calle Cuatro Km. 25, Hermosillo, Sonora, Mexico.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - S3-04 - S3-05 - S3-06 <p>Address provided on the PDD: Saliendo de Hermosillo por la Carretera a Kino se gira al Sur en la Calle 4 Sur, se avanza durante 25 km y se gira al oriente para ingresar al predio “La Cuatro Oriente” Correct address: Calle Cuatro Km. 25, Hermosillo, Sonora, Mexico.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - S3-07 - S3-08 - S3-09 <p>Address provided on the PDD: Saliendo de Hermosillo por la Carretera a Kino se gira al Sur en la Calle 4 Sur, se avanza durante 25 km y se gira al poniente para ingresar al predio “La Cuatro Poniente”</p>		<p>S3-19 San Manuel San Raul Please correct the information concerning the address for the above farms, according to the information at the left.</p> <p><u>Further response from the project developer:</u> Addresses corrected in PDD.</p>	<p>be indicated in table 1b.</p>
--	--	---	----------------------------------

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

Correct address:

Calle Cuatro Km. 25, Hermosillo, Sonora, Mexico.

- S3-13

- S3-15

- S3-19

Address provided on the PDD:

Saliendo de Hermosillo por la Carretera a Kino se gira al Sur en la Calle 4 Sur, se avanza hasta llegar a la Calle 13 y se gira al oriente y se avanza por 6 km y se gira al norte para entrar al predio "El 28".

Correct address:

Calle 13 esquina Calle 26, Hermosillo, Sonora, Mexico.

- San Manuel

Address provided on the PDD:

Domicilio conocido Predio Bacajaquia, Navojoa, Sonora.

Correct address:

Predio Bacajaquia Lote #14- 4, Navojoa, Sonora, México.

- San Raul

Address provided on the PDD:

Predio Ejido Mumuncuera, Carretera a LA Jaula, al Ejido La union, Navojoa, Sonora

Correct address:

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

Carretera La Jaula - La Unión Km. 3, Predio Mumuncuera, Huatabampo, Sonora, México			
<u>Corrective Action Request No.3.</u> For all the sites included in this project please correct: the dates of start and end of construction showed in the PDD according to the construction schedule.	Table 1a A.4.12	#1, Construction start date has not been set yet. Preliminary or estimated construction information is included in the site description area of the PDD. <u>Further request form DOE:</u> The date of the last revision of the PDD is October 2 nd 2007. The digesters expected to be completed on 21 st September 2007. Please update the information regarding the construction of the biodigesters considering that the expected dates have past. <u>Further response from the project developer:</u> Construction information updated in PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.
<u>Corrective Action Request No.4.</u> According to the PDD information, the project's starting date is May 21 st , 2007. This information do not corresponds with the Lol signing date, which is April 7 th , 2005. Please correct this issue.	Table 1a A.4.12 C.1.1	#1, Both dates are correct. The legal entity of the PDD 112 (Norson) has several projects with AgCert that began in 2005. New sites of this legal entity have been added to AgCert projects, for this reason, new PDDs with dates of 2007 are present.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.
<u>Corrective Action Request No.5.</u> For all the sites included in this project, please correct:	Table 1a B.2.6 B.5.1 B.5.6	#1, The data inventory was confirmed by the producer. The average monthly inventory matches the PDD. The PDD is changed to "monthly" in the base-line tables.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The revised PDD is responding to CARS and CRS given by table 1a.

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68



Industrie Service

<p>The inventories showed in the PDD are from October 2005 to September 2006. All of them represent the amount of animals in the farm the last day of each month, besides the monthly average.</p> <p>At the moment of the visit the inventories were provided, but they are exactly the same as those in the PDD.</p> <p>The correct averages should be provided.</p>	<p>E.1.3 E.3.1 E.3.4</p>		<p>Any further new issue or still unresolved issue will be indicated in table 1b.</p>
<p><u>Corrective Action Request No.6.</u></p> <p>According to vers10 of the III.D methodology CO₂ emissions from use of fossil fuels or electricity for the operation of the facility should be taken into account in the calculations. Please additionally describe the equipment including capacity and time of operation.</p>	<p>Table 1a E.1.2 E.1.3 E.3.1</p>	<p>#1, This information is in the PDD. Using the standard equipment configuration of one 1HP blower that operates 24 hours per day per anaerobic digester and one 3HP pump that operates 24 hours per day per anaerobic digester, direct emissions from the use of fossil fuels and or electricity for the operation of the facility are considered as part of the project emissions.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>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.</p>
<p><u>Corrective Action Request No.7.</u></p> <p>The Emission Factor of the electricity needs to be calculated with the most recent data from the host country. There is data available from national authorities from the host country of 2004. The EF of the electricity needs to be actualized.</p>	<p>Table 1a E.1.2 E.1.3 E.3.1</p>	<p>#1, Researched and confirmed most current data.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>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.</p>
<p><u>Corrective Action Request No.8.</u></p> <p>Please give more details about the direct</p>	<p>Table 1a E.1.2 E.1.3</p>	<p>#1, A factor of 10% is used as methane conversion factor for the digester which incorporates methane not captured by the project.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The revised PDD is responding to CARS and</p>

Validation Protocol

Project Title: AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México

Date of Completion: Jan 13th, 2008.

Number of Pages: 68




Industrie Service


<p>project emission like:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Methane not captured by the project and re-released to the atmosphere; - Methane captured and not flared (e.g. physical leakage, flare inefficiency, flare availability) - CO2 emissions from combustion of non-biogenic methane. <p>Please describe if in addition, the methane conversion factor of the emission reduction calculations include a conservative percentage discount to compensate for intrinsic digester emissions.</p>	E.3.1	<p>A factor of 2% is attributed to flare inefficiency (98% flare efficiency)</p> <p>CO2 emissions from combustion of fossil fuels and electricity are included in Table B.4</p> <p>MCF of 10% is used for project digester methane emissions</p> <p>This information is already in the PDD.</p>	<p>CRS given by table 1a.</p> <p>Any further new issue or still unresolved issue will be indicated in table 1b.</p>
<p><u>Corrective Action Request No.9.</u></p> <p>The values from the IPCC used in the assumptions should be update with the newest values available (IPCC Guidelines 2006)</p>	<p>Table 1a</p> <p>E.1.2</p> <p>E.1.3</p> <p>E.3.1</p>	#1, Researched and confirmed most current data.	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The revised PDD is responding to CARS and CRS given by table 1a.</p> <p>Any further new issue or still unresolved issue will be indicated in table 1b.</p>




Annex 2: Information Reference List

Final Report 2008-01-13	Validation of the “AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México” Information Reference List	Page 1 of 7	 Industrie Service
-------------------------	--	----------------	--


Reference No.	Document or Type of Information
1	<p>On-site interview at the Farm S3-01, March 14th, 2007 by auditing team of TÜV:</p> <p>Validation team on site: Guadalupe Avendaño Reyes TÜV America de Mexico. GHG Auditor</p> <p>Interviewed persons: Juan Carlos Valdez Parra Farm's Manager Jesus Francisco Puebla Norson Maintenance Manager</p> <p>Jaime de la Cruz AgCert Mexico Ramon A. Ruiz Zámamo AgCert Mexico</p>
2	<p>On-site interview at the Farm S3-02, March 15th, 2007 by auditing team of TÜV:</p> <p>Validation team on site: Guadalupe Avendaño Reyes TÜV America de Mexico. GHG Auditor</p> <p>Interviewed persons: Evaristo Cuencas Farm's Manager Jesus Francisco Puebla Norson Maintenance Manager</p> <p>Jaime de la Cruz AgCert Mexico Ramon A. Ruiz Zámamo AgCert Mexico</p>
3	<p>On-site interview at the Farm S3-03, March 15th, 2007 by auditing team of TÜV:</p> <p>Validation team on site: Guadalupe Avendaño Reyes TÜV America de Mexico. GHG Auditor</p>

Final Report 2008-01-13	Validation of the "AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México"	Page 2 of 7	 Industrie Service
	Information Reference List		


Reference No.	Document or Type of Information										
	Interviewed persons: <table> <tr> <td>José Jesús Ramírez</td><td>Farm's Manager</td></tr> <tr> <td>Jesus Francisco Puebla</td><td>Norson Maintenance Manager</td></tr> <tr> <td>Jaime de la Cruz</td><td>AgCert Mexico</td></tr> <tr> <td>Ramon A. Ruiz Zámano</td><td>AgCert Mexico</td></tr> </table>	José Jesús Ramírez	Farm's Manager	Jesus Francisco Puebla	Norson Maintenance Manager	Jaime de la Cruz	AgCert Mexico	Ramon A. Ruiz Zámano	AgCert Mexico		
José Jesús Ramírez	Farm's Manager										
Jesus Francisco Puebla	Norson Maintenance Manager										
Jaime de la Cruz	AgCert Mexico										
Ramon A. Ruiz Zámano	AgCert Mexico										
4	On-site interview at the Farm S3-04, March 16 th , 2007 by auditing team of TÜV: Validation team on site: <table> <tr> <td>Guadalupe Avendaño Reyes</td><td>TÜV America de Mexico. GHG Auditor</td></tr> </table> Interviewed persons: <table> <tr> <td>Víctor Pacheco</td><td>Farm's Manager</td></tr> <tr> <td>Jesus Francisco Puebla</td><td>Norson Maintenance Manager</td></tr> <tr> <td>Jaime de la Cruz</td><td>AgCert Mexico</td></tr> <tr> <td>Ramon A. Ruiz Zámano</td><td>AgCert Mexico</td></tr> </table>	Guadalupe Avendaño Reyes	TÜV America de Mexico. GHG Auditor	Víctor Pacheco	Farm's Manager	Jesus Francisco Puebla	Norson Maintenance Manager	Jaime de la Cruz	AgCert Mexico	Ramon A. Ruiz Zámano	AgCert Mexico
Guadalupe Avendaño Reyes	TÜV America de Mexico. GHG Auditor										
Víctor Pacheco	Farm's Manager										
Jesus Francisco Puebla	Norson Maintenance Manager										
Jaime de la Cruz	AgCert Mexico										
Ramon A. Ruiz Zámano	AgCert Mexico										
5	On-site interview at the Farm S3-05, March 16 th , 2007 by auditing team of TÜV: Validation team on site: <table> <tr> <td>Guadalupe Avendaño Reyes</td><td>TÜV America de Mexico. GHG Auditor</td></tr> </table> Interviewed persons: <table> <tr> <td>Víctor Pacheco</td><td>Farm's Manager</td></tr> </table>	Guadalupe Avendaño Reyes	TÜV America de Mexico. GHG Auditor	Víctor Pacheco	Farm's Manager						
Guadalupe Avendaño Reyes	TÜV America de Mexico. GHG Auditor										
Víctor Pacheco	Farm's Manager										

Final Report 2008-01-13	Validation of the "AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México"	Page 3 of 7	 Industrie Service
	Information Reference List		


Reference No.	Document or Type of Information
	<p>Jesus Francisco Puebla Norson Maintenance Manager</p> <p>Jaime de la Cruz AgCert Mexico</p> <p>Ramon A. Ruiz Zámano AgCert Mexico</p>
6	<p>On-site interview at the Farm S3-06, March 16th, 2007 by auditing team of TÜV:</p> <p>Validation team on site:</p> <p>Guadalupe Avendaño Reyes TÜV America de Mexico. GHG Auditor</p> <p>Interviewed persons:</p> <p>Víctor Pacheco Farm's Manager</p> <p>Jesus Francisco Puebla Norson Maintenance Manager</p> <p>Jaime de la Cruz AgCert Mexico</p> <p>Ramon A. Ruiz Zámano AgCert Mexico</p>
7	<p>On-site interview at the Farm S3-07, March 15th, 2007 by auditing team of TÜV:</p> <p>Validation team on site:</p> <p>Guadalupe Avendaño Reyes TÜV America de Mexico. GHG Auditor</p> <p>Interviewed persons:</p> <p>José Jesús Ramírez Farm's Manager</p> <p>Jesus Francisco Puebla Norson Maintenance Manager</p> <p>Jaime de la Cruz AgCert Mexico</p>

Final Report 2008-01-13	Validation of the "AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México"	Page 4 of 7	 Industrie Service
	Information Reference List		


Reference No.	Document or Type of Information
	Ramon A. Ruiz Zámamo AgCert Mexico
8	<p>On-site interview at the Farm S3-08, March 14th, 2007 by auditing team of TÜV:</p> <p>Validation team on site:</p> <p>Guadalupe Avendaño Reyes TÜV America de Mexico. GHG Auditor</p> <p>Interviewed persons:</p> <p>Daniel Felix U. Farm's Manager</p> <p>Jesus Francisco Puebla Norson Maintenance Manager</p> <p>Jaime de la Cruz AgCert Mexico</p> <p>Ramon A. Ruiz Zámamo AgCert Mexico</p>
9	<p>On-site interview at the Farm S3-09, March 14th, 2007 by auditing team of TÜV:</p> <p>Validation team on site:</p> <p>Guadalupe Avendaño Reyes TÜV America de Mexico. GHG Auditor</p> <p>Interviewed persons:</p> <p>José Eusebio Sandoval Miranda Farm's Manager</p> <p>Jesus Francisco Puebla Norson Maintenance Manager</p> <p>Jaime de la Cruz AgCert Mexico</p> <p>Ramon A. Ruiz Zámamo AgCert Mexico</p>
10	<p>On-site interview at the Farm S3-13, March 12th, 2007 by auditing team of TÜV:</p>

Final Report 2008-01-13	Validation of the "AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México"	Page 5 of 7	 Industrie Service
	Information Reference List		

Reference No.	Document or Type of Information
	Validation team on site: Guadalupe Avendaño Reyes TÜV America de Mexico. GHG Auditor Interviewed persons: Francisco Manuel A. R. Farm's Manager Jesus Francisco Puebla Norson Maintenance Manager Jaime de la Cruz AgCert Mexico Ramon A. Ruiz Zámamo AgCert Mexico
11	On-site interview at the Farm S3-15, March 12 th , 2007 by auditing team of TÜV: Validation team on site: Guadalupe Avendaño Reyes TÜV America de Mexico. GHG Auditor Interviewed persons: Refugio Marrujo Farm's Manager Jesus Francisco Puebla Norson Maintenance Manager Jaime de la Cruz AgCert Mexico Ramon A. Ruiz Zámamo AgCert Mexico
12	On-site interview at the Farm S3-19, March 12 th , 2007 by auditing team of TÜV: Validation team on site: Guadalupe Avendaño Reyes TÜV America de Mexico. GHG Auditor Interviewed persons:

Final Report 2008-01-13	Validation of the “AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México” Information Reference List	Page 6 of 7	 Industrie Service
-------------------------	--	----------------	--

Reference No.	Document or Type of Information
	Francisco Alfredo Moreno L. Farm's Manager Jesus Francisco Puebla Norson Maintenance Manager Jaime de la Cruz AgCert Mexico Ramon A. Ruiz Zámamo AgCert Mexico
13	On-site interview at the Farm San Manuel, March 19 th , 2007 by auditing team of TÜV: Validation team on site: Guadalupe Avendaño Reyes TÜV America de Mexico. GHG Auditor Interviewed persons: Sergio Cabrera Farm's Supervisor Jaime de la Cruz AgCert Mexico Ramon A. Ruiz Zámamo AgCert Mexico
14	On-site interview at the Farm San Raúl, March 19 th , 2007 by auditing team of TÜV: Validation team on site: Guadalupe Avendaño Reyes TÜV America de Mexico. GHG Auditor Interviewed persons: Sergio Cabrera Farm's Supervisor Jaime de la Cruz AgCert Mexico Ramon A. Ruiz Zámamo AgCert Mexico
15	Validation and Verification Manual, IETA/World Bank (PCF)
16	Farm letters of intention

Final Report 2008-01-13	Validation of the "AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México"	Page 7 of 7	 Industrie Service
	Information Reference List		

Reference No.	Document or Type of Information
	Norson Frigorífica Agropecuaria – submitted – April 7 th , 2005.
17	Operations and Maintenance Plan for AgCert Operations, DM004en, March 2007.
18	Farm Production Data (confidential - Agcert forms B of each farm)
19	Letter issued by Designated National Authority of Mexico regarding the need for environmental licenses and impact assessments, dated November 3 rd , 2006.
20	Approved baseline methodology AMS III.D. "Methane Recovery", version 11, UNFCCC, 2006
21	Calculation of baseline and project emissions "AWMS Methane Recovery Project MX07-S-112, Sonora, México", AgCert, December, 2007
22	IPCC: 2006 Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories
23	IPCC: 2000, Good Practice Guidance
24	Approved monitoring methodology AMS III.D. "Methane Recovery", version 11, UNFCCC, 2006
25	Stakeholder meeting documentation for meetings performed: Invitation (direct and via e-mail), meeting report, presentation given at the meeting
26	Flare efficiency test procedure, OM002, submitted November 2006