



VERIFICATION/CERTIFICATION REPORT

“HAPUGASTENNE AND HULU GANGA SMALL HYDROPOWER PROJECTS” IN SRI LANKA

UNFCCC REFERENCE NO. 0085

VERIFICATION PERIOD
1 January 2007 to 30 September 2008

REPORT No. 2009-9001/1

REVISION No. 01

DET NORSKE VERITAS



VERIFICATION/CERTIFICATION REPORT

Date of first issue: 2009-05-18	Project No.: PRJC-98887-2008-CCS-IND /1
Approved by: Hendrik W. Brinks Technical Director for CDM	Organisational unit: Climate Change Services
Client: C-Quest Capital LLC	Client ref.: Francine M. Steininger

DET NORSKE VERITAS
DNV CERTIFICATION AS

Veritasvegen 1
3N-1322 Høvik
Norway
<http://www.dnv.com>

Summary:

Det Norske Veritas Certification AS (DNV) has performed the third periodic verification of the emission reduction of the “*Hapugastenne and Hulu Ganga Small Hydropower Projects*” in Sri Lanka (Registration Ref No. 0085) for the period 1 January 2007 to 30 September 2008.

In our opinion, the GHG emission reductions reported for the project in the monitoring report of dated 19 December 2009 are correctly stated. The GHG emission reductions were calculated correctly on the basis of the approved monitoring methodology AMS-I.D. Version 05, the monitoring plan and formulae given in the registered PDD of the “*Hapugastenne and Hulu Ganga Small Hydropower Projects*”.

Hence, DNV is able to certify that the emission reductions from the “*Hapugastenne and Hulu Ganga Small Hydropower Projects*” during the period of 1 January 2007 to 30 September 2008 amount to 75 365 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent.

Report No.: 2009-9001/1	Subject Group: Environment	Indexing terms	
Report title: “Hapugastenne and Hulu Ganga Small Hydropower Projects” in Sri Lanka		Key words Climate Change Kyoto Protocol Validation Clean Development Mechanism	Service Area Verification
Work carried out by: Kakaraparthi Venkata Raman, Murali Govindarajulu, Astakala Vidayacharan, Ricardo Diaz.			Market Sector
Work verified by: Anjana Sharma			Energy Industry
Date of this revision: 2010-01-22	Rev. No.: 01	Number of pages: 20	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No distribution without permission from the client or responsible organisational unit <input type="checkbox"/> free distribution within DNV after 3 years <input type="checkbox"/> Strictly confidential <input type="checkbox"/> Unrestricted distribution

© 2002 Det Norske Veritas AS

All rights reserved. This publication or parts thereof may not be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying or recording, without the prior written consent of Det Norske Veritas AS.

<i>Table of Content</i>	<i>Page</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	3
1.1 Objective	3
1.2 Scope	3
1.3 Description of the Project Activity	3
2 METHODOLOGY	4
2.1 Review of Documentation	5
2.2 Site Visits	5
2.3 Assessment	6
2.4 Reporting of Findings	6
3 VERIFICATION FINDINGS	7
3.1 Remaining Issues, CARs, FARs from Previous Validation or Verification	7
3.2 Project Implementation	7
3.3 Completeness of Monitoring	7
3.4 Accuracy of Emission Reduction Calculations	8
3.5 Quality of Evidence to Determine Emission Reductions	9
3.6 Management System and Quality Assurance	9
5 CERTIFICATION STATEMENT	1
6 REFERENCES	3

Appendix A Corrective Action Requests and Forward Action Requests

Appendix B Details of Monitoring Parameters

Abbreviations

CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CEA	Central Environmental Authority
CEB	Ceylon Electricity Board
CEF	Carbon Emission Factor
CER	Certified Emission Reduction(s)
CH ₄	Methane
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
CO ₂ e	Carbon dioxide equivalent
DNV	Det Norske Veritas
DNA	Designated National Authority
ERU	Emission Reduction Units(s)
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
MP	Monitoring Plan
MVP	Monitoring and Verification Plan
N ₂ O	Nitrous oxide
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
ODA	Official Development Assistance
PDD	Project Design Document
TIN	Total Inorganic Nitrogen
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change
GWP	Global Warming Potential



1 INTRODUCTION

C-Quest Capital LLC has commissioned Det Norske Veritas Certification AS (DNV) to carry out the third periodic verification of emission reductions reported for the “Hapugastenne and Hulu Ganga Small Hydropower Projects” in Sri Lanka” for the period 1 January 2007 to 30 September 2008. This report contains the findings from the verification and a certification statement for the certified emission reductions

1.1 Objective

Verification is the periodic independent review and ex-post determination by the Designated Operational Entity (DOE) of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions that have occurred as a result of the registered CDM project activity during a defined verification period.

Certification is the written assurance by the DOE that, during a specific period in time, a project activity achieved the emission reductions as verified.

1.2 Scope

The verification scope was:

- To verify that actual monitoring systems and procedures are in compliance with the monitoring systems and procedures described in the monitoring plan for the project activity,
- To evaluate the GHG emission reduction data and express a conclusion with a reasonable level of assurance about whether the reported GHG emission reduction data is free from material misstatement,
- To verify that the reported GHG emission data is sufficiently supported by evidence

The verification shall ensure that the reported emission reductions are complete and accurate in order to be certified.

1.3 Description of the Project Activity

Project Parties:	Sri Lanka and Netherlands
Title of project activity:	Hapugastenne and Hulu Ganga Small Hydropower Projects
UNFCCC registration No:	0085
Project Entity:	Eco Power (Private) Limited of Sri Lanka, IFC-Netherlands Carbon Facility (INCaF).
Project's crediting period:	01 Jan 2003 to 31 Dec 2012
Period verified in this verification:	1 January 2007 to 30 September 2008
Location of the project activity:	The Hapugastenne phase I and phase II small hydropower projects are located within close proximity of each other at Hapugastenne estate, near town of Ratnapura, Ratnapura



district, Sabaragamuwa Province, Sri Lanka. The Hulu Ganga I and II projects are located near the Panwila village, north of the Kandy town, Kandy district, central province, Sri Lanka.

The project is a bundle of four small-scale, run-of-river hydro power plants in Sri Lanka. The four projects are Hapugastenne Phase I and II and Hulu Ganga Phase I and II. Electricity generated is supplied to the national grid through Ceylon Electricity Board (CEB).

Hapugastenne phase I consists of two turbines with rated capacities of 2.526 MW each and phase II comprises of a turbine with rated capacity of 2.526 MW. As per the registered PDD the rated capacities of the Hapugastenne phase I and II turbines is 2.4 MW each, but as evidenced during the verification site visit and also as reported in the first verification report, the installed turbines are of 2.526 MW capacity each. The Hulu Ganga has been installed in two phases (phase I and Phase II) and each phase comprises of two Francis turbines with rated capacity of 1.5 MW each, aggregating to a total of 6 MW. Hence the installed capacity of the full project is 13.578 MW (7.578 MW + 6 MW).

The project's emission reductions are determined as the product of the net electricity generated and exported to the grid by the project and the validated *ex-ante* fixed grid emission coefficient of 0.8496 tCO₂/MWh. According to the validated project design, there are no project emissions and leakage effects associated with the project.

2 METHODOLOGY

The verification of the emission reductions has assessed all factors and issues that constitute the basis for emission reductions from the project. These include:

- Electricity generation - net export to grid and auxiliary consumptions, on a monthly basis
- Project emissions due to import of electricity from grid during plant shut downs
- Ex-ante fixed Grid emission factor.
- Social benefit Indicators

**Verification team**

Role/Qualification	Last Name	First Name	Country	Type of involvement					
				Desk review	Site visit	Reporting	Supervision of work	Technical review	Expert input
Project Manager/ GHG Auditor	Govindarajulu	Murali	India	Y	Y	Y			
CDM verifier/Technical Team Leader	Vidyacharan	Astakala	India	Y		Y	Y		
GHG auditor	Kakaraparthi	Venkata Raman	India	Y	Y	Y			
Sectoral Inputs	Diaz	Ricardo	Mexico						Y
Technical reviewer	Sharma	Anjana	India					Y	

Duration of verification

Preparations: 9 May 2009 to 11 May 2009.

On-site verification: 12 and 13 May 2009.

Reporting & QC: 14 May 2009 – 21 January 2010

2.1 Review of Documentation

The monitoring reports (version 1 and 2) / 1/ and the emission reduction calculations, provided in the form of spreadsheets submitted by Eco Power Pvt Ltd. were assessed as a part of the verification. In addition the Project Design Document / 2/, the monitoring plan contained in the PDD as well as the validation report / 3/ were assessed. Other operational documents /6/-/9/ were also assessed as evidence during the site visit.

2.2 Site Visits

During the period 12 and 13 May 2009, DNV carried out site visit at the hydro power plant. DNV verified that the actual operation of the project is as described in the PDD. The energy meters used for monitoring electricity at all the evacuation locations (including the calibration records) were checked. Evidence for the reported net generation of electricity was verified, i.e. the electricity supplied to the grid minus the imported electricity consumption of the project (grid electricity).



Interviewed organisation	Interview topics
Eco Power Private Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Whether the project has been implemented as planned ➤ Adherence to monitoring plan established in registered Project Design Document. ➤ Management procedures like internal audits and reviews to minimise uncertainties in data monitoring and data management ➤ Project performance ➤ Calibration of metering equipments ➤ Any pending issues from previous verifications ➤ Reasons for delay in phase II implementation

2.3 Assessment

The data presented in the monitoring report were assessed in detail through a review of the detailed project documentation and electricity generation records, interviews with personnel at Eco Power (Private) Ltd, observation of established monitoring and reporting practices and assessment of the reliability of monitoring equipment. This has enabled the verification team to assess the accuracy and completeness of reported monitoring data and to verify the correct application of the approved monitoring plan and monitoring methodology. The grid emission factor has been calculated *ex-ante* (for the entire crediting period) based on electricity generation mix in the Ceylon electricity grid and this has been assessed and verified as part of the validation of the project.

2.4 Reporting of Findings

Findings established during the verification may be as follows:

A corrective action request (CAR) is issued, where:

- i. Non-conformities with the monitoring plan or methodology are found in monitoring and reporting, or if the evidence provided to prove conformity is insufficient;
- ii. Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data or calculations of emission reductions which will impair the estimate of emission reductions;
- iii. Issues identified in a FAR during validation to be verified during verification have not been resolved by the project participants.

A clarification request (CL) shall be raised if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable CDM requirements have been met.

A forward action request (FAR) is issued for actions if the monitoring and reporting require attention and/or adjustment for the next verification period.

The verification identified one error in the monitoring report (version 1) which resulted in DNV issuing a corrective action request (CAR) as stated in Appendix B of this report.



3 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

3.1 Remaining Issues, CARs, FARs from Previous Validation or Verification

According to the validation report / 3/ and the previous verifications reports, no issues were required to be closed out during the current verification. This has been confirmed by DNV.

3.2 Project Implementation.

The project commissioning dates are as given below:

Hapugastenne Phase I	–	14 August 2001
Hapugastenne Phase II	–	9 September 2002
Hulu Ganga Phase I	–	3 June 2003
Hulu Ganga Phase II	–	25 October 2006

Although the different phases of the project started operation at different periods, 1 January 2003 is considered as the starting date for the crediting period.

3.3 Completeness of Monitoring

The monitoring is divided in to two parts, the monitoring of the a) electrical output indicators and b) project social benefit indicators. As stated in the section D.3 of the registered PDD, the following parameters are being monitored:

- Hapugastenne Phase I project electricity output
- Hapugastenne Phase II project electricity output
- Hullu Ganga Phase I and phase II project electricity output by a single energy meter.
- Project employment benefit's at Hapugastenne Phase I & phase II and Hullu Ganga Phase I & phase II.
- Community development project financing at Hapugastenne Phase I & phase II and Hullu Ganga Phase I & phase II.

The monitoring report version 1, indicated a monitoring period from 1 January 2007 till 31 August 2008, while the data in the table and the evidences provided are till the period ending 30 September 2008. In response to the CAR 1 raised by DNV, the monitoring report has been revised and readings have also been checked with the monthly invoices and generation records.

The electricity output indicator is measured through the energy meters located at the point of electricity uploading to the state utility grid under the custody of Ceylon electricity board and are maintained and calibrated by them. The readings from these meters have been considered as the basis for the emission reduction calculations. The electricity generated and exported to the grid from the projects is being monitored. The monthly meter reading documents have been cross



checked with the invoices raised. The registered PDD states that the meters will be calibrated/tested annually. The details on the dates of calibration of individual meters for the current verification period are given in the table below:

	Meter details		
Name of Units	Hapugastene Phase I	Hapugastenne Phase II	Huluganga Phase I & II
Details of Calibration	09 May 06	09 May 06	26 April 06
	21 September 07	21 September 07	01 March 07
	05 Jan 08 and 06 November 08	05 Jan 08 and 06 November 08	27 November 08
Deviation	Gap of four months before calibrating the meter in September 07.	Gap of four months before calibrating the meter in September 07.	Gap of eight months before calibrating the meter in November 08.

A deviation request with reference number I-Dev 0265 was submitted to the EB and as per the decision of the UNFCCC EB <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/deviations/57072>, a deduction based on the maximum inaccuracy specification of the meters has been applied for the period were the meter were in use without being calibrated.

As per the registered PDD, the parameters to be monitored are the electricity output supplied to the grid. This has to be calculated as the difference of the electricity exported and the electricity imported from the grid. The web hosted monitoring report was not indicating the electricity import from the grid and in response to the CAR 2 raised by DNV, the monitoring report has been revised to include the electricity import from the grid. The CER calculations have been done based on the net electricity supplied to the grid.

The source, frequency and review criteria of the parameters indicated in the monitoring plan were verified to be correct and in line with the validated monitoring plan of the PDD. Necessary management system procedures including responsibility and authority of monitoring activities have been verified to be consistent with the PDD. Knowledge of personnel associated with the project activity was also found to be satisfactory.

Under the project social benefit indicators, the total short and long-term employment positions created and project sponsor financial contributions to local development projects are being monitored and have been evidenced /10, /11/, /12/ & /13/.

3.4 Accuracy of Emission Reduction Calculations

The emission reductions are calculated as the product of the net electricity exported to the grid (calculates as export to grid-import from grid) and the grid emission factor of the connecting grid. The electricity exported from the project activities are read directly from an uploading meter. The meter is owned by the CEB and the maintenance and calibration is done by CEB on an annual basis. The import from the grid is sourced from the invoices provided by the CEB to the project proponent. The calibration certificate has been evidenced.



The quantity of electricity imported from the grid has been verified based on the invoices. During the months of January 2007 to December 2007 the CEB has provided an invoice based on the estimated consumption and hence an equal value of 960 has been raised in the invoice for the entire period. These invoices have been verified by DNV and found to be matching with the values indicated in the monitoring report.

The grid emission factor of the CEB was calculated during validation as 0.8496 t CO₂/MWh using a combined margin emission factor approach. The PDD mainly refers to *ex-ante* determination of this (but in the monitoring part opening up for *ex-post* determination if becoming required by EB). The fixed value of 0.8496 t CO₂/MWh has therefore been used.

It has been verified during the site visit that the monthly electricity generation during the monitoring period has not exceeded the rated capacity for the Hapugastenne and Hulu Ganga project.

The emission reductions from the project for the period from 1 January 2007 to 30 September 2008 as reported in the revised monitoring report of version 02 dated 19 December 2009 and actually verified at site equals to 75 569 tCO₂ equivalent. The reported emission reductions of 75,569 are lesser by 10% than the estimated emission reduction of 78 473 (estimated for the same period as per the registered PDD).

Year	Registered PDD CERs	Monitoring Report (version 1) CERs	Revised Monitoring Report (version 2) CERs
1 January 2007 to 30 September 2008	78 473	75 630	75 365
% Deviation from PDD	0	(-) 3.6	(-) 3.97

It has been confirmed by DNV that the maximum output capacity has not been exceeded on any given month during the monitoring period.

The emission reductions from the project for the period from 1 January 2007 to 30 September 2008 as reported in the revised monitoring report of 19 December 2009 are 75 365 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent.

3.5 Quality of Evidence to Determine Emission Reductions

Sufficient evidence was presented for the reported net emission reductions. Please refer to section 5 for a list of evidences assessed by DNV.

3.6 Management System and Quality Assurance

Eco Power Pvt. Ltd. has established management procedures and implemented effectively to ensure that the process is consistent. The procedures cover management responsibilities, data monitoring procedures, training procedures, periodical internal audits, management reviews and corrective actions in case of any deviations effectively. Calibration process is followed as per defined procedures and carried out annually and the calibration certificates of all the three meters have been verified by DNV during site visit.



4 CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

Det Norske Veritas Certification AS (DNV) has been engaged by C-Quest Capital LLC. to verify the greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions reported for the “Hapugastenne and Hulu Ganga Small Hydropower Projects” in Sri Lanka” (CDM registration reference no. 0085) for the period 1 January 2007 to 30 September 2008.

The Project participants of the “Hapugastenne and Hulu Ganga Small Hydropower Projects” in Sri Lanka” are responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emissions reductions on the basis set out within the project’s monitoring plan. The development and maintenance of records and reporting procedures in accordance with that plan, including the calculation and determination of GHG emission reductions from the project, is the responsibility of the management of the project.

It is DNV’s responsibility to express an independent verification statement on the GHG emission reductions from the project reported for the period 1 January 2007 to 30 September 2008.

DNV’s verification approach draws on an understanding of the risks associated with reporting GHG emissions data and the controls in place to mitigate these. Our examination includes assessment, on a test basis, of evidence relevant to the amounts and disclosures in relation to the project’s GHG emissions for the period from 1 January 2007 to 30 September 2008.

We planned and performed our work to obtain the information and explanations that we considered necessary to provide sufficient evidence for us to give reasonable assurance that the amount of GHG emission reductions for the period 1 January 2007 to 30 September 2008 are fairly stated.

We conducted our verification on the basis of the simplified monitoring methodology AMS-I.D, version 5, and the monitoring plan included in the PDD of the project. The verification included:

- collection and assessment of evidence supporting the reported data,*
- checking whether the provisions of the monitoring methodology AMS-I.D, version 5, and the monitoring plan in the PDD were consistently and appropriately applied.*

We have verified whether the information included in the monitoring report of version 2 dated 19 December 2009 is correct and that the emissions reductions achieved have been determined correctly.

Certification Statement

In our opinion, the GHG emission reductions stated in the monitoring report of 19 December 2009 for the “Hapugastenne and Hulu Ganga Small Hydropower Projects” in Sri Lanka” for the period from 1 January 2007 to 30 September 2008 are fairly stated.

The GHG emission reductions were calculated correctly on the basis of the approved simplified baseline and monitoring methodology AMS-I.D, version 5 and the monitoring plan and formulae provided in the validated and registered PDD.



Det Norske Veritas Certification AS is able to certify that the emission reductions from the “Hapugastenne and Hulu Ganga Small Hydropower Projects” in Sri Lanka for the period 1 January 2007 to 30 September 2008 amount to 75 365 ton CO₂ equivalent.

Bangalore & Oslo, 22 January 2010

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Vidyacharan'.

Astakala Vidyacharan
CDM Verifier

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'H.W. Brinks'.

Hendrik W. Brinks
Technical Director for CDM
Climate Change Services
Det Norske Veritas Certification AS



5 REFERENCES

Category 1 Documents:

Documents provided by the Project Participants that relate directly to the GHG components of the project

- / 1/ Eco Power Pvt. Ltd.: Monitoring report for “Hapugastenne and Hulu Ganga Small Hydropower Projects” in Sri Lanka, version 01 dated 10 September 2008 and version 02 dated 19 December 2009.
- / 2/ Eco Power Pvt. Ltd: CDM PDD for the “Hapugastenne and Hulu Ganga Small Hydropower Projects” in Sri Lanka”.
- / 3/ SGS: Validation report for the “Hapugastenne and Hulu Ganga Small Hydropower Projects” in Sri Lanka”. Report No. CDM.VAL0023
- / 4/ CDM Executive Board: AMS-I.D – “Grid connected renewable energy generation”, version 5.

Background documents related to the design and/or methodologies employed in the design or other reference documents.

- /5/ CDM Executive Board: *Validation and Verification Manual* version 01
- /6/ Record of Statements for the energy generated through wind mills from KPTCL for the monitoring period.
- /7/ Records of Invoices raised from the project participant for the Sale of power.
- /8/ Records of Monthly generation details in the plant and Maintenance records.
- /9/ Calibration records of meter at Hapugastene Phase I dated i) 09 May 2006, ii) 21 September 2007, iii) 05 January 2008 and iv) 06 November 2008.
Calibration records of meter at Hapugastene Phase II dated i) 09 May 2006, ii) 21 September 2007, iii) 05 January 2008 and iv) 06 November 2008
Calibration records of meter at Huluganga Phase I and Phase II dated i) 26 April 2006, ii) 03 January 2007 and iii) 27 November 2008.
- /10/ River bank erosion and sedimentation records done by plant operating personnel.
- /11/ Ecological Flora and Fauna-Post construction monitoring report done by Devaka K Weerakoon and Nalinda Periris – report of April 2008
- /12/ Reports of Surface water analysis for BOD and COD done by National Technology Institute (ITI)-chemical and microbiological lab June 2007 and June 2008.
- /13/ Reports of Surface Water nutrient levels done by National Technology Institute (ITI) dated May 2007 and September 2008.

Persons interviewed during the verification.

- /14/ Dr. Romesh Dias Bandarnaike, Chief Executive Officer, Eco Power (Private) Limited.
- /15/ Mr. Lionel, Operations Manager, Eco Power (Private) Limited.





APPENDIX A

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUESTS AND FORWARD ACTION REQUESTS



Corrective action requests

Verification # 1 (Current)

CAR ID	Corrective action request	Response by Project Participants	DNV's assessment of response by Project Participants
CAR 1	The Monitoring period indicated in the web hosted monitoring report is up to 31 August 2008, while the table indicates the values of September 2008 also. The date in the monitoring period in the report needs to be corrected.	The revised monitoring report dtd 19 December 2009 has been submitted.	Accepted based on the documents provided and the revised monitoring report. The CAR is closed.
CAR 2	As per the registered PDD, the parameters to be monitored are the electricity output supplied to the grid. The initial monitoring report only considers the export to the grid as the net electricity. The net electricity has to be calculated as the difference of the electricity exported and the electricity imported from the grid.	The revised monitoring report dtd 19 December 2009 has been submitted.	Accepted based on the documents provided and the revised monitoring report. Due to this, the CERs reduced by 61. The CAR is closed.
CAR 3	As per the registered PDD, meter for measuring the electricity supplied to the grid needs to be calibrated annually. The gap in the calibration period needs to be substantiated with required documents.	There is a gap between calibration periods of four months in two of the meters and a gap of eight months in the third meter. All the meters are under the purview of CEB and request for calibration has been submitted to CEB in time.	A deviation request with reference number I-Dev 0265 was submitted to the EB and as per the decision of the UNFCCC EB http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/deviations/57072 , a deduction based on the maximum inaccuracy specification of the meters has been applied for the period were the meter were in use without being calibrated The CAR is Closed.

**Forward action requests from this verification**

FAR ID	Forward action request	Summary of how FAR has been addressed in this reporting period	Assessment of how FAR has been addressed
	<i>No FAR was issued</i>		

- o0o -



APPENDIX B

DETAILS OF MONITORING PARAMETERS



	Assessment/ Observation
Data / Parameters: (as in monitoring plan of PDD):	Net Electricity Supplied to the grid,
Measuring frequency:	Measured continuously and recorded monthly
Reporting frequency:	Monthly
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Type of monitoring equipment:	Electronic Bidirectional Meter.
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes.
Calibration frequency /interval:	Annual
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	<p>Yes, the calibration frequency has been indicated in the PDD and the following records have been evidenced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Calibration records of meter at Hapugastene Phase I dated i) 09 May 2006, ii) 21 September 2007, iii) 05 January 2008 and iv) 06 November 2008. ➤ Calibration records of meter at Hapugastene Phase II dated i) 09 May 2006, ii) 21 September 2007, iii) 05 January 2008 and iv) 06 November 2008. ➤ Calibration records of meter at Huluganga Phase I and Phase II dated i) 26 April 2006, ii) 03 January 2007 and iii) 27 November 2008.
Company performing the calibration:	CEB
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	Yes.
Is(are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	Yes
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	The reported data has been checked with the invoices raised by the PP.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	<p>The following documents have been Checked:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The monthly statements on net electricity supplied to the grid.



VERIFICATION/CERTIFICATION REPORT

	2. Invoices raised by the PP to CEB
Does the data management (from monitoring equipment to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

- o0o -