VALIDATION REPORT

The Rotary Club Bali Ubud

Gianyar Waste Recovery Project

SGS Climate Change Programme
SGS United Kingdom Ltd
SGS House
217-221 London Road
Camberley Surrey
GU15 3EY
United Kingdom

Date of Issue:	**Project Number:**
03-11-2008	CDM.VAL1087IN01
Project Title:	
Gianyar Waste Recovery Project	
Organisation:	**Client:**
SGS United Kingdom Limited	Rotary Club of Bali Ubud
Publication of PDD for Stakeholders Consultation	
Commenting Period:	From 27-07-2007 to 25-08-2007 AMS III F version 4 From 11-04-2008 to 10-05-2008 AMS III F version 5
First PDD Version and Date:	00, 6th July 2007
Final PDD Version and Date:	03, 8th April 2008

Summary:

The Rotary Club of Bali Ubud has commissioned SGS to perform the validation of the project: Gianyar Waste Recovery Project

Methodology Used: Type III – Other project activities. Category III.F – avoidance of methane production from decay of biomass through composting.

Version and Date: Version 5, dated 10th August 2007

The scope of the validation is defined as an independent and objective review of the project design document, the project's baseline study and monitoring plan and other relevant documents. The information in these documents is reviewed against Kyoto Protocol requirements, UNFCCC rules and associated interpretations. SGS has employed a risk-based approach in the validation, focusing on the identification of significant risks for project implementation and the generation of CERs.

The report is based on the findings of document reviews, the stakeholder consultation process and responses from the project participants to the findings raised in this report.

The report and the annexed validation describes a total of 13 findings which include:

- 6 Corrective Action Requests;
- 7 New Information Requests; and

All findings have been closed out satisfactorily and the project

– Will be recommended to the CDM Executive Board with a request for registration.

Subject:

CDM Validation

Validation Team:

Mr. Pankaj Mohan – Lead Assessor
Mr. Kamesh Iyer – Assessor
Mr. Randy Ismail – Local Assessor (Trainee)
Dr. Kaviraj Singh Pradhan – Expert

Technical Review:	**Trainee Technical Reviewer:**
Date: 08-04-2008 and 04-11-2008 Name: Sanjeev Kumar	Name: Vikrant Badve

Authorised Signatory:

Name: Siddharth Yadav
Date: 4th November 2008

Revision Number:	**Date:**	**Number of Pages:**
0	28-03-2008	45
1	03-11-2008	45
2	-	-

Abbreviations

CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emission Reductions
CO2	Carbon Dioxide
COP/MOP	Conference of Parties serving as the Meeting of Parties to Kyoto Protocol
DNA	Designated National Authority
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
DR	Document Review
EIA	Environment Impact Assessment
GHG	Green House Gas(es)
I	Interview
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
ISHC	International Stakeholder Consultation
MoV	Means of Verification
MP	Monitoring Plan
NIR	New Information Request
NGO	Non Government Organisation
PDD	Project Design Document
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change

Table of Content

Annexes:

1. Validation Opinion

SGS United Kingdom Ltd has been contracted by Rotary Club of Bali Ubud to perform a validation of the project: Gianyar Waste Recovery Project in Bali, Indonesia.

The Validation was performed in accordance with the UNFCCC criteria for the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) and host country criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

SGS reviewed of the project design documentation, using a risk based approach and conducted follow-up interviews.

By using technology to avoid the production of methane from the biomass fraction of municipal waste that would have otherwise been left for anaerobic decay in a solid waste disposal site without methane capture and flaring or power production, the project activity will result in reductions of greenhouse gas emissions that are real, measurable and give long-term benefits to the mitigation of climate change. The decay is prevented through aerobic treatment by composting the organic waste fraction and proper soil application of the compost. The proper composting process is secured by adequate compost handling procedures and measures, including active aeration.

In our opinion, the project meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM and all relevant host country criteria. The project correctly applies methodology Type III – Other project activities. Category III.F – avoidance of methane production from decay of biomass through composting. version 5. It is demonstrated that the project 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.

The total emission reductions from the project are estimated to be **76,707** t of CO2e over a 10 years crediting period, averaging **7,671** t of CO2e annually. The emission reduction forecast has been checked and it is deemed likely that the stated amount is achieved given the underlying assumptions do not change.

The project will hence be recommended by SGS for registration with the UNFCCC.

Signed on Behalf of the Validation Body by Authorized Signatory

Signature: 

Name: Siddharth Yadav

Date: 4th November 2008

2. Introduction

2.1 Objective

Rotary Club of Bali Ubud has commissioned SGS to perform the validation of the project: Gianyar Waste Recovery Project with regard to the relevant requirements for CDM project activities. The purpose of a validation is to have an independent third party assess the project design. In particular, the project's baseline, the monitoring plan (MP) and the project's compliance with relevant UNFCCC and host country criteria are validated in order to confirm that the project design as documented is sound and reasonable and meets the stated requirements and identified criteria. Validation is seen as necessary to provide assurance to stakeholders of the quality of the project and its intended generation of Certified Emission Reduction (CER). UNFCCC criteria refer to the Kyoto Protocol criteria and the CDM rules and modalities and related decisions by the COP/MOP and the CDM Executive Board.

2.2 Scope

The scope of the validation is defined as an independent and objective review of the project design document, the project's baseline study and monitoring plan and other relevant documents. The information in these documents is reviewed against Kyoto Protocol requirements, UNFCCC rules and associated interpretations. SGS has employed a risk-based approach in the validation, focusing on the identification of significant risks for project implementation and the generation of CERs.

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.

2.3 GHG Project Description

The project activity is the expansion of the facility's capacity to 50 tons of waste per day or around 17,500 tons per year, to cope with all waste in the Gianyar Regency with its 500,000 inhabitants. This capacity expansion requires additional space and equipment, amounting to additional USD 383,000 investment. The existing 400 m^2 building will accommodate two additional shredder, blowers to aerate the compost piles and the existing baler. A new covered 5,000 m^2 area under light steel constructions will house waste sorting on 700 m^2, composting in table piles on 3,200 m^2, compost curing and compost storage on 1,100 m^2, as well as an additional compost sieve and compost mixer. For managing and handling of compost and waste on-site additional vehicles are required. A new waste water garden will process the waste water from the facility. The plant is expected to commence operation in 2008. The project plan contains the option to extent the processing capacity in the future up to 100 tons of waste per day to cope with increasing waste volumes due to increased collection capacity and economic growth in the region.

2.4 The Names and Roles of the Validation Team Members

Name	Role	Affiliate
Mr. Pankaj Mohan	Lead Assessor	SGS India
Mr. Kamesh Iyer	Assessor	SGS India
Mr. Randy Ismail	Local Assessor (Trainee)	SGS Indonesia
Mr. Kaviraj Singh Pradhan	Expert	SGS India

3. Methodology

3.1 Review of CDM-PDD and Additional Documentation

The validation is performed primarily as a document review of the publicly available project documents. The assessment is performed by trained assessors using a validation protocol.

A site visit is usually required to verify assumptions in the baseline.

Site visit was performed by assessor and Local Assessor (trainee) and the work carried out during the site visit was mentioned in separate checklist attached as Annex 1 with this report.

Local staff (SGS Indonesia) was also involved to confirm other statements in the PDD through review of documents direct contacts with key stakeholders (including the project developers and Government and NGO representatives in the host country).

3.2 Use of the Validation Protocol

The validation protocol used for the assessment is partly based on the templates of the IETA / World Bank Validation and Verification Manual and partly on the experience of SGS with the validation of CDM projects. It serves the following purposes:

- it organises, details and clarifies the requirements the project is expected to meet; and
- it documents both how a particular requirement has been validated and the result of the validation.

The validation protocol consists of several tables. The different columns in these tables are described below.

Checklist Question	Ref ID	Means of Verification (MoV)	Comment	Draft and/or Final Conclusion
The various requirements are linked to checklist questions the project should meet.	Lists any references and sources used in the validation process. Full details are provided in the table at the bottom of the checklist.	Explains how conformance with the checklist question is investigated. Examples of means of verification are document review (DR) or interview (I). N/A means not applicable.	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.	This is either acceptable based on evidence provided (Y), or a Corrective Action Request (CAR) due to non-compliance with the checklist question (See below). New Information Request (NIR) is used when the validation team has identified a need for further clarification.

The completed validation protocol for this project is attached as Annex 2 to this report

3.3 Findings

As an outcome of the validation process, the team can raise different types of findings

In general, where insufficient or inaccurate information is available and clarification or new information is required the Assessor shall raise a **New Information Request (NIR)** specifying what additional information is required.

Where a non-conformance arises the Assessor shall raise a **Corrective Action Request (CAR).** A CAR

is issued, where:

I. mistakes have been made with a direct influence on project results;
II. validation protocol requirements have not been met; or
III. there is a risk that the project would not be accepted as a CDM project or that emission reductions will not be verified.

The validation process may be halted until this information has been made available to the assessors' satisfaction. Failure to address a NIR may result in a CAR. Information or clarifications provided as a result of an NIR may also lead to a CAR.

Observations may be raised which are for the benefit of future projects and future verification or validation actors. These have no impact upon the completion of the validation or verification activity.

Corrective Action Requests and New Information Requests are raised in the draft validation protocol and detailed in a separate form (Annex 3). In this form, the Project Developer is given the opportunity to "close" outstanding CARs and respond to NIRs and Observations.

3.4 Internal Quality Control

Following the completion of the assessment process and a recommendation by the Assessment team, all documentation will be forwarded to a Technical Reviewer. The task of the Technical Reviewer is to check that all procedures have been followed and all conclusions are justified. The Technical Reviewer will either accept or reject the recommendation made by the assessment team.

4. Validation Findings

4.1 Participation Requirements

The host Party for this project is Indonesia. Indonesia has ratified the Kyoto protocol on 3rd December 2004. Initially Host country approval from Indonesia DNA was not provided by the project proponent and hence CAR 1 was raised. In response to CAR 1 project proponent submitted a copy of Letter of Approval from Indonesia DNA (reference number E.111/Dep.III/LH/03/08), dated 6th March 2008. This was verified with the original copy and CAR 1 was closed. A copy of same letter is submitted with this report.

No Annex I Party has been identified in the first version of PDD (dated 24/07/2007) by the project proponent and therefore no further Letter of Approval was required. However, it was noted in the revised PDD (dated 01/10/2007) that MyClimate, The climate protection partnership from Switzerland as project participant for this project has been added. Hence CAR 13 was raised. In response to this CAR 13, project proponent submitted a copy of Letter of Approval from Switzerland DNA (reference number G462-0679) dated 16th November 2007. This was verified with the original copy and CAR 13 was closed. A copy of same letter is submitted with this report.

4.2 Project Design

The PDD has prepared as per the guidelines mentioned in version 3 of CDM-SSC-PDD. The PDD for the present project activity when checked against these guidelines and the format of PDD, it has found that the some of the sections are not as per the PDD guidelines for small scale PDD for bundled project activity. The CAR 6 was raised for the same. In response to CAR (6) project proponent made all the required corrections in the rephrased PDD. The corrections made by the project proponent are cross-checked in rephrased version of the PDD. However, this correction has not specified the revision number yet. So CAR 6 was left open. Subsequently the PP provided the revised PDD mentioning the version correctly. This was accepted and hence CAR 6 was closed.

4.3 Eligibility as a Small Scale Project

This waste recovery project aims to avoid the production of methane from biomass or other organic matter that would have otherwise been left to decay anaerobically in a solid waste disposal site without methane recovery. Due to the project activity, decay is prevented through aerobic treatment by composting and proper soil application of the compost. The project qualifies as a small scale CDM project activity as the annual average emission reductions are below 60 kilo tonnes of CO2 as per the approved small scale methodology AMS-III.F version 5. It was confirmed through site visit of the project activity, cross checking with the UNFCCC guidelines and interviews with the local government office that this Small scale project activity is not a debundled component of a larger project. Hence the project meets the eligibility criteria of small scale project activity.

4.4 Baseline Selection and Additionality

The applicability of methodology was checked from the paragraph 1 of the methodology AMS III F version 5. This states that the emission reductions should be less than or equal to 60,000 tCO2e per year. This requirement is met by the project activity as the average emission reductions per year is 7671 tCO2e.

The project boundary was checked and found to be in order. This is also in accordance with the small scale methodology AMS III F version 5.

The Project proponent considered four alternatives as the baseline alternatives in the PDD.

Alternative 1: The proposed project activity not undertaken as CDM project activity.

Alternative 2: Incineration of the municipal waste (MSW).

Alternative 3: Building a sanitary landfill including the capture and use of LFG for electricity production.

Alternative 4: Continuation of the current situation.

The baseline scenarios selected were Alternative 1 i.e. Project activity not taken as CDM project activity and Alternative 4 continuation of current practices. Alternative 1 is not the viable option as this will result in heavy losses as checked from the spreadsheet provided by the PP. Alternative 4 was taken as the baseline scenario as there is no additional cost involved and the PP will continue the current practice i.e. the PP will continue to dump the waste on the existing landfill site without the project activity. Paragraph 2 and 10 mainly relate to the expansion of an existing facility and this situation is not applicable to the project activity as the continuation of current situation is dumping of waste on the existing landfill site without the project activity. This was observed on-site as during the time of site visit the baseline scenario was still in continuation. These are in accordance with applicable laws and regulations as confirmed by Local Assessor.

The resulting baseline emissions are calculated based on the First Order Decay model (FOD) as required by the methodology AMS III F version 5. The formula and the parameters involved for the FOD Model were verified and it was found that most of the parameters use the IPCC 2006 default values or recommendations given in the methodology AMS III F version 5 along with pilot plant data. Hence this was concluded that the baseline selected was the most possible baseline scenario.

The additionality of the project activity is based on financial barrier and Market barrier respectively. Financial barrier is the main barrier. The financial barrier was there for the project activity which was checked from the yearly profit and loss statement dated 14/08/2007 provided by the project proponent. The spread sheet provided and verified indicates that; if the project is implemented without CDM benefits, the activity shall incur a loss of 6.8%. With CDM benefits a profit of 31.7% was envisaged. This spread sheet was reviewed by the local assessor also and the the assessment confirmed that in the present scenario there are very few/no organizations wanting to invest in the composting projects as this is not a profitable business and the maintenance of such kind of projects is high which requires continuous investment. The scenario was also cross checked through interviews with the project participants and employees attached to the pilot study earlier. The letter from Amandari dated 09/08/2007 says that the hotel will be purchasing the compost from the project participant for their garden etc. This letter was also checked and found to be satisfactory. The market barrier was also checked during the site visit and found that compost is not well accepted by the people. This is not well accepted by the market. This was checked from the letter dated 4th October 2007 provided by Dr.Ir. Ni Luh Kartini M.S., Director of Study Program, Udayana University Jl. P.B. Sudirman, Denpasar, Bali 80232. The market needs to be developed for selling of the compost at competitive prices and this will require investment. This was checked from the interview with PP and local assessor also confirmed that there is no market for compost at present. This was accepted and the project was found additional on the basis of financial barrier supported by market barrier.

CAR 10 was raised to get the documentary evidences and justification for using monthly values in the financial barrier. The PP provided the justification that monthly values were used because they reflected better operational relevance as their understanding. In addition the proponent had also provided the yearly Profit and loss statement. The yearly profit and loss statement was verified and it was found Ok. Based on the review of the statements and cross checking of the background information it could be concluded that the project activity faces a financial barrier without CDM benefits. The background information of the spreadsheet dated 14/08/2007 was checked by the Local Assessor i.e. cost of operations and overhead are correct and the income from compost selling to Amandari hotel was checked from the letter dated 09/08/2007. The documentary evidences were accepted and CAR 10 was closed.

CAR 11 was raised to further substantiate the marketing barrier by providing documentary evidence. The PP provided the justification that there is no comprehensive national statistical data available and submitted an experts letter dated 4th October 2007 from Dr.Ir. Ni Luh Kartini M.S., Director of Study Program Udayana University Jl. P.B. Sudirman, Denpasar, Bali 80232. The experts opinion clearly states that the market acceptability of compost is very low. This letter was checked and verified by the local assessor as the recommendation was in the local language. The Assessor and local assessor also confirmed through interviews with Head of Environmental Service of Gianyar, Bali Regency that there is no statistical or documentary evidence which is publicly or privately undertaken which is available. The internet was also checked to confirm the same. Hence, the justification along with letter dated 4th October 2007 was accepted based on cross checking and acceptance of expert's opinion and hence CAR 11 was closed out.

4.5 Application of Baseline Methodology and Calculation of Emission Factors

The proposed CDM project activity is to avoid the production of methane from biomass or other organic matter that would have otherwise been left to decay anerobically in a solid waste disposal site without methane recovery and uses baseline methodology as described under AMS-III.F version 5. for "Avoidance of methane production from decay of biomass through composting" as per Appendix B of the simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale CDM project activities. It has been checked from the emission reduction calculation that the annual average emission reduction below 60 kilo tonnes of CO2 and hence the present project activity comes under small scale category of the CDM activities.

The NIR 8 was raised as the emission reductions spreadsheet is not comprehensive. As the FOD calculations for methane avoidance is not evident. In response to NIR 8 the complete spreadsheet is made available by the project proponent and calculation for GHG reduction was checked from the FOD model. The revised spreadsheet was desk reviewed and found to be in order. Hence this NIR 8 was closed.

The project emissions are mainly due to the use of electricity from the grid. The combined emission factor of 0.728 tonnes of CO2e/MWh is fixed ex-ante and was verified by the letter addressed by the Director General of Electricity and Energy Utilization, Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources, to the Chairperson of the Designated National Authority of Indonesia on 28 April 2006. Since the copy of the letter is from an official source this was accepted as an evidence for the combined margin emission factor.

4.6 Application of Monitoring Methodology and Monitoring Plan

The monitoring plan given in web hosted version of the PDD is as per item number 10 on page 4 of the small scale methodology AMS-III.F version 5, dated 18th May 2007 for "Avoidance of methane production from decay of biomass through composting" as per Appendix B of the simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale CDM project activities.

The NIR 12 was raised as few clarifications are required on Issues regarding data collection and archiving and annual assessment of common practice at proximate site as per methodology from the web hosted version of PDD. The project proponent in his response to NIR 12 made all necessary corrections required and the PDD has been revised to accommodate issues on data recording and archiving and assessment of common practice at proximate site. These were desk reviewed and found that Revised PDD dated 08/04/2008 version 3 has made all the necessary corrections. Hence this was accepted and NIR 12 was closed.

4.7 Choice of the Crediting Period

The web hosted version of PDD has specified the starting date of the project and its operational life time (25 years). Meanwhile project proponent has selected fixed crediting time for the project and is defined as 10 years and the starting date for crediting period mentioned in PDD is 01-05-2008 but not before the date registration of the project activity with CDM - EB. It was confirmed that the operational lifetime period (25 years) exceeds the crediting period (10 years). However documentary supporting was required to substantiate start date of the project activity. Therefore CAR 07 was raised. In response to CAR 7 the project proponent submitted the contract and conformation letter. The contract, article 4 mention that the construction will take place between 15th August and 31st October 2007 and the confirmation letter mention that the project start was on 18th August 2007. But the revised PDD specify starting date was October 2007. Due to the mismatch CAR 7 was open. Subsequently the PDD was again revised by the PP which mentions the correct start date of project activity as 18th August 2007. This was found to be satisfactory and hence the CAR 7 was closed out.

4.8 Environmental Impacts

During site visit the compliance with the applicable local environmental regulations for the project activity was checked. However, according to regulations from Ministry of Environment of Indonesia Government, No. 11 in year 2006, this project does not required to have EIA but this project should provide the Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan (UKL/UPL) document. During site visit, a discussion on UKL/UPL progress with the local government was undertaken.

The NIR 9 was raised asking the project proponent to submit the Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan (UKL/UPL) document. The project proponent in his response to NIR 9 had submitted a copy of UKL / UPL with reference number 660.1/627/DLH/2007. The document addresses the relevant issues for the project particularly on environmental and social impact. This was verified with the original copy. This was accepted and hence NIR 9 was closed.

4.9 Local Stakeholder Comments

The project proponent in the web hosted version of the PDD has mentioned the identified local stakeholders for project activity. NIR 2 was raised asking project proponent to provide all the specific contact persons were included in the list and to provide evidence when exactly the stakeholders were consulted. Project proponent has submitted a copy of invitation letter for project socialization meeting (dated 26/07/07) with the local communities, local government and local NGO and copy of attendance list of this meeting (dated 26/07/07 and 25/07/07) and the PDD was revised accordingly. NIR 2 was closed.

Concerning the appropriate media used to invite comments by local stakeholders, NIR 3 was raised. Project proponent had submitted minutes of socialization of local stakeholders meeting (dated 25/07/07) and it was evident that the project was known to the local community; the consultation was an open and transparent process. Hence NIR 3 was closed.

Since the EIA is not required for this project, local stakeholder's consultation is not mandatory. However it is not clear from the PDD whether Stake holder consultation was carried out as per CDM requirement. For this reason, NIR 4 was raised. Project proponent has submitted minutes of socialization of local stakeholders meeting (dated 25/07/07) and it was evident that this activity has addressed all important aspects from the economical, environmental and social point of view as required by CDM modalities and procedures. Hence NIR 4 was closed.

The summary of local stakeholders' comments were not clear in the first version of the PDD hence NIR 5 was raised. Project proponent made necessary corrections and included corrected the summary of comments in the rephrased PDD. A copy of minutes of socialization of local stakeholders meeting (dated 25/07/07) is also provided to the validator. It was also found that no public complain was raised on project activity. Hence NIR 5 was closed.

5. Comments by Parties, Stakeholders and NGOs

In accordance with sub-paragraphs 40 (b) and (c) of the CDM modalities and procedures, the project design document of a proposed CDM project activity shall be made publicly available and the DOE shall invite comments on the validation requirements from Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC accredited non-governmental organizations and make them publicly available. This chapter describes this process for this project.

5.1 Description of How and When the PDD was Made Publicly Available

The Project Design Document for this project was made available on the SGS website http://www.sgsqualitynetwork.com/tradeassurance/ccp/projects/project.php?id=310 and was open for comments from 27-07-07 until 25-08-07. Comments were invited through the UNFCCC CDM homepage.

The Project Design Document for this project was made available on the SGS website http://www.sgsqualitynetwork.com/tradeassurance/ccp/projects/project.php?id=480 and was open for comments from 11-04-2008 until 10-05-2008. Comments were invited through the UNFCCC CDM homepage.

The PDD was re-web hosted as request for registration on older version of methodology AMS III F version 4 could only be submitted until 09-04-2008. This was also checked from the UNFCCC website mentioned as:- http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/DB/83G6NA8NDD90GYOS9SO154JL8M2YVO/view.html. Although the report was prepared on 28-03-2008 and Technical Review was conducted on 08-04-2008 due to last minute rush the project could not be submitted for request for registration until 09/04/2008 The project was re-webhosted and since AMS III F Version 5 did not have any material changes (the only change in Version 5 from Version 4 was the inclusion of PoA and this project does not fall in this category) that affected the Technical reviewer's decision. The re-webhosting was followed as per guidelines of the Executive Board.

5.2 Compilation of all Comments Received

Comment Number	Date Received	Submitter	Comment
None in first ISHC			
None in second ISHC			

5.3 Explanation of How Comments Have Been Taken into Account

No comments received in first ISHC

No comments received in Second ISHC

6. List of Persons Interviewed

Date	Name	Position	Short Description of Subject Discussed
06-07/08/2007	Mr. David Kuper	Project Manager/Coordinator	Project proponents view on project activity , CDM funds and additionality of the project activity
06-07/08/2007	Mr. Till Danckwardt,	Consultant	Technical description of project activity and baseline and data monitoring for project activity. Additionality of the project activity
07/08/2007	Mr. Drs. I Ketut Sudiarsa	Head of Environmental Service of Gianyar, Bali Regency	Local stakeholder consultation
06-07/08/2007	Ms. Ni Made Kushandari	Office Manager, (GUS Foundation)	Local stakeholder consultation
06-07/08/2007	Mr. I Nyoman Budhi Wirayadnya	Project Manager, (GUS Foundation)	Local stakeholder consultation

7. Document References

Category 1 Documents (documents provided by the Client that relate directly to the GHG components of the project, (i.e. the CDM Project Design Document, confirmation by the host Party on contribution to sustainable development and written approval of voluntary participation from the designated national authority):

/1/ PDD of Gianyar Waste Recovery Project (Version 00, 6th July 2007)
This version was published for the international stakeholder consultation
/2/ PDD of Gianyar Waste Recovery Project (Version, 01 October 2007)
/3/ PDD of Gianyar Waste Recovery Project (Version 2, 25 March 2008)
/4/ PDD of Gianyar Waste Recovery Project (Version 3, 8 April 2008)
/5/ Letter of Approval (LoA) for Gianyar Waste Recovery Project by DNA of Indonesia (No. E.111/Dep.III/LH/03/08 (Jakarta, 6 March 2008)
/6/ Letter of Approval (LoA) for Gianyar Waste Recovery Project by DNA of Switzerland (No. G462-0679 (Berne, 16 November 2007)
/7/ Modalities of Communication

Category 2 Documents (background documents used to check project assumptions and confirm the validity of information given in the Category 1 documents and in validation interviews):

/1/ Invitation letter for project socialization (dated 26/07/07)
/2/ Attendance list of project socialization (dated 26/07/07and 25/07/07)
/3/ Minutes meeting for project socialization (dated 25/07/07)
/4/ Contract of building construction (No. 007/CU/TPA/VIII/07)
/5/ Confirmation letter (dated 25/10/2007)
/6/ Gianyar Waste project ER calculation 070724-included hidden.xls (dated 24/07/07)
/7/ Environment Monitoring Plan (UKL/UPL) document (no. 660.1/627/DLH/2007 (11/09/07))
/8/ Yearly Profit and Loss Statement of Gianyar Waste Projec (excel sheet) (dated 14/08/07)
/9/ Purchase letter from Amandari Hotel (dated 09/08/2007)
/10/ Letter from Udayana University (dated 04/10/07)
/11/ Letter addressed by the Director General of Electricity and Energy Utilization, Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources, to the Chairperson of the Designated National Authority of Indonesia on 28 April 2006

- o0o -

Annex 1: Local Assessment

This checklist is designed to provide confirmation of in-country data and information provided in the Project Design Document for Gianyar Waste Recovery Project.

It serves as a "**reality check**" on the project that is completed by a local assessor from SGS Indonesia

Issue	**Findings**	**Source/Means of Verification**	**Further Action / Clarification / Information Required?**
Environmental impact	Site visit to the existing facility for waste recovery with processing capacity of 4 tons of waste per day was done. This facility has been build next to the existing landfill and is operational since early 2005 and the actual production is 2 tons of waste per day. It was observed that the facility is equipped with laboratory and research station where large scale forced aeration composting is studied and continuously improved. For the current activities, any potensial adverse impact to the environment are noise from the equipment used, dust and ambient air quality as well as traffic due existing waste recovery activity. It was confirmed that those potential impact has been properly managed.	Observation and Document Review (DR)	The PP provided the information on Environmental impacts through the document Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan (UKL/UPL).
Relevant regulation	Any applicable regulation on this activity and the expansion project was reviewed.	Document Review (DR) and Interview	There is regulation 11 for this which was reviewed. The expansion is not there of the project activity.
Social impact	It was also observed that local community was toY part as a working in the existing waste recovery activity.	Observation and interview	This was checked by physical verification during site visit.

Issue	Findings	Source/Means of Verification	Further Action / Clarification / Information Required?
Stakeholders consultation	Discussion with the worker and management at the existing waste recovery activity, local government, community and NGO was undertaken. It was confirmed that positive response concerning the project. Any relevant evidence are listed into the list of the record below.	Observation and interview	This was reviewed by minutes of meeting and interview during site visit.

Annex 2: Validation Protocol

Table 1 Participation Requirements for Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Project Activities (Ref PDD, Letters of Approval and UNFCCC website)

Requirement	Reference	Comments	Conclusion
1. All Parties (listed in Section A3 of the PDD) have ratified the Kyoto protocol and are allowed to participate in CDM projects	Marrakech Accords, CDM Modalities §30	Yes, Indonesia has ratified the Kyoto protocol on 03 December 2004 and is allowed to participate. http://maindb.unfccc.int/public/country.pl?country=ID	Y
2. The project shall assist Parties included in Annex I in achieving compliance with part of their emission reduction commitment under Art. 3 and be entered into voluntarily.	Marrakech Accords, CDM Modalities §29 and §30	The project will assist Parties included in Annex I in achieving compliance with part of their emission reduction commitment under Art. 3. However, no Annex-1 participant has been identified so far. In the revised PDD of October 2007 Annex 1 party (Switzerland) was listed so CAR13 was raised.	Y CAR13 CAR13 closed after receiving the Switzerland HCA from Switzerland DNA.

Requirement	Reference	Comments	Conclusion
3. The project shall assist non-Annex I Parties in achieving sustainable development and shall have obtained confirmation by the host country thereof, and be entered into voluntarily	Marrakech Accords, CDM Modalities §29 and §30 Kyoto Protocol Art. 12.2, Marrakech Accords, CDM Modalities §40a	Yes, The project activity is likely to contribute to sustainable development. Host Country Approval from Designated National Authority is to be submitted by the proponent.	CAR 1 Y CAR 1 was closed after receiving the Host country approval from Indonesian DNA.
4. Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC accredited NGOs shall have been invited to comment on the validation requirements for minimum 30 days, and the project design document and comments have been made publicly available	Marrakech Accords, CDM Modalities, §40	Yes, the Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC accredited NGOs shall have been invited to comment on the validation requirements for minimum 30 days on the http://www.sgsqualitynetwork.com/tradeassurance/ccp/projects/project.php?id=310 From 27-07-07 to 25-08-07 and the UNFCCC website. http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/Validation/index.html *Number of comments received: nil* *Due to meth expiry this was re-web-hosted for 30 days* http://www.sgsqualitynetwork.com/tradeassurance/ccp/projects/project.php?id=480 From 11-04-2008 to 10-05-2008 Number of comments received : nil	Y
5. The project design document shall be in conformance with the UNFCCC SSC PDD format		Yes, the guidelines for completing the PDD has been followed , except some pending closure of CARs and NIRs	Y

Requirement	Reference	Comments	Conclusion
6. The project participants shall submit a letter on the modalities of communication (MoC) before submitting a request for registration	EB-09 F_CDM_REG form	Yes, MoC was available.	Y
7. For AR projects, the host country shall have issued a communication providing a single definition of minimum tree cover, minimum land area value and minimum tree height. Has such a letter been issued and are the definitions consistently applied throughout the PDD?		NA	NA

Table 2 PDD

Checklist Question	Ref. ID	MoV*	Comments	Draft Concl	Final Concl
IV. 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?	PDD	DR	Yes, it does, i.e. Gianyar Waste Recovery Project	Y	Y
A.1.2. Are there an indication of a revision number and the date of the revision?	PDD	DR	PDD Version is not provided in Section A.1 Details provided in Annex 3 is not clear	CAR6	Y CAR 06 closed
A.1.3. Is this in consistency with the time line of the project's history?	PDD	DR	Yes, Project starting date is 18 August 2007 and start of the crediting period: 01/01/2008	Y	Y
A.2. Description of the Project Activity					
A.2.1. Is the description delivering a transparent overview of the project activities?	PDD	DR	Yes, it is, such as a transparency on the purpose of the project activity, type of technology used and the contribution of the project to sustainable development	Y	Y
A.2.2. Is all information provided in compliance with actual situation or planning?	PDD, site visit	DR, I	Yes, it complies with the actual situation and planning.	Y	Y
A.2.3. Is all information provided consistent with details provided in further chapters of the PDD?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was consistently provided.	Y	Y
A.3. Project Participants					
A.3.1. Is the table required for the indication of project participants correctly applied?	PDD	DR	Yes, the entire relevant column in table was properly applied.	Y	Y
A.3.2. Is all information provided in consistency with details provided by further chapters of the PDD (in particular annex 1)?	PDD	DR	Yes, consistency is evident for this table and annex 1.	Y	Y

Checklist Question	Ref. ID	MoV*	Comments	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A.4. Technical Description of the Project Activity					
A.4.1. Does the information provided on the location of the project activity allow for a clear identification of the site(s)?	PDD	DR	Yes, the location of the project is clearly identified through map and coordinate, i.e. 115° 21' east of Greenwich and 8° 33' south of the equator.	Y	Y
A.4.2. Do the project participants possess ownership or licenses which will allow the implementation of the project at that site / those sites?	PDD, Waste project proposal	DR	Yes, it was noted in the waste project proposal page 5 in Section of project contact.	Y	Y
A.4.3. Does the description of the technology to be applied provide sufficient and transparent input to evaluate its impact on the greenhouse gas balance and is the explanation how the project will reduce greenhouse gas emission transparent and suitable?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was noted in the section A.4.2., B.3. and 5.	Y	Y
A.4.4. Does the project design engineering reflect current good practices?	PDD	DR, I	It was confirmed during site visit that the current project design reflect good practices and so far, there is no environmentally safe and sound technology and know-how is transferred to the host country, since the technology is simple and commonly known. Specific additional know-how is developed in the on-site research station.	Y	Y
A.4.5. Is all information provided in compliance with actual situation or planning as available by the project participants?	PDD	DR, I	Yes, it was confirmed during site visit the availability and use of any equipment and installation which is specify in annex 5 of PDD.	Y	Y
A.4.6. 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?			Yes, it was confirmed during site visit that the project use of technology does improve performance.	Y	Y

Checklist Question	Ref. ID	MoV*	Comments	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A.4.7. Is the project technology likely to be substituted by other or more efficient technologies within the project period?			Due to composting technology is relatively simple and less expensive, it is unlikely that a new more efficient technology is introduced during project period.	Y	Y
A.4.8. Does the project require extensive initial training and maintenance efforts in order to work as presumed during the project period?	PDD	DR, I	Despite no environmentally safe and sound technology and know-how is transferred to the host country, since the technology is simple and commonly known. Still the project will require quite extensive initial training and maintenance efforts as detailed in the PDD. It was confirmed that specific additional know-how is developed in the on-site research station and volunteers and students from internationally recognized waste research institutions (Sandec, EAWAG ETH Zürich, Switzerland) contribute to a significant know-how inflow by optimizing processes with state-of-the-art knowledge.	Y	Y
A.4.9. Does the project make provisions for meeting training and maintenance needs?	PDD, site visit	DR, I	Yes, it was confirmed during site visit that daily activities for the existing operation capacity was running well.	Y	Y
A.4.10. Is a schedule available on the implementation of the project and are there any risks for delays?	PDD, site visit	DR, I	It was confirmed during site visit and record verification (i.e. waste project proposal) that project progress (e.g. construction of building, local stakeholders' consultation etc.) is still running well according the target date of project starting date.	Y	Y
A.4.11. Is the table required for the indication of projected emission reductions correctly applied?	PDD	DR	Yes, it would be useful if this table is provided	Y	Y
A.5. Public Funding					
A.5.1. Does the information on public funding provided conform with the actual situation or planning as presented by the project participants?	PDD, site visit	DR, I	It was confirmed that no ODA is used as per PDD A.4.4. and annex 2 as well as site visit examination, particularly on financial data.	Y	Y

Checklist Question	Ref. ID	MoV*	Comments	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A.5.2. Is all information provided consistent with details provided by further chapters of the PDD (in particular annex 2)?	PDD, site visit	DR, I	Yes, it was confirmed to be consistent	Y	Y
A.5.3. In case of public funding from Annex I Parties is it confirmed that such funding does not result in a diversion of official development assistance	PDD, site visit	DR, I	Yes, it was confirmed through interview and checking some records (e.g. waste project proposal page 2, para 2).	Y	Y
A.6. Debundling					
A.6.1. Is the small-scale project activity a debundled component of a large scale project activity	PDD, site visit	DR, I	Yes, this Small scale project activity is not a debundled component of a larger project. It was confirmed through site observation surrounding the project, cross checking in the UNFCCC and Indonesia web site including interview with the local government office as well as confirmation from local university (Udayana University).	Y	Y
A.6.2. If the project is a debundled component of a larger project, does the larger project fall within the limits for small-scale CDM project activities			NA (This project is not de-bundled component from the larger project.)	NA	Y
V. Baseline and Monitoring Methodology					
A.7. Choice and Applicability					
A.7.1. Is the project using an approved simplified methodology?	PDD	DR	Yes, the project use the approved simplified methodology, i.e. III.F. Avoidance of methane production from biomass decay through composting (Version 04) (mentioned in PDD page 9)	Y	Y
A.7.2. Does the project activity qualify as small scale project?	PDD	DR	The project qualifies as a small scale CDM project activity as the annual average emission reduction below 60 kilo tonnes of CO2.	Y	Y
A.7.3. Is the category(ies) of the project activity correctly identified in accordance with Appendix B to the simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale CDM project activities?	PDD	DR	The Project conforms to Small Scale project activity of AMS III F	Y	Y

Checklist Question	Ref. ID	MoV*	Comments	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A.7.4. Is the project activity a bundle of several small scale activities and if so does it contain any sub-bundles	PDD	DR	No this project has applied for one project activity in Gianyar only and this project activity is not the bundled project activity.	Y	Y
A.7.5. If the project activity is a bundle of several small scale activities, does the sum of the total bundle (including any subbundles) fall within the limits for small scale projects	PDD	DR	No this project has applied for one project activity in Gianyar only and this project activity is not the bundled project activity.	Y	Y
A.7.6. If the project activity is a bundle of several small scale activities, has the form with information related to the bundle been submitted and is it correctly used	PDD	DR	No this project has applied for one project activity in Gianyar only and this project activity is not the bundled project activity.	Y	Y
A.8. Project Boundary					
A.8.1. Has the project boundary of the project activity been based on the guidance of the applicable project category?	PDD, Site visit	DR	The project boundary seems to be in accordance as per PDD. It was confirmed during site visit that all specified information on this boundary has matched with the simplified methodology.	Y	Y
A.8.2. In case of grid connected electricity projects: Is the relevant grid correctly identified in accordance with EB guidance and the underlying methodology?	PDD	DR	NA	NA	NA
A.8.3. Are the project's spatial boundaries (geographical) and the project's system boundaries (components and facilities used to mitigate GHGs) clearly defined?	PDD, Site visit	DR	Yes, is clearly defined according to the PDD (annex 5) and physical evidence during site visit.	Y	Y
A.9. Identification of the Baseline					
A.9.1. Does the PDD discuss the identification of the most likely baseline?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was addressed in the section B.2. page 9 and confirmed that the proposed project activity is a waste management project, where methane emissions are avoided through waste composting instead of dumping it on a landfill, and therefore qualifies as a category III.F project.	Y	Y

Checklist Question	Ref. ID	MoV*	Comments	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A.9.2. Is the discussion and determination of the chosen baseline transparent and supported by the available data?	PDD, site visit	DR	Yes, the discussion and determination of chosen baseline was transparent and supported with the available data. Any key assumptions for the baseline were properly determined and justified. Any variables, parameters and data sources were clearly specified in the section B.6.2., B.6.3. and B.7.1. in the PDD. The reliability and credibility of all data, rationales and assumption were verified and found in order.	Y	Y
A.9.3. Is conservativeness addressed in the way of identifying the baseline?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was properly addressed through using IPCC default values since there is no local data available but once available, the local or site specific data used (e.g. EF_{grid} parameter).	Y	Y
A.10. Additionality					
A.10.1. Is the discussion on additionality and the evidence provided consistent with the starting date of the project	PDD	DR	Yes, it was consistent according to waste project proposal and PDD but see comment on C.1.1.	Y	Y
A.10.2. Is the discussion on additionality based on a comparison with realistic and credible alternatives?	PDD	DR	Yes, it has been addressed in PDD section B.5 but see comment in B.4.4.	Y	Y
A.10.3. Does the discussion on additionality take into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies, macro-economic trends and political aspirations??	PDD	DR	Yes, it was confirmed for any relevant regulation, existing common practice and local price for composting were being used for the discussion of additionality.	Y	Y

Checklist Question	Ref. ID	MoV*	Comments	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A.10.4. Has it been shown that the proposed project activity faces barriers that prevent the implementation of this type of proposed project activity but would not have prevented the implementation of at least one of the alternatives?	PDD	DR	<u>Financial Barrier</u> Please provide supporting for Monthly profit loss statement as provided in Annex 6. Also, it is not evident why annual figures are not used. <u>Market Barrier</u> Please provide adequate documentary or statistical supporting as the barrier is not comprehensive.	CAR10 CAR11	Y CAR 10 closed Y CAR 11 Closed
A.10.5. Is it demonstrated/justified that the project activity itself is not a likely baseline scenario	PDD	DR	Yes, but some evidence are needed, see comment in B4.4.	Y	Y
A.11. Application of the Simplified Methodology					
A.11.1. Has the simplified methodology been applied correctly for determining **baseline emissions**?	PDD	DR	Yes, it has been correctly applied according to methodology III F for baseline emission and for yearly Methane Generation Potential for the solid waste was calculated using the first order decay model as described in category AMS III.G.	Y	Y
A.11.2. Has the simplified methodology been applied correctly for determining **project emissions**?	PDD	DR	Yes, it has been correctly applied according to methodology III F for project emission and for O2 emissions related to the power or fossil fuel used by the project activity facilities. Emission factors for grid electricity was calculated as described in methodology AMS I.D	Y	Y
A.11.3. Has the simplified methodology been applied correctly for determining **leakage**?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was confirmed during site visit that no leakage applied for this project.	Y	Y
A.11.4. Have all the methodological choices been explained, have they been properly justified and are they correct	PDD	DR	Yes, it was clearly defined in the PDD and being correctly used the IIIF and its supporting methodology AMS III.G and AMS I.D.	Y	Y
A.11.5. Are uncertainties in the GHG emissions estimates properly addressed in the documentation?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was properly addressed, therefore for this case IPCC 2006 default value was used.	Y	Y

Checklist Question	Ref. ID	MoV*	Comments	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A.12. Ex-ante Data and Parameters Used					
A.12.1. Are the data provided in compliance with the simplified methodology?	PDD, excel sheet	DR	Yes, the data provided in compliance with the simplified methodology.	Y	Y
A.12.2. Is all the data derived from official data sources or replicable records and have these been correctly quoted?	PDD, excel sheet	DR	Yes, it was confirmed that all the data derived from official data sources or replicable records have been correctly quoted either from IPCC, Grid emission factor from Directorate General of Electricity and Energy Utilization, Jakarta, Indonesia etc.	Y	Y
A.12.3. Is the vintage of the baseline data correct?	PDD, excel sheet	DR	Yes, it was correct.	Y	Y
A.13. Calculation of Emissions Reductions					
A.13.1. Has the approved methodology been applied correctly for determining **emission reductions**?	PDD, excel sheet	DR	Yes, it was clearly stated in the PDD, section B.6.1 and confirmed that all the required calculations have been followed.	Y	Y
A.13.2. Are the emission reduction calculations documented in a complete and transparent manner?	PDD, excel sheet	DR	Emission reductions spreadsheet is not comprehensive. As the FOD calculations for methane avoidance is not evident. Provide the complete spreadsheet by which data can be traced back	NIR08	Y NIR08 Closed
A.13.3. Have conservative assumptions been used to calculate emission reductions?	PDD, excel sheet	DR	Yes, this was evident, e.g. Model corrections factor to account for model uncertainties, Methane correction factor, Maximum amount of organic waste processed for composting per year in the BAU scenario (pilot facility) etc.	Y	Y
A.13.4. Is the projection based on provable input parameter?	PDD, excel sheet	DR	Yes, this was evidence.	Y	Y

Checklist Question	Ref. ID	MoV*	Comments	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A.13.5. Is the projection based on same procedures as used for later monitoring or acceptable alternative models?	PDD, excel sheet	DR	Yes, it is.	Y	Y
A.13.6. Is the calculation of the emission reduction correct?	PDD, excel sheet	DR	Yes, it was confirmed after checking through the excel sheet.	Y	Y
A.14. Emission Reductions					
A.14.1. Will the project result in fewer GHG emissions than the baseline scenario?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was evident according to emission reduction calculation available in the PDD and excel sheet.	Y	Y
A.14.2. Is the form/table required for the indication of projected emission reductions correctly applied?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was correctly applied.	Y	Y
A.14.3. Is the projection in line with the envisioned time schedule for the project's implementation and the indicated crediting period?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was in line for both envisioned time schedule for the project's implementation and the indicated crediting period	Y	Y
A.15. Monitoring Methodology					
A.15.1. Does the monitoring methodology provide a consistent approach in the context of all parameter to be monitored and further information provided by the PDD?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was evident that the consistency was in place.	Y	Y
A.15.2. Does the monitoring methodology consistently apply the choice of the option selected for monitoring both of project and baseline emissions?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was consistently applied.	Y	Y

Checklist Question	Ref. ID	MoV*	Comments	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A.16. Data and Parameters Monitored					
A.16.1. Does the monitoring plan provide for the collection and archiving of all relevant data necessary for estimation or measuring the emission reductions within the project boundary during the crediting period?	PDD	DR	Monitoring plan appears to be consistent, however few clarifications are required on: 1) Issues regarding data collection and archiving 2) Annual assessment of common practice at proximate site as per methodology	NIR 12	Y NIR 12 Closed
A.16.2. Are the choices of project GHG indicators reasonable and in conformance with the requirements set by the simplified methodology applied?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was reasonable and in conformance with the requirements set the simplified methodology applied.	Y	Y
A.16.3. Will it be possible to determine the specified project GHG indicators?	PDD	DR	It was verified the applicable monitored parameter and found in order.	Y	Y
A.16.4. Will the indicators enable comparison of project data and performance over time?	PDD	DR	Yes, the project data and performance is enabled to compare.	Y	Y
A.16.5. Is the information given for each monitoring variable by the presented table sufficient to ensure the verification of a proper implementation of the monitoring plan?	PDD	DR	Yes, the presented table is sufficient to ensure the verification of proper implementation of the monitoring plan.	Y	Y
A.16.6. 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?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was confirmed that quality of data and correctness were evident.	Y	Y
A.16.7. Is the monitoring approach in line with current good practice, i.e. will it deliver data in a reliable and reasonably acceptable accuracy?	PDD, site visit	DR	Yes, it was confirmed according to the PDD and site visit observation.	Y	Y
A.16.8. Are all formulae used to determine project emission clearly indicated and in compliance with the monitoring methodology.	PDD	DR	Yes, it was in compliance.	Y	Y

Checklist Question	Ref. ID	MoV*	Comments	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A.17. Quality Control (QC) and Quality Assurance (QA) Procedures					
A.17.1. Is the selection of data undergoing quality control and quality assurance procedures complete?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was being done.	Y	Y
A.17.2. Is the belonging determination of uncertainty levels done correctly for each ID in a correct and reliable manner?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was applied.	Y	Y
A.17.3. Are quality control procedures and quality assurance procedures sufficiently described to ensure the delivery of high quality data?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was sufficient.	Y	Y
A.17.4. Is it ensured that data will be bound to national or internal reference standards?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was evident the PDD particularly in baseline and monitoring data.	Y	Y
A.17.5. Is it ensured that data provisions will be free of potential conflicts of interests resulting in a tendency of overestimating emission reductions?	PDD	DR	It was confirmed through the use of calibrated equipment and implementing QA/QC procedure.	Y	Y
A.18. Operational and Management Structure					
A.18.1. Is the authority and responsibility of project management clearly described?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was clearly described in the PDD section B.7.2.	Y	Y
A.18.2. Is the authority and responsibility for registration, monitoring, measurement and reporting clearly described?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was clearly described in the PDD section B.7.2.	Y	Y
A.18.3. Are procedures identified for training of monitoring personnel?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was included in the procedures.	Y	Y
A.19. Monitoring Plan (Annex 4)					
A.19.1. Is the monitoring plan developed in a project specific manner clearly addressing the unique features of the CDM activity?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was described in the PPD section B.7.2 and Annex 4.	Y	Y
A.19.2. Does the monitoring plan completely describes all measures to be implemented for monitoring all parameter required, including measures to be implemented for ensuring data quality?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was described in the PPD section B.7.2 and Annex 4.	Y	Y

Checklist Question	Ref. ID	MoV*	Comments	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A.19.3. Does the monitoring plan provide information on monitoring equipment and respective positioning in order to safeguard a proper installation?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was described in the PPD section B.7.2 and Annex 4.	Y	Y
A.19.4. Are procedures identified for calibration of monitoring equipment?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was described in the PPD section B.7.2 and Annex 4.	Y	Y
A.19.5. Are procedures identified for maintenance of monitoring equipment and installations?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was described in the PPD section B.7.2 and Annex 4.	Y	Y
A.19.6. Are procedures identified for day-to-day records handling (including what records to keep, storage area of records and how to process performance documentation)	PDD	DR	Monitoring plan appears to be consistent, however few clarifications are required on: 3) Issues regarding data collection and archiving 4) Annual assessment of common practice at proximate site as per methodology	NIR12	Y NIR 12 Closed
A.19.7. Are procedures identified for dealing with possible monitoring data adjustments and missing data allowing redundant reconstruction of data in case of monitoring problems??	PDD	DR	Yes, it was described in the PPD section B.7.2 and Annex 4.	Y	Y
A.19.8. Are procedures identified for internal audits of GHG project compliance with operational requirements where applicable?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was described in the PPD section B.7.2 and Annex 4.	Y	Y
A.19.9. Are procedures identified for project performance reviews before data is submitted for verification, internally or externally?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was described in the PPD section B.7.2 and Annex 4.	Y	Y
A.20. Baseline Details					
A.20.1. Is there any indication of a date when determine the baseline?	PDD	DR	It was described in the PDD section B.8. page 34.	Y	Y
A.20.2. Is this in consistency with the time line of the PDD history?	PDD	DR	Yes, it was consistent.	Y	Y
A.20.3. Is all data required provided in a complete manner by annex 3 of the PDD?	PDD	DR	Yes, the required data has provided in a complete manner.	Y	Y

Checklist Question	Ref. ID	MoV*	Comments	Draft Concl	Final Concl
VI. **Duration of the Project / Crediting Period**					
A.20.4. Are the project's starting date and operational lifetime clearly defined and reasonable?	PDD	DR	The starting date of the project and it's operational life time (25 years) is clearly defined. However documentary supporting is required to substantiate start date of the project activity.	CAR07	Y CAR07 closed
A.20.5. 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)?	PDD	DR	Project proponent has selected fixed crediting time for the project and is defined as 10 years. Crediting period starting date mentioned in PDD is 01-01-2008 and is reasonable.	Y	Y
A.20.6. Does the project's operational lifetime exceed the crediting period	PDD	DR	Yes, the operational lifetime period (25 years) exceeds the crediting period (10 years)	Y	Y
VII. Environmental Impacts					
A.20.7. Does the project comply with environmental legislation in the host country?	PDD, Site visit	DR, I	Yes, it was confirmed during site visit.	Y	Y
A.20.8. Are there any Host Party requirements for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and if yes, is an EIA approved?	PDD	DR	EIA is not required, however project proponent is required to provide Environment Monitoring Plan (UKL/UPL) document as a part of local requirements.	NIR9	Y NIR09 Closed
VIII. Stakeholder Comments					
A.20.9. Have relevant stakeholders been consulted?	PDD, Site visit	DR, I	PDD mentions concern local stakeholders list but not all the specific contact persons were included in the list. It is also not comprehensive from the PDD when exactly the stakeholders were consulted. Clarify	NIR2	Y NIR02 Closed
A.20.10. Have appropriate media been used to invite comments by local stakeholders?	PDD, Site visit	DR, I	The media used to invite comments by local stakeholders is not detailed in the PDD. Justify	NIR3	Y NIR03 Closed

Checklist Question	Ref. ID	MoV*	Comments	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A.20.11. If a stakeholder consultation process is required by regulations/laws in the host country, has the stakeholder consultation process been carried out in accordance with such regulations/laws?	PDD, Site visit	DR, I	Stake holder consultation process is not required as per law; however it is not clear from the PDD whether Stake holder consultation was carried out as per CDM requirement. Please provide documentary evidence.	NIR4	Y NIR04 Closed
A.20.12. Is the undertaken stakeholder process described in a complete and transparent manner?	PDD, Site visit	DR, I	Yes, it was confirmed during site visit and interview with the local government.	Y	Y
A.20.13. Is a summary of the stakeholder comments received provided?	PDD, Site visit	DR, I	Summary of the stakeholder comments received is not clear. Supporting documents to be provided.	NIR5	Y NIR05 Closed
A.20.14. Has due account been taken of any stakeholder comments received?	PDD, Site visit	DR, I	How due account has been taken on any stakeholder comment is not clear.	Pending NIR5	Y NIR05 Closed

References

S.No	Title / Description	Reference No.	Comments
1.	Letter of Approval (LoA) for Gianyar Waste Recovery Project by DNA of Indonesia	No. E.111/Dep.III/LH/03/08 (Jakarta, 6 March 2008)	
2.	Letter of Approval (LoA) for Gianyar Waste Recovery Project by DNA of Switzerland	No. G462-0679 (Berne, 16 November 2007)	
3.	PDD of Gianyar Waste Recovery Project	Version 01 October 2007	
4.	PDD of Gianyar Waste Recovery Project	Version 02 25 March 2008	
5.	Invitation letter for project socialization	(dated 07/07/26)	
6.	Attendance list of project socialization	(dated 07/07/26 and 07/07/25)	
7.	Minutes meeting for project socialization	(dated 07/07/25)	
8.	Contract of building construction	(No. 007/CU/TPA/VIII/07)	

S.No	Title / Description	Reference No.	Comments
9.	Confirmation letter	(dated October 25, 2007)	
10.	Gianyar Waste project ER calculation 070724-included hidden.xls	(dated 07/07/24)	
11.	Environment Monitoring Plan (UKL/UPL) document	no. 660.1/627/DLH/2007 (11/09/07)	
12.	Yearly Profit and Loss Statement of Gianyar Waste Project (excel sheet)	(dated 14/08/07)	
13.	Purchase letter from Amandari Hotel	(dated August 9, 2007)	
14.	Letter from Udayana University	(dated 04/10/07)	
15	PDD of Gianyar Waste Recovery Project	Version 03 08 April 2008	
16	Modalities of Communication	Signed on 6th May, 9th May, & 19th May 2008.	

Annex 3: Findings Overview

Date:	13/08/07			Raised by:	Kamesh Iyer		
No.:	1	Type:	CAR	Issue:	DNA LoA	Ref.:	1.3
Lead Assessor Comment					Date: 13/08/07		
Letter of approval from Host Country (Indonesia) is to be submitted by the project proponent.							
Project Participant Response:					Date: 01.10.2007		
Approval process is currently ongoing. As soon as the UKL/UPL document is ready the DNA will issue the host country approval to the project developer. The project developer will then immediately forward the document to the DOE. (Pending).							
Project Participant Response:					Date: 17/03/2008		
On February 14, 2008 we had a meeting with the Technical Team of the DNA at the Ministry of Environment in Jakarta to present and explain the project. On February 27, we received a few questions concerning the approval. These questions were then answered satisfactorily and the DNA issued the Host Country Approval on March 06, 2008.							
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:					Date: 18/03/2008		
Information Provided: Letter of Approval (LoA) for Gianyar Waste Recovery Project by DNA of Indonesia Information Verified: Received LoA has been verified and all mandatory issues has properly addressed in this LoA.						Verified Document Reference: Letter of Approval for Gianyar Waste Recovery Project by DNA of Indonesia, No. E.111/Dep.III/LH/03/08 (Jakarta, 6 March 2008)	
Reasoning for acceptance and close out: LoA has been submitted by PP and the content of this LoA has addressed all mandatory issues required by all relevant CDM requirements. Hence this was accepted and CAR01 was closed out.							

Date:	13/08/07			Raised by:	Kamesh Iyer		
No.:	2	Type:	NIR	Issue:	Stakeholders contact person and consultation	Ref.:	E.1.1.
Lead Assessor Comment					Date: 13/08/07		
PDD mentions concern local stakeholders list but not all the specific contact persons were included in the list. It is also not comprehensive from the PDD when exactly the stakeholders were consulted. Clarify.							
Project Participant Response:					Date: 01.10.2007		
A detailed list of local stakeholders involved in the consultation process will be included in the detailed report about the stakeholder consultation report currently prepared in addition to the information in the PDD.							
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:					Date: 05/11/2007		
Information Provided: - PDD of Gianyar Waste Recovery Project - Invitation letter for project socialization - Attendance list of project socialization Information Verified: The above PDD and socialization records were verified and the copies of the same were obtained for records.						Verified Document Reference: - Invitation letter for project socialization (dated 070726) - Attendance list of project socialization (dated 070726 and 070725) - Revised PDD	
Reasoning for acceptance and close out: NIR 2 closed as the specific contact persons were included in the list of the revised PDD page 38-39. Furthermore, evidence of stakeholder consultation was provided and it was held in July 2007.							

Date:	13/08/07			Raised by:	Kamesh Iyer		
No.:	3	Type:	NIR	Issue:	Stakeholders' comment	Ref.:	E.1.2.
Lead Assessor Comment					Date: 13/08/07		
The media used to invite comments by local stakeholders is not detailed in the PDD. Justify							
Project Participant Response:					Date: 01.10.2007		
The procedures and communications used to invite stakeholders will be evident from the detailed report about the stakeholder consultation report currently prepared in addition to the information in the PDD. Since the project was very known and developed with the participation of the local community, the consultation was a very open and transparent process.							
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:					Date: 05/11/2007		
Information Provided: - PDD of Gianyar Waste Recovery Project - Minutes meeting for project socialization - Attendance list of project socialization Information Verified: The above PDD and socialization records were verified and the copies of the same were obtained for records.					Verified Document Reference: - Minutes meeting for project socialization on 070725 - Attendance list of project socialization on 070725 - Revised PDD		
Reasoning for acceptance and close out: NIR 3 closed as the media used to invite comments by local stakeholders was specified in the revised PDD page 36, sub-section E1, paragraph 1.							

Date:	13/08/07			Raised by:	Kamesh Iyer		
No.:	4	Type:	NIR	Issue:	Stakeholders' comment	Ref.:	E.1.3.
Lead Assessor Comment					Date: 13/08/07		
Stake holder consultation process is not required as per law; however it is not clear from the PDD whether Stake holder consultation was carried out as per CDM requirement. Please provide documentary evidence.							
Project Participant Response:					Date: 01.10.2007		
As described in request nr 4, the stakeholder consultation was very open and addressed all important aspects from the economical, environmental and social point of view. Details are given in the stakeholder consultation report currently prepared in addition to the PDD information. It shows that all important aspects for CDM projects are covered.							
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:					Date: 05/11/2007		
Information Provided: - PDD of Gianyar Waste Recovery Project - Minutes meeting for project socialization - Attendance list of project socialization Information Verified: The above PDD and socialization records were verified and the copies of the same were obtained for records.					Verified Document Reference: - Minutes meeting for project socialization on 070725 - Attendance list of project socialization on 070725 - Revised PDD		
Reasoning for acceptance and close out: NIR 4 closed as the above documentary evidence has shown that stakeholder consultation was conducted as per CDM requirement.							

Date:	13/08/07			Raised by:	Kamesh Iyer		
No.:	5	Type:	NIR	Issue:	Stakeholders' comment	Ref.:	E.1.5.
Lead Assessor Comment					Date: 13/08/07		
Summary of the stakeholder comments received is not clear. Supporting documents to be provided.							
Project Participant Response:					Date: 01.10.2007		
Summary of the stakeholder comments and how the raised issues have been addressed is evident from the stakeholder consultation report currently prepared in addition to the PDD information.							
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:					Date: 05/11/2007		

Information Provided: - PDD of Gianyar Waste Recovery Project - Minutes meeting for project socialization - Information Verified: The above PDD and minutes meeting records were verified and the copies of the same were obtained for records.	Verified Document Reference: - Minutes meeting for project socialization on 070725 - Revised PDD
Reasoning for acceptance and close out: The summary of stakeholder comments was addressed in the revised PDD page 36, sub-section E1, paragraph 2 and the detail addressed issues was noted in the Minutes meeting for project socialization on 070725. Hence this was accepted and NIR04 was closed.	

Date:	13/08/07			Raised by:	Kamesh Iyer		
No.:	6	Type:	CAR	Issue:	PDD format	Ref.:	A.1.2
Lead Assessor Comment					Date: 13/08/07		
PDD Version is not provided in Section A.1 Details provided in Annex 3 is not clear							
Project Participant Response:					Date: 01.10.2007		
Versions: The PDD format used is Version 03 – in effect as off: 22 December 2006 The project PDD version is given in section A.1: it is Version from 06 July 2007 (last update). Due to some changes in the course of the validation and the resulting requests the project PDD version has now been updated to 01 October 2007 Details in Annex 3: All important baseline parameters, assumptions and data are detailed already in section B of the PDD. Annex 3 provides only some additional information about the climatic conditions in the region, which is important to determine climate parameters in the FOD model. The baseline model calculation itself is available as Excel file to the DOE. Because the Excel-calculations and tables are too comprehensive, only the results are transferred to the PDD.							
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:					Date: 05/11/2007		
Information Provided: PDD of Gianyar Waste Recovery Project Information Verified: The above PDD was verified particularly on Section A.1., B.6.2. and Annex 3					Verified Document Reference: Revised PDD		
Reasoning for acceptance and close out: The explanation that material issues on Annex 3 have been covered in section B.6.2 is accepted. However, the revised PDD specify the revision number. CAR 06 was closed out.							

Date:	13/08/07			Raised by:	Kamesh Iyer		
No.:	7	Type:	CAR	Issue:	Starting date of project	Ref.:	C.1.1.1
Lead Assessor Comment					Date: 13/08/07		
The starting date of the project and it's operational life time (25 years) is clearly defined. However documentary supporting is required to substantiate start date of the project activity.							
Project Participant Response:					Date: 01.10.2007		
The project had a long planning phase with some important implementation steps undertaken in the year 2007. However, important milestone is 18 October 2007 where the project implementation is officially started. Documentary evidence for the starting date is available from the project developer if required. The respective date has been adjusted in the PDD.							
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:					Date: 05/11/2007		

Information Provided: - PDD of Gianyar Waste Recovery Project - Contract of building construction - Confirmation letter Information Verified: All the above document and records were verified. The contract, article 4 mention that the construction will take place between August 15 and October 31, 2007 and the confirmation letter mention that the project start was on August 18, 2007. The revised PDD specify starting date as August 18, 2007.	Verified Document Reference: - Contract of building construction (No. 007/CU/TPA/VIII/07) - Confirmation letter (October 25, 2007) - Revised PDD
Reasoning for acceptance and close out: The mismatch of starting date of project has been revised as per confirmation letter and PDD has been revised. This was accepted and hence CAR07 was closed.	

Date:	13/08/07			Raised by:	Kamesh Iyer		
No.:	8	Type:	NIR	Issue:	Emission reductions spreadsheet	Ref.:	B.7.2.
Lead Assessor Comment					Date: 13/08/07		
Emission reductions spreadsheet is not comprehensive. As the FOD calculations for methane avoidance is not evident. Provide the complete spreadsheet by which data can be traced back							
Project Participant Response:					Date: 01.10.2007		
The FOD model calculation is fully provided in the spreadsheet. For the sake of simplicity the sheets containing the complex calculations are hidden. Only the summary page is visible. However, a new file where all sheets are visible will be sent to the DOE.							
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:					Date: 05/11/2007		
Information Provided: Gianyar Waste project ER calculation 070724-included hidden.xls Information Verified: Emission reductions spreadsheet was verified and all data on this spreadsheet can be properly traced back.						Verified Document Reference: Gianyar Waste project ER calculation 070724-included hidden.xls	
Reasoning for acceptance and close out: NIR 8 closed as the complete spreadsheet is available and calculation for GHG reduction was checked as required and these were found to be correct. Hence NIR08 was closed.							

Date:	13/08/07			Raised by:	Kamesh Iyer		
No.:	9	Type:	NIR	Issue:	EIA requirement	Ref.:	D.1.2.
Lead Assessor Comment					Date: 13/08/07		
EIA is not required, however project proponent is required to provide Environment Monitoring Plan (UKL/UPL) document as a part of local requirements.							
Project Participant Response:					Date: 01/10/2007		
UKL/UPL is under preparation and will be submitted to the DOE soon. (pending)							
Project Participant Response:					Date: 26/10/2007		
Please note that we could not obtain an electronic file of the UKL-UPL (environmental impact assessment). It was therefore enclosed as hardcopy.							
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:					Date: 05/11/2007		
Information Provided: Environment Monitoring Plan (UKL/UPL) document Information Verified: Environment Monitoring Plan (UKL/UPL) document was reviewed and it has properly addressed any relevant issues for the project particularly on environmental and social impact.						Verified Document Reference: UKL/UPL no. 660.1/627/DLH/2007 (11/09/07)	
Reasoning for acceptance and close out: NIR 9 closed as the required document is provided and it has properly addressed any relevant issues for the project particularly on environmental and social impact.							

Date:	13/08/07			Raised by:	Kamesh Iyer		
No.:	10	Type:	CAR	Issue:	Financial barrier	Ref.:	B.4.4.
Lead Assessor Comment					Date: 13/08/07		
Financial Barrier Please provide supporting for Monthly profit loss statement as provided in Annex 6. Also, it is not evident why annual figures are not used.							
Project Participant Response:					Date: 01.10.2007		
An annual profit/loss statement has been prepared and submitted to the DOE. The monthly statement was initially chosen because it reflects best operational relevance.							
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:					Date: 05/11/2007		
Information Provided: - PDD of Gianyar Waste Recovery Project - Yearly Profit and Loss Statement of Gianyar Waste Projec (excel sheet) - Purchase letter from Amandari Hotel Information Verified: The above PDD and the excel sheet for yearly profit and loss statement was verified. Cost for overhead and operational as well as income for compost selling from Amandari hotel was reviewed.						Verified Document Reference: - Yearly Profit and Loss Statement of Gianyar Waste Projec (excel sheet) (140807) - Purchase letter from Amandari Hotel (August 9, 2007) - Revised PDD	
Reasoning for acceptance and close out: The Yearly Profit and Loss Statement of Gianyar Waste Project (excel sheet) was appropriate with the current condition in local site and it was evident that this project has a barrier in financial matters except the CERs is obtained. CAR 10 is closed out.							

Date:	13/08/07			Raised by:	Kamesh Iyer		
No.:	11	Type:	CAR	Issue:	Market barrier	Ref.:	B.4.4.
Lead Assessor Comment					Date: 13/08/07		
Market Barrier Please provide adequate documentary or statistical supporting as the barrier is not comprehensive.							
Project Participant Response:					Date: 08.10.2007		
Until today, compost was a rather unknown concept in Bali with relatively low acceptance. Main reasons are the small volumes and the low quality of compost produced. Farmers today rely more on fertilizer than on compost as a soil conditioner. Hence, to create awareness and acceptance of compost as a valuable product, the project proponent has to develop the market demand. This leads to additional risks and expenditures/efforts during the first years of operation of the composting facility. Since compost has not gained high attention in the past, comprehensive statistical data is not available. Also other tailored documentary evidence to support the market barrier is hardly at hand. The current situation and the status of compost in Bali can be confirmed by Dr. Ir. Ni Luh Kartini M.S. Director of the Master Program for Soil Agriulture of Udayana University in Bali. She is one of the most respected soil experts and advocates the transition from chemical fertilizers to compost application in Bali since years. Her contact details are: Dr.Ir. Ni Luh Kartini M.S. Director of Study Program Udayana University Jl. P.B. Sudirman, Denpasar, Bali 80232 Telephone Office: +62 361 224827 or +62 361 429882 Handphone: +62 81 2398 1531 or +62 81 2399 3742 Email: pgdryland@indo.net.id							
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:					Date: 05/11/2007		

Information Provided: - PDD of Gianyar Waste Recovery Project - Letter from Udayana University Information Verified: The above PDD and the letter confirmation as well as the participant comment in their response were verified.	Verified Document Reference: - Letter from Udayana University(041007). - Revised PDD
Reasoning for not acceptance or acceptance and close out: CAR 11 closed as the explanation and the fact in the letter from Udayana University has supported the this barrier.	

Date:	13/08/07			Raised by:	Kamesh Iyer		
No.:	12	Type:	NIR	Issue:	Monitoring plan	Ref.:	B.10.1.
Lead Assessor Comment					Date: 13/08/07		
Monitoring plan appears to be consistent, however few clarifications are required on: 5) Issues regarding data collection and archiving 6) Annual assessment of common practice at proximate site as per methodology							
Project Participant Response:					Date: 08.10.2007		
Two clarifications have been requested: 1) Issues regarding data collection and archiving: Respective clarifications have been added under paragraph B.7.2 (section: data recording and archiving) in the PDD. All the data collected will be consolidated in a monitoring file available to the DOE. Detailed collection procedures will be part of the operating manual. This manual will be elaborated as soon as the facility is commissioned and operational. Archiving of all the data (logbooks and consolidated files) will be organised by the plant management. Data will be kept for 2 years after the end of the crediting period. 2) Annual assessment of common practice at proximate site as per methodology: The landfill where the waste would have been disposed in the baseline case is right next to the composting facility. To date no methane capture and destruction equipment is in place, and it is unlikely that in the future such an equipment will be installed. However, the common (or current) practice at the landfill site will be monitored annually through out the crediting period, and can be verified by the DOE upon verification of the emission reduction. Written confirmation by the landfill operator can be obtained of required. Respective remarks have been added in section B.7.2 in the PDD under Monitoring Processes/Other Parameters required by the Methodology.							
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:					Date: 05/11/2007		
Information Provided: PDD of Gianyar Waste Recovery Project Information Verified: The above PDD was verified particularly on Section B.7.2 concerning data recording and archiving (page 33-34) and assessment of common practice at proximate site (page 33, para 9)					Verified Document Reference: Revised PDD		
Reasoning for not acceptance or acceptance and close out: NIR 12 closed as the PDD has been revised to accommodate some issues on data recording and archiving and assessment of common practice at proximate site.							

Date:	05/10/2007			Raised by:	Pankaj Mohan		
No.:	13	Type:	CAR	Issue:	Annex 1 DNA LoA	Ref.:	1.3
Lead Assessor Comment					Date: 05/11/2007		
MyClimate, The climate protection partnership from Switzerland as project participant has been added in the revised PDD version 01/10/2007. Due to Switzerland, as Annex I country and has ratified Kyoto Protocol on 09/07/2003 then LoA from Switzerland is to be submitted by the project proponent as well.							
Project Participant Response:					Date: 17/03/2008		
Switzerland LoA was provided.							
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:					Date: 18/03/2008		

Information Provided: Letter of Approval (LoA) for Gianyar Waste Recovery Project by DNA of Switzerland Information Verified: Received LoA has been verified and all mandatory issues has properly addressed in this LoA.	Verified Document Reference: Letter of Approval for Gianyar Waste Recovery Project by DNA of Switzerland, No. G462-0679 (Berne, 16 November 2007)
Reasoning for not acceptance or acceptance and close out: LoA has been submitted to SGS and the content of this LoA has addressed all mandatory issues required by all relevant CDM requirements. Hence CAR13 was closed out.	

Annex 4: Team Members Statements of Competency

Statement of Competence

Name: Kamesh Iyer SGS Affiliate: India

Status

- Product Co-ordinator ☐
- Operations Co-ordinator ☐
- Technical Reviewer ☐
- Expert ☒

	Validation	Verification
- Local Assessor	☒	☒
- Lead Assessor	☒	☒
- Assessor / Trainee Lead Assessor	☐	☐

Scopes of Expertise

1. Energy Industries (renewable / non-renewable)	☒
2. Energy Distribution	☒
3. Energy Demand	☐
4. Manufacturing	☐
5. Chemical Industry	☐
6. Construction	☐
7. Transport	☐
8. Mining/Mineral Production	☐
9. Metal Production	☐
10. Fugitive Emissions from Fuels (solid,oil and gas)	☐
11. Fugitive Emissions from Production and Consumption of Halocarbons and Sulphur Hexafluoride	☐
12. Solvent Use	☐
13. Waste Handling and Disposal	☐
14. Afforestation and Reforestation	☐
15. Agriculture	☐

Approved Member of Staff by: Siddharth Yadav Date: 06/04/2008

Statement of Competence

Name: Pankaj Mohan SGS Affiliate: SGS India Pvt. Ltd.

Status

- Product Co-ordinator ☐
- Operations Co-ordinator ☐
- Technical Reviewer ☐
- Expert ☒

	Validation	Verification
- Local Assessor	☒	☒
- Lead Assessor	☒	☒
- Assessor / Trainee Lead Assessor	☒	☒

Scopes of Expertise

1. Energy Industries (renewable / non-renewable)	☒
2. Energy Distribution	☒
3. Energy Demand	☒
4. Manufacturing	☒
5. Chemical Industry	☐
6. Construction	☐
7. Transport	☐
8. Mining/Mineral Production	☐
9. Metal Production	☐
10. Fugitive Emissions from Fuels (solid,oil and gas)	☐
11. Fugitive Emissions from Production and Consumption of Halocarbons and Sulphur Hexafluoride	☐
12. Solvent Use	☐
13. Waste Handling and Disposal	☐
14. Afforestation and Reforestation	☐
15. Agriculture	☐

Approved Member of Staff by: Marco van der Linden Date: 03-04-07

Statement of Competence

Name:Kaviraj Singh Pradhan SGS Affiliate:SGS India Pvt. Ltd.

Status

- Product Co-ordinator ☐
- Operations Co-ordinator ☐
- Technical Reviewer ☐
- Expert ☒

	Validation	Verification
- Local Assessor	☒	☒
- Lead Assessor	☐	☐
- Assessor /Trainee Lead Assessor	☐	☐

Scopes of Expertise

1. Energy Industries (renewable / non-renewable) ☒
2. Energy Distribution ☐
3. Energy Demand ☐
4. Manufacturing ☐
5. Chemical Industry ☐
6. Construction ☐
7. Transport ☐
8. Mining/Mineral Production ☐
9. Metal Production ☐
10. Fugitive Emissions from Fuels (solid,oil and gas) ☐
11. Fugitive Emissions from Production and Consumption of Halocarbons and Sulphur Hexafluoride ☐
12. Solvent Use ☐
13. Waste Handling and Disposal ☒
14. Afforestation and Reforestation ☐
15. Agriculture ☐

Approved Member of Staff by Siddharth Yadav Date: 8th October 2007