




**Validation report form for post-registration changes for
CDM project activities
(Version 03.0)**

Complete this form in accordance with the instructions attached at the end of this form.

BASIC INFORMATION

Title and UNFCCC reference number of the project activity	Manaus Landfill Gas Project UNFCCC Ref. Number: 4211
Process track	<input type="checkbox"/> Prior approval <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Issuance <input type="checkbox"/> Renewal of crediting period
Version number of the validation report	1.1
Completion date of the validation report	28/07/2020
Type(s) of PRCs	<input type="checkbox"/> Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents ¹ <input type="checkbox"/> Corrections <input type="checkbox"/> Changes to the start date of the crediting period <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion of a monitoring plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan, or permanent deviation of monitoring from the applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes to the project design <input type="checkbox"/> Changes specific to afforestation and reforestation project activities
Version number of PDD to which this report applies	5
Project participants	- Conestoga Rovers e Associados Engenharia Ltda. - Nordic Environment Finance Corporation
Host Party	Brazil
Applied methodologies and standardized baselines	ACM0001 – version 18.0 – Flaring or use of landfill gas
Mandatory sectoral scopes	13 and 1
Conditional sectoral scopes, if applicable	-

¹ Other standards, methodologies, methodological tools and guidelines (to be) applied in accordance with the applied(selected) methodologies are collectively referred to as the other (applied) methodological regulatory documents).

Name and UNFCCC reference number of the DOE	Earthood Services Private Limited UNFCCC Ref. Number: E-0066
Name, position and signature of the approver of the validation report	 Dr. Kaviraj Singh Managing Director

SECTION A. Executive summary

Brief summary of the project activity

The project activity consists in capturing and burning methane resulted from the decomposition of organic waste in Manaus Landfill. It uses a collecting system composed by horizontal trenches and vertical wells and a high efficiency enclosed flare unit to burn the LFG, so reducing the greenhouse gas emissions previously emitted into the atmosphere.

The LFG collection and flaring system installed at Manaus landfill is located at km 19 of Highway AM-010 – city of Manaus, State of Amazonas, Brazil – Latitude: 2°57'29.92" S; Longitude: 60°00'54.74" W.

Scope of validation

Conestoga Rovers e Associados Engenharia Ltda. has contracted ESPL to conduct the validation of the PRC of the CDM project activity "Manaus Landfill Gas Project".

The scope of the validation is to establish that the PRCs are in accordance with PS for project activities 02.0.

Validation process

The validation process involved the following:

- contract with Conestoga Rovers e Associados Engenharia Ltda. for the scope of validation of the PRCs, along with the verification;
- publication of monitoring report;
- desk review;
- physical on-site inspection;
- issuance of validation findings;
- reporting, calculation checks, QA/QC and resolution of findings;
- issuance of draft validation report;
- independent technical review of the project documentation;
- issuance of the final validation report.

Conclusion

ESPL has performed the validation of the PRCs of the CDM PA "Manaus Landfill Gas Project", with UNFCCC Ref. Number 4211.

The validation team has confirmed that the PRCs are in accordance with PS for project activities 02.0, relevant CDM rules and requirements and conditions of the applied methodology ACM0001 – version 18.0.

Therefore, the request for registration of the PRCs is being submitted in accordance with the CDM procedures.

SECTION B. Validation team, technical reviewer and approver

B.1. Validation team member

No.	Role	Type of resource	Last name	First name	Affiliation (e.g. name of central or other office of DOE or outsourced entity)	Involvement in			
						Desk/document review	On-site inspection	Interviews	Verification findings
1.	Team Leader	OR	Cruz	Sergio	Verifit	Y	Y	Y	Y
2.	Local Expert	OR	Cruz	Sergio	Verifit	Y	Y	Y	Y
3.	Methodological Expert	OR	Cruz	Sergio	Verifit	Y	Y	Y	Y

4.	Technical Expert	OR	Cruz	Sergio	Verifit	Y	Y	Y	Y
----	------------------	----	------	--------	---------	---	---	---	---

B.2. Technical reviewer and approver of the validation report on PRCs

No.	Role	Type of resource	Last name	First name	Affiliation (e.g. name of central or other office of DOE or outsourced entity)
1.	Technical reviewer	IR	Gautam	Ashok	Central Office
2.	Technical Expert	IR	Gautam	Ashok	Central Office
3.	Approver	IR	Singh	Kaviraj	Central Office

SECTION C. Means of validation

C.1. Desk/document review

A desk review was conducted by the validation team that included:

- a review of the data and information presented to assess its completeness;
- a review of the registered project activity, the applied methodology including applicable tool(s) and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline;
- a review of supporting documents.

A complete list of documents/evidences reviewed is included as Appendix 3 of the Verification Report to which this Validation report form for post-registration changes is attached to.

C.2. On-site inspection

Duration of on-site inspection: 06/11/2019 and 07/11/2019				
No.	Activity performed on-site	Site location	Date	Team member
1.	Opening Meeting	PP's office in São Paulo	06/11/2019	Sergio Cruz
2.	Review of ER calculations in accordance with applied methodology and relevant tools	PP's office in São Paulo	06/11/2019	Sergio Cruz
3.	Review of monitored data and relevant documents in accordance with registered monitoring plan and applied monitoring methodology	PP's office in São Paulo	06/11/2019	Sergio Cruz
4.	Physical inspection of the project activity: site visit and interview of monitoring personnel	Manaus landfill	07/11/2019	Sergio Cruz
5.	Checking of management and operational system	Manaus landfill	07/11/2019	Sergio Cruz
6.	Verification checklist: compliance of monitoring procedures followed at project site with registered PDD and monitoring methodology. Management and monitoring procedures followed at project site.	Manaus landfill	07/11/2019	Sergio Cruz
7.	Presentation of findings	Manaus landfill	07/11/2019	Sergio Cruz
8.	Closing meeting	Manaus landfill	07/11/2019	Sergio Cruz

C.3. Interviews

No.	Interviewee			Date	Subject	Team member
	Last name	First name	Affiliation			
1.	Corona	Olga	CRA	06/11/2019	Project activity management Project monitoring	Sergio Cruz

2.	Camargo	Fernando	CRA	06/11/2019	Extraction of raw data ER calculations	Sergio Cruz
3.	Pileggi	Flávia	CRA	06/11/2019	MR ER calculations	Sergio Cruz
4.	Gomes Linhares	João	CRA	07/11/2019	Project activity operation and monitoring of parameters	Sergio Cruz

C.4. Sampling approach

Not applicable as no sampling has been used during the validation.

C.5. Clarification requests (CLs), corrective action requests (CARs) and forward action requests (FARs) raised

Areas of validation findings	No. of CL	No. of CAR	No. of FAR
Compliance with PDD form	-	-	-
Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents	-	-	-
Corrections	-	-	-
Changes to the start date of the crediting period	-	-	-
Inclusion of a monitoring plan	-	-	-
Permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan, or permanent deviation of monitoring from the applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents	-	1	-
Changes to the project design	-	-	-
Changes specific to afforestation and reforestation project activities	-	-	-
Others (please specify)	-	-	-
Total	0	1	0

SECTION D. Validation findings**D.1. Compliance with PDD form**

Means of validation	The PDD was crosschecked with the CDM-PDD-FORM template available at the UNFCCC website and with the instructions for filling it out.
Findings	-
Conclusion	A latest version of the verification template (CDM-PDD-FORM – version 11.0) available at the UNFCCC website has been used. It has been filled out in accordance with the instructions.

D.2. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents

Means of validation	Not applicable
Findings	-
Conclusion	Not applicable

D.3. Corrections

Means of validation	Not applicable
Findings	-
Conclusion	Not applicable

D.4. Changes to the start date of the crediting period

Means of validation	Not applicable
Findings	-
Conclusion	Not applicable

D.5. Inclusion of a monitoring plan

Means of validation	Not applicable
Findings	-
Conclusion	Not applicable

D.6. Permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan, or permanent deviation of monitoring from the applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents

Means of validation	<p>The proposed PRC is a permanent change to the registered monitoring plan.</p> <p>This deviation was verified by the validation team during the on-site visit, when it was possible to check that the biogas generator has been installed and no monitoring is being done. Several interviews were performed with PP's representatives about management and monitoring of the entire project activity.</p> <p>Thus, as the operation of the installed biogas generator group CHP300 is not being monitored, the PPs are proposing to consider the electricity generation from biogas as 0 (zero). Thus, no CERs will be claimed by the PP for this activity.</p> <p>The decision of not monitoring was done because the installation of this small generator was done only to supply biogas plant demand for electricity and the monitoring of its operation (e.g. meters, calibrations and maintenance of monitoring system) would be more costly and time consuming than the savings with electricity consumption.</p> <p>The revised PDD clearly describes the permanent change to the registered monitoring plan.</p> <p>The change does not reduce the level of accuracy of the monitoring compared with the requirements contained in the registered monitoring plan.</p> <p>In addition, the change does not lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of GHG emission reductions, as the biogas that is used for the generator is captured before the flow meter that monitors the LFG that goes to the flare.</p> <p>Therefore, no changes have been done that may cause any impact to the accuracy of the monitoring and calculations.</p>
Findings	CAR 01
Conclusion	The proposed permanent change to the registered monitoring plan is in accordance with paragraph 239 of PS for project activities – version 2.0, as conservative assumptions are being applied as all the electricity generated by the biogas generator will be considered as <u>0 (zero)</u> , so no CERs will ever be claimed for this activity.

D.7. Changes to the project design

Means of validation	<p>The change to the project design is an increase in the capacity specified in the registered PDD – at the registered PDD, the capacity is 19.2 MW and the change increases the capacity to 19.37 MW. The project activity is a large scale one, but no CERs will be claimed for this increase.</p> <p>The decision for this increase occurred after the investment decision and validation of the project activity. It was taken due to an opportunity to do a test of electricity generation with a small biogas generator with the purpose only to supply biogas plant demand for electricity. The planned electricity generation with 12 engines of 1.6 MW (each) is still not implemented due to financial issues.</p> <p>A biogas generator group CHP Brasil – model CHP300-UGN – Serial # DC9W201 – consumption 74 Nm³/h @ 170 kW (continuous power)^{20/} was installed on 26/05/2019^{21/}, for the self-consumption of electricity of the biogas plant and landfill, which was not described in the registered PDD.</p> <p>This change to project design was verified by the validation team during the on-site visit, when it was possible to check that the biogas generator has been installed. The name plate and manual of the equipment and generator installation report were checked. In addition, several interviews were performed with PP's representatives about management and monitoring of the entire project activity.</p> <p>The change has no negative impact to:</p>
----------------------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the registered monitoring plan, as no monitoring of the biogas generator will be done and no CERs will ever be claimed for this equipment. Thus, the monitoring necessary for parameters used in the calculations had not suffer any changes; - the level of accuracy of the monitoring activity, as no monitoring of the biogas generator will be done and no CERs will ever be claimed for this activity. Thus, the monitoring necessary for parameters used in the calculations had not suffer any changes. So, the level of accuracy of the monitoring activity continues the same as before; - the applied methodology and other methodological regulatory documents, as all requirements of ACM0001 and related tools continue being applied to the project activity. <p>In addition, the change does not adversely impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the additionality of the registered CDM project activity: a new financial analysis^{/16/} has been performed as the installation of the biogas generator CHP300 and, conservatively, neither the investment for the installation of the biogas generator nor fair value of new equipment have been accounted, but the savings that may occur in the payment of electricity expenses of the biogas plant are being accounted (in fact, conservatively, the amount is being considered again, as in the original financial assessment, it was accounted as a reduction in the electricity generation). <p>Therefore, an amount of R\$ 105,722.33 per year (annual electricity expenses on 2019^{/22/}) was used since May/2019 in order to account for the savings of electricity expenses.</p> <p>With this inclusion, the IRR of the project was increased from 4.29% (original assessment) to 4.37% (assessment with the installation of CHP300), which is far below the validated benchmark of 11.94%.</p> <p>No new sensibility analysis had to be performed as the savings do not reach the 10% variation that was already applied during the original additionality.</p> <p>In addition, it is important to mention that no ERs will be claimed for the generated electricity. Thus, there will be no increase at all in revenues.</p> <p>So, it was concluded that even with this slight increase of planned installed capacity, <u>the project remains additional</u>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the scale of the registered CDM project activity, as it is already a large-scale project activity; - the applicability and application of the applied methodologies and other methodological regulatory documents, as all requirements of ACM0001 and related tools continue being applied; - the compliance of the monitoring plan with the applied methodologies and other methodological regulatory documents. as all requirements of ACM0001 and related tools continue being applied. <p>Moreover, the revised PDD also complies with all requirements of the applied methodologies and other methodological regulatory documents.</p>
Findings	CAR 01
Conclusion	<p>The proposed change to the project design is in accordance with paragraph 241 (a) of PS for project activities – version 2.0, as it represents an increase in the capacity specified in the registered PDD (no CERs will be claimed).</p> <p>In addition, the change is in accordance with paragraph 242 of PS, as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it has no impact to the applicability and application of the applied methodology, as the methodology indicates the installation of generators of one of its scenarios. This installation was already described in the registered PDD and all requirements of ACM0001 and related tools continue being applied; - the monitoring plan is in compliance with the applied version of the methodology and tools. Actually, this PRC is being requested to clearly state this accomplishment and demonstrate that all requirements of ACM0001 and related tools continue being applied; - it has no impact to the level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring of the project activity, which remains as accurate and complete as before; - it has no impact to the additionality of the project activity, as a new additionality assessment was performed to confirm this;

	- the change has no impact to the scale of the project activity, as it continues being a large-scale project activity.
--	--

D.8. Changes specific to afforestation and reforestation project activities

Means of validation	Not applicable
Findings	-
Conclusion	Not applicable

SECTION E. Internal quality control

The draft validation report that is prepared by validation team is reviewed by an independent technical review team (one or more members) to confirm if the internal procedures established and implemented by ESPL were duly complied with and such opinion/conclusion is reached in an objective manner that complies with the applicable CDM rules/requirements.

The technical review team is collectively required to possess the technical expertise of all the technical area/sectoral scope to which the project activity is related. All members of technical review team are independent of the validation team.

During the technical review process, additional findings may be identified or the closed-out findings may be opened, which needs to be satisfactorily resolved before the request for the renewal of the crediting period is submitted to UNFCCC. The independent technical reviewer may either approve the report as such or reject/return the same, in such case, providing the comments/findings/issues that needs to be resolved by the validation team. The decision taken by the technical reviewer is final and is authorized on behalf of ESPL.

SECTION F. Validation opinion

The proposed permanent change to the registered monitoring plan and the change to the project design are in accordance with paragraphs 238 and 239 – permanent change to the registered monitoring plan – and paragraph 241 (a) – change to the project design – of PS for project activities – version 2.0, respectively.

Both changes are in line with paragraph 1(b) and (c), respectively, of the Appendix of PS for project activities – version 2.0, as the proposed permanent change to the registered monitoring plan has no material impact on the applicability of the applied methodology or the other applied methodological regulatory documents, or the accuracy and completeness of the monitoring; and the change to the project design has no impact to the applicability and application of the applied methodology and has no impact to the additionality and scale of the project activity.

Regarding the permanent change to the registered monitoring plan, the validation team can confirm that it is in accordance with paragraphs 296 - 299 of VVS for project activities – version 2.0.

Moreover, regarding the change to the project design, according to paragraphs 309 and 310 of VVS for project activities – version 2.0, the validation team can confirm that:

- the decision to change the configuration of the plant occurred after the project has been registered;
- the ER estimation was not changed as no ERs will be claimed for the electricity generated by the biogas generator;
- the change has no impact to the applicability and application of the applied methodology;
- the change has no impact to the project boundary and associated leakages;
- the monitoring plan is in compliance with the applied methodology and tools;
- the change has no impact to the level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring of the project activity;
- the change has no impact to the additionality of the project activity;
- the change has no impact to the scale of the project activity.

In addition, no findings of previous verification and certification reports had any relationship with the present change to the project design.

In accordance with paragraph 246 of PS for project activities – version 02.0 and also in accordance of paragraph 130 of PCP for project activities – version 02.0, the PRCs are being requested under issuance track as per PP's discretion.

The new version of the PDD accurately and clearly reflects the proposed changes.

Appendix 1. Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Full texts
ACM	Approved Consolidated Methodology
BE	Baseline Emissions
BM	Build Margin
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CH ₄	Methane
CL	Clarification Request
CM	Combined Margin
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
CO ₂ e	Carbon dioxide equivalent
CP	Crediting Period
CRA	Conestoga Rovers e Associados Engenharia Ltda.
DNA	Designated National Authority
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
EB	Executive Board
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EPE	Energy Research Company of the Ministry of Mines and Energy – Brazil
ESPL	Earthood Services Private Limited
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Green House Gas
GSC/GSP	Global Stakeholder Consultation Process
IPAAM	Institute of Environmental Protection of the State of Amazonas
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LE	Leakage Emissions
LFG	Landfill gas
KP	Kyoto Protocol
LoA	Letter of Approval/Authorization
MP	Monitoring Plan
OM	Operating Margin
PA	Project Activity
PCP	Project Cycle Procedure
PDD	Project Design Document
PE	Project Emissions
PP	Project Participant
PS	Project Standard
SEMMAS	Secretary of the Environment and Sustainability of the City of Manaus
SEMULSP	Department of Urban Cleaning Service of the City of Manaus
tCO ₂ e	Tonnes of Carbon di oxide equivalent
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VT	Verification Team
VVS	Validation and Verification Standard

Appendix 2. Competence of team members and technical reviewers

Competence Statement			
Name	Sergio Bonanno Cruz		
Country	Brazil		
Education	Post Graduate Diploma in Environment		
Experience	25 Years		
Field	Environmental Law, CDM, Energy, Climate Change		
Approved Roles			
Team Leader	Yes		
Validator	Yes		
Verifier	Yes		
Methodology Expert	ACM0001, ACM0002, AM0026, ACM0006, AMS-I.D		
Local expert	Brazil, Chile		
Financial Expert	Yes		
Technical Reviewer	No		
TA Expert	1.2, 13.1		
Reviewed by	Shreya Garg	Date	04/06/2019
Approved by	Anshika Gupta	Date	04/06/2019

Competence Statement			
Name	Ashok Gautam		
Country	India		
Education	M. Sc. (Environmental Sciences) M. Tech. (Energy & Environmental Management)		
Experience	16 Years +		
Field	Energy, Climate Change & Environment		
Approved Roles			
Team Leader	Yes		
Validator	Yes		
Verifier	Yes		
Methodology Expert	AMS-I.D, AMS-I.A, AMS-I.C, AMS-I.E, AMS-II.D, AMS-II.G, AMS-III.E, AMS-III.H, AMS-III.Q, AMS-III.Z, AMS-III.AV, AM0029, AM0025, AM0056, ACM0001, ACM0002, ACM0004, ACM0012, ACM0006, AM0018, ACM0009, AM0034, AMS.I.B		
Local expert	India		
Financial Expert	Yes		
Technical Reviewer	Yes		
TA Expert	1.1, 1.2, 3.1, 13.1		
Reviewed by	Shreya Garg	Date	25/01/2019
Approved by	Anshika Gupta	Date	25/01/2019

Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced

No.	Author	Title	References to the document	Provider
1.	UNFCCC	Standard: CDM PS for project activities	version 02.0	Others
2.	UNFCCC	Standard: CDM PCP for project activities	version 02.0	Others
3.	UNFCCC	Standard: CDM VVS for project activities	version 02.0	Others
4.	UNFCCC	Form: CDM-PDD-FORM	version 11.0	Others
5.	PP	Monitoring Report (draft)	version 1 – 08/10/2019	PP
6.	PP	Monitoring Report (revised)	version 2 – 21/02/2020 version 4 – 20/03/2020 version 5 – 26/03/2020 version 6 – 02/04/2020 version 7 – 03/04/2020 version 8 – 15/04/2020 version 9 – 24/04/2020 version 10 – 12/05/2020	PP
7.	PP	Monitoring Report (final)	version 11 – 08/07/2020	PP
8.	PP	ER Spreadsheet (draft)	version 1	PP
9.	PP	ER Spreadsheet (revised)	version 2 version 3 version 5	PP
10.	PP	ER Spreadsheet (final)	version 6	PP
11.	PP	Raw data Spreadsheets	Feb / Mar / Apr / May / Jun / Jul / Aug / Sep 2019	PP
12.	PP	Monthly hourly templates spreadsheets	Feb / Mar / Apr / May / Jun / Jul / Aug / Sep 2019	PP
13.	PP	Registered PDD	version 03.1 – 02/07/2018	Others
14.	PP	Revised PDD (draft)	version 4 – 15/04/2020	PP
15.	PP	Revised PDD (final)	version 5 – 12/05/2020	PP
16.	PP	<u>Additionality Analysis</u> Manaus landfill Investment analysis_biogas generator	Ref. 20b	PP
17.	UNFCCC	<u>Methodology</u> ACM0001 – Flaring or use of landfill gas	version 18.0	Others
18.	UNFCCC	<u>Methodological tools</u> - TOOL02 – Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality	version 06.0	Others
		- TOOL03 – Tool to calculate project or leakage CO ₂	version 02.0	

		emissions from fossil fuel combustion		
		- TOOL04 – Emissions from solid waste disposal sites	version 08.0	
		- TOOL05 – Baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption and monitoring of electricity generation	version 02.0	
		- TOOL06 – Project emissions from flaring	version 02.0.0	
		- TOOL08 – Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream	version 03.0	
		- TOOL09 – Determining the baseline efficiency of thermal or electric energy generation systems	version 02.0	
		- TOOL12 – Project and leakage emissions from transportation of freight	version 01.1.0	
19.	IPAAM IPAAM	<u>License:</u> - Operation License # 228/14-02 – valid for 01 year - Protocol for renewal of the Operation License – Process # 1832/14/V2	16/01/2018 27/07/2018 and 05/02/2019	PP
20.	CHP Brasil	<u>Manual:</u> - Operation and Maintenance – Biogas Group Generator CHP300	Oct/2018	PP
21.	PP	Maintenance activities report of the LFG system	2019	PP
22.	Amazonas Energia	<u>Invoices:</u> Electricity	2019	PP
23.	-	DNA of Brazil	mctic.gov.br	Other
24.	-	Brazilian Institute for the Environment	http://www.ibama.gov.br/	Other
25.	-	Institute of Environmental Protection of the State of Amazonas	http://www.ipaam.am.gov.br/	Other
26.	-	IPCC publications	www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp	Other
27.	-	UNFCCC	http://cdm.unfccc.int	Other

Appendix 4. Clarification requests, corrective action requests and forward action requests

Table 1. CLs from this validation

Not applicable.

Table 2. CARs from this validation

CAR ID	01	Section no.	D.6; D.7	Date:	07/11/2019
Description of CAR					

<p><i>It was verified during the site visit that a biogas generator of 170 kW was installed on 26/05/2019, for the self-consumption of electricity of the biogas plant and landfill.</i></p> <p><i>Nevertheless, the equipment is not in accordance with the description of the generator groups that are to be installed in the project activity on 2022, neither the date of installation.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, it was verified that there is no monitoring of the biogas that is being used by the group generator, neither the electricity generation is being monitored as per the approved monitoring plan.</i></p>	
Project participant response	Date: 21/02/2020
The information about the generator was introduced in the MR version 2.	
Documentation provided by project participant	
MR – v. 2	
DOE assessment	Date: 05/03/2020
<p>The information about the biogas generator is not complete at the MR and no procedures have been proposed regarding this change of the project activity.</p> <p>Therefore, the CAR remains open.</p>	
Project participant response #2	Date: 20/03/2020
The information was introduced in the MR V.4.	
Documentation provided by project participant	
MR – v. 4	
DOE assessment #2	Date: 26/03/2020
<p>The information about the biogas generator is still not complete at the MR and the procedures proposed regarding this change of the project activity are not clear, neither the types of the proposed PRCs.</p> <p>Therefore, the CAR remains open.</p>	
Project participant response #3	Date: 31/03/2020
New information was introduced in the MR V.5	
Documentation provided by project participant	
MR – v. 5	
DOE assessment #3	Date: 02/04/2020 02/05/2020
<p>The information about the installation of the biogas generator is now complete at the MR and procedures being proposed on a PRC are described in the MR and revised PDD.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the change to project design has not been correctly classified, neither an additionality reassessment has been presented.</p>	
Project participant response #4	Date: 12/05/2020
The change was revised and a new additionality assessment was presented.	
Documentation provided by project participant	
MR – v. 10; PDD – v. 5	
DOE assessment #4	Date: 12/05/2020
The PRC has been revised and a new additionality assessment was performed and shows that the project activity is additional with the increase in the installed capacity.	

Table 3. FARs from this validation

Not applicable.

- - - -

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
03.0	31 May 2019	Revision to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensure consistency with version 02.0 of the “CDM validation and verification standard for project activities” (CDM-EB93-A05-STAN);• Make editorial improvements.
02.0	31 October 2017	Revision to align with the requirements in the “CDM validation and verification standard for project activities” (version 01.0).
01.0	23 March 2015	Initial publication.
Decision Class: Regulatory Document Type: Form Business Function: Registration Keywords: post-registration change, project activities, validation report		