



**Verification and certification report form for
CDM project activities
(Version 02.1)**

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	Chumporn applied biogas technology for advanced waste water management UNFCCC Ref No: 2148 TN Ref. No: MY-PVer 16/22 – 16/158
Version number of the verification and certification report	1.0
Completion date of the verification and certification report	17/10/2018
Monitoring period number and duration of this monitoring period	Monitoring Period: 2 Duration of MP: 01/09/2010 to 30/09/2011 (both dates inclusive) (including both days)
Version number of the monitoring report to which this report applies	5.0
Crediting period of the project activity corresponding to this monitoring period	1 st renewable credit period (7 years) 09/02/2009 to 08/02/2019 (includes both days)
Project participants	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH, Eschborn, Germany Chumporn Palm Oil Industry Public Company Limited, Bangkok, Thailand
Host Party	The Kingdom of Thailand
Applied methodologies and standardized baselines	AM0013: Avoided methane emissions from organic waste-water treatment Version 4.0
Mandatory sectoral scopes linked to the applied methodologies	Scope: 13 / Technical Area: 13.1
Conditional sectoral scope(s) linked to the applied methodologies	N/A
Estimated amount of GHG emission reductions or GHG removals for this monitoring duration in the registered PDD	30,445 t CO _{2e}
Certified amount of GHG emission reductions or GHG removals for this monitoring period	39,819 t CO _{2e}
Name and UNFCCC reference number of the DOE	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH; E-0022

**Name, position and signature of the
approver of the verification and
certification report**



Rainer Winter

Final Approver

SECTION A. Executive summary

Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH has commissioned the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program to carry out this periodic verification of the project:

“Chumporn applied biogas technology for advanced waste water management”

with regard to the relevant requirements for CDM project activities.

This verification covers the period as indicated on the title page.

The project reduces GHG emissions due to a wastewater treatment facility using anaerobic tank digesters to capture methane for combustion at the boilers to generate heat for the palm oil mill and refinery processes. Excess gas produced is combusted in an open flare system.

Details of the project location are given in table A-1 below:

Table A-1: Project Location

No.	Project Location
Host Country	Kingdom of Thailand
Region:	Chumporn
Project location address:	296, Moo 2 Phetchkasem Road, Tambol Salui, Ampur Tasae
Latitude:	10° 50' 38.98" N
Longitude:	99° 13' 2.55" E

Basic technical details of the project are summarized in table A-2.

Table - A-2: Technical data of the project activity

Parameter	Unit	Value
CSTR & UASB Reactors	4	Total Capacity 6,000 m ³
Steam Boilers	2	Medium / high pressure boiler (60-90 bar, boiler type NUK-HP 930
Dual-fuel burner	2	Type RGMS7/1-D ZMD, DN50 Weishaupt
Low pressure boiler	2	30 bar, AWG Series II dual-fuel burner from Hamworthy (AWG 15)
High Pressure Boilers	2	60-90 bar, boiler type NUK-HP 930 from GekaKonus GmbH
Open Flare	1	Flowrate 900Nm ³ /h

As a result of this verification, the verifier confirms that:

- all operations of the project are implemented and installed as planned and described in the validated project design document.
- the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied approved CDM methodology,
- the installed equipment essential for measuring parameters required for calculating emission reductions are calibrated appropriately.
- the monitoring system is in place and functional. The project has generated GHG emission reductions.

As the result of this periodic verification, the verifier confirms that the GHG emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements in a conservative and appropriate manner.

SECTION B. Verification team, technical reviewer and approver**B.1. Verification 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 / Verifier / Technical Expert	EI	Cheong	Chun Yuen (Robert)	TÜV NORD Malaysia	x	x	x	x

B.2. Technical reviewer and approver of the verification and certification report

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	EI	Lubanga	David	-
2.	Approver	IR	Winter	Rainer	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH

SECTION C. Application of materiality**C.1. Consideration of materiality in planning the verification**

In order to ensure a complete, transparent and timely execution of the verification task the team leader has planned the complete sequence of events necessary to arrive at a substantiated final verification opinion.

Various tools have been established in order to ensure an effective verification planning.

Materiality Threshold

The verification is based on the materiality threshold identified in table C-1 below:

Table C-1: Applied Materiality Threshold

	Threshold	Related to
<input type="checkbox"/>	0.5 %	Emission reductions or removals for registered CDM project activities achieving a total emission reduction or removal equal to or more than 500,000 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent per year ¹ ;
<input type="checkbox"/>	1 %	Emission reductions or removals for registered CDM project activities achieving a total emission reduction or removal of between 300,000 and 500,000 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent per year;
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 %	Emission reductions or removals for registered large-scale CDM project activities achieving a total emission reduction or removal of 300,000 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent per year or less;

¹ A year refers to a period of 12 consecutive months.

	Threshold	Related to
<input type="checkbox"/>	5 %	Emission reductions or removals for registered small-scale CDM project activities other than registered CDM project activities covered under next category below;
<input type="checkbox"/>	10 %	Emission reductions or removals for the type of registered CDM project activities referred to in decision 3/CMP.6, paragraph 38 (referred to as microscale project activities).

Strategic Analysis

At the beginning of the verification the verification team leader has assessed the nature, scale and complexity of the verification tasks by carrying out a strategic analysis of all activities relevant to the project activity. The team leader has collected and reviewed the information relevant to assess that the designated verification team is sufficiently competent to carry out the verification and to ensure that it is able to conduct the necessary risk analysis.

Risk analysis and detailed audit testing planning

For the identification and assessment of potential reporting risks and to determine the necessary detailed audit testing procedures for residual risk areas the following table is used.

No.	Risk that could lead to material errors, omissions or misstatements	Assessment of the risk		Response to the risk in the verification plan and/or sampling plan
		Risk level	Justification	
1.	Delay in calibration	High	Monitoring instruments calibration due date was not follow	The instrument list should be reviewed regularly to avoid future delay in calibration.
2.	Calibration error	High	Due to overlook of the calibration results.	Calibration reports shall be reviewed to verify for any error reported.
3.	Transfer of data to ER spreadsheet and MR	Low	Human error during transfer of data for ER calculations	Thorough cross-check required on the transfer of data to the ER spreadsheet and MR.

On the basis of the risk analysis the verification has been planned. A detailed audit/verification plan has been prepared and submitted to the project participant(s) in due time before the onsite inspection.

C.2. Consideration of materiality in conducting the verification

Based on the verification planning the verification has been carried out. The concept of materiality has been considered. A breakdown of the chosen approaches is included in the following table.

<i>Parameter</i>	<i>Approach*</i>	<i>Errors* detected</i>	<i>Findings reference</i>	<i>Correc- ted</i>	<i>Remaining verification risk</i>			
T2	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.8-02	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
F _{Dig,in}	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.7-01	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
F _{Dig,out}	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-06	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
COD _{c, baseline}	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-07	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
COD _{a,in}	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-08	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
COD _{a,out}	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-08	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
T _{Ing}	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
D _{Ing}	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
HG _{BL}	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
COD _{c,dig_out}	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
EL _{P,y}	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
F _{la}	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.7-03	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
COD _{la}	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
F _{c,dw}	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
COD _{c,dw}	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
FR _{BIO}	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.7-04	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
P _{CH4,bio}	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-15	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
T _{comb,f}	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-17	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
PE _{flare,y}	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-18	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
FR _{e,inlet}	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-16 CAR E.7-05	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
FR _{e,s}	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
P _{CH4,e,s}	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.8-03	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
T _{comb,e}	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
Sa	CDC	<input type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
NC	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20 CL E.8-01	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
EG _y	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
NCV_BG	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.8-04	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
T _{FI}	CDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.8-05	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not material			
Aggregate					Materiality threshold not exceeded			
*) incl. omissions and misstatements								
*) <u>Verification Approaches:</u>								
CDC:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Complete data check of data including all data aggregation steps						
NDC:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Non-complete data check – omissions not material						

SPL:	Sampling approach (all data available)
ASP:	Acceptance Sampling
COM:	Data check at higher data aggregation levels and sampling at original data levels

The verification was basically carried out as per the verification plan. However, based on the actual situation on-site and the errors, omissions and misstatements identified during the verification minor deviations from the original plan occurred. However, due to the insignificance no major revision of the overall plan was required.

SECTION D. Means of verification

D.1. Desk/document review

During the desk review all documents initially provided by the client and publicly available documents relevant for the verification were reviewed. The main documents are listed below:

- the last revision of the PDD including the monitoring plan^{/PDD1toPDD3/},
- the last revision of the validation report^{/VAL/},
- documentation of previous verifications^{/VER/}
- the monitoring report, including the claimed emission reductions for the project^{/MR/},
- the emission reduction calculation spreadsheet^{/ER/}.

Other supporting documents, such as publicly available information on the UNFCCC website and background information were also reviewed.

D.2. On-site inspection

Duration of on-site inspection: 05/01/2017 to 06/01/2017				
No.	Activity performed on-site	Site location	Date	Team member
1.	Opening Meeting, Plant Inspection, MR review, calibrations records	Chumporn	05/01/2017	Cheong, Chun Yuen (Robert)
2	Generation records, ER, document review, Reporting & closing meeting		06/01/2017	

D.3. Interviews

No.	Interviewee			Date	Subject	Team member
	Last name	First name	Affiliation			
1.	Sommart	Kritsana	Chumporn Palm Industry / Engineering Manager /IM01/	05/01/2017 06/01/2017	Site Inspection, Calibration reports, Review of MR, ER calculation, Raw Data in server, Secondary data in ER spreadsheet, Downtime / Operation records, data archiving	Cheong, Chun Yuen (Robert)
2	Chantaramanee	Somchay	Chumporn Palm Industry / Production Manager /IM01/			
3	Sawassri	Yada	Chumporn Palm Industry / QA Manager /IM01/			
4	Eangmee	Urai	Chumporn			

No.	Interviewee			Date	Subject	Team member
	Last name	First name	Affiliation			
			Palm Industry / Admin Power Plant /IM01/			
5	Punikom	Wilaiwan	Chumporn Palm Industry / QC Power Plant /IM01/			
6	Dechdee	Phattanasak	Chumporn Palm Industry / Engineer Power Plant /IM01/			
7	Posaei	Pirot	Chumporn Palm Industry / Biogas Section Head /IM01/			
8	Saengaroon	Chusak	Chumporn Palm Industry / Instrument Section Head /IM01/			
9	Na Lamphun	Bundit	GIZ / Consultant /IM02/			
10	Kossmann	Werner	GIZ / Consultant /IM02/			

D.4. Sampling approach

D.4.1 Sampling during monitoring

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No sampling approach has been used by the PP to determine the monitored parameters				
<input type="checkbox"/>	A sampling approach has been taken for the following monitored parameter(s):				
	Parameter	Sampling approach ¹⁾	Sampling Type ²⁾	Population	Sample Size

¹⁾ Sampling Approaches:

SiRS: Simple Random Sampling
 StRS: Stratified Random Sampling
 SS: Systematic Sampling
 CS: Cluster Sampling
 MSS: Multi-stage Sampling
 AS: Acceptance Sampling

²⁾ Sampling Types:

PS: Parameter Sampling

D.4.2 Sampling approaches during verification

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No sampling approach has been used by the VT to verify the monitored parameters				
<input type="checkbox"/>	A sampling approach has been applied by the VT for the following monitored parameter(s):				
	Parameter	Sampling approach ¹⁾	Sampling Type ²⁾	Population	Sample Size

¹⁾ Sampling Approaches:

SiRS: Simple Random Sampling
 StRS: Stratified Random Sampling
 SS: Systematic Sampling
 CS: Cluster Sampling
 MSS: Multi-stage Sampling

²⁾ Sampling Types:

AS: Acceptance Sampling
 PS: Parameter Sampling
 COM: Full data check at higher data aggregation levels and sampling at original data levels

During the on-site verification, no sampling approach has been used by the verification team to verify the reported values for the monitored parameters as listed in section D.2 of the MR. All electricity data listed in the ER spreadsheet were 100% checked and reviewed against the submitted electricity protocol and cross-checked with the sales invoices

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

Areas of verification findings	No. of CL	No. of CAR	No. of FAR
Compliance of the monitoring report with the monitoring report form (E.1)	0	2	0
Compliance of the project implementation with the registered PDD (E.3)	0	5	0
Post-registration changes (E.4)	0	0	0
Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology including applicable tool and standardized baseline (E.5)	0	0	0
Compliance of monitoring activities with the registered monitoring plan (E.6)	0	20	0
Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments (E.7)	0	4	0
Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions or net removals (E.8)	1	12	0
Assessment of reported sustainable development co-benefits (E.9)	0	0	0
Global stakeholder consultation (E.10)	0	0	0

Others (please specify)	0	0	0
Total	1	43	0

SECTION E. Verification findings

E.1. Compliance of the monitoring report with the monitoring report form

Means of verification	<p>A draft monitoring report was submitted to the verification team by the project participants. The DOE has made this report publicly available prior to the start of the verification activities. No comments were received.</p> <p>By means of the UNFCCC website it has been checked whether the latest applicable MR template CDM-MR-FORM has been used.</p> <p>Further it has been checked whether the latest instructions for filling out the MR template have been followed. Every section has been checked against the respective guidance.</p> <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /MR/ • /MRT/ • /unfccc/ 	
Findings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The latest reporting template CDM-MR-FORM as listed on the UNFCCC website has been used for the Monitoring Report to be uploaded.</p>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The latest instructions for filling out the MR have been followed. No adverse finding has been identified in the course of this verification.</p>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The respective requirements have widely been complied with; however; the following issues needed to be addressed in this context:</p>
		<p>CAR E.1-01</p>
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>No CARs/CLs have been raised in this context. No correction was required in the context. The project is in line with the respective requirements.</p>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The raised CARs/CLs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.</p>
		<p>The verification team has checked all sections of the MR and confirms by means of comparing the MR that has been used with the standardized MR template.</p> <p>With the correction, it could be concluded the MR is completed according to the MR template requirements</p>

E.2. Remaining forward action requests from validation and/or previous verifications

During the validation the validating DOE might have raised issues that could not be closed or resolved during the validation stage. For this purpose FARs might have been raised. Likewise FARs might have been raised in the course of previous verifications.

In the course of this verification the latest version of the PDD ^{/PDD/} and the previous verification report ^{/VER/}, where applicable, have been checked in order to identify any remaining forward action requests. For the current monitoring period the following applies:

(i) Open issues from validation:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	There were no open issues which have been addressed in the latest version of the validation report.
<input type="checkbox"/>	All open issues from the validation have been appropriately addressed in the context of previous verifications.
<input type="checkbox"/>	All issues related to the validation have been appropriately addressed in the course of the current monitoring period (for details please refer to appendix 4)
	The following issues related to the validation have not yet been appropriately addressed (for details please refer to appendix 4):

<input type="checkbox"/>	- N/A
--------------------------	-------

(ii) Open issues from previous verifications:

<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A – as this is the first monitoring period for this CDM project activity.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	There were no open issues which have been addressed in the previous verification report
<input type="checkbox"/>	All issues related to the previous verification have been appropriately addressed in the course of the current monitoring period (for details please refer to appendix 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	The following issues related to the previous verification have not yet been appropriately addressed (for details please refer to appendix 4):
	- N/A

E.3. Compliance of the project implementation and operation with the registered project design document

Means of verification	<p>By means of an in-depth review of the PDD in its latest form – as downloaded from the UNFCCC project site - and the checks carried out during the on-site visit an assessment has been carried out whether the project has been implemented and operated in line with the latest approved version of the PDD and whether all physical features of the project are in place. The following has been checked: implemented technology, project equipment as well as monitoring and metering equipment.</p> <p>Further it has been checked if relevant technical equipment of the project activity has been exchanged or modified during the monitoring period and consistent notations of key equipment (meters etc.) in PDD, MR and calculation spreadsheet are applied.</p> <p>Interviews with operational personnel have been carried out, QMS records, maintenance records, instrument specifications were checked in this context.</p> <p>Special focus has further been laid to determine whether a potential phase wise implementation has occurred within the crediting period or any delays with respect to the starting dates have occurred.</p> <p>Further it has been checked whether any observed deviations from the registered project design have been correctly addressed as PRCs.</p> <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /PDD1-PDD3/ • /MR/ • /VVS/ • /ER/ • /unfccc/ 	
Findings	<input type="checkbox"/>	The project has been implemented as described in the latest version of the PDD as well as in section B.1 of the monitoring report. No deviations thereof have been identified in the course of this verification.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The following deviations from the registered / approved project design and or the project description in the MR have been identified in the course of this verification (for further details please refer to section E.4): - N/A
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following CARs, CLs have been raised: Refer CAR E.3-01, CAR E.3-02, CAR E.3-03, CAR E.3-04 and CAR E.3-05.
		<i>In case of phased implementation:</i>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A

	<input type="checkbox"/>	The phased implementation has correctly and in sufficient detail been described in the latest version of the PDD.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The description in section B.1 of the MR differs in content or the level of detail from the latest version of the PDD. However, the description in the MR is correct and reflects the situation during the site inspection.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The project description in the PDD/MR is not deemed sufficient. The detailed implementation timeline is as follows: N/A or add as appropriate
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs have been raised in this context. No correction was required in the context. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.
	Where corrections were required a revised MR was prepared by the PPs and presented to the verification team. All raised issues were addressed appropriately so that it can be confirmed that the project is implemented and operated in line with the approved revised PDD and the applied methodology	

E.4. Post-registration changes

E.4.1. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies or applied standardized baselines

It has been checked whether Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan (TDfrMP) or Temporary deviations from monitoring methodology or standardized baseline (TDfMM) have been applied during this monitoring period. The result is summarized in the table below.

<input type="checkbox"/>	No Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan (TDfrMP) or Temporary deviations from monitoring methodology or standardized baseline (TDfMM) have been submitted to the UNFCCC prior to the current monitoring period.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The following TDfrMP or TDfMM have been approved or are under approval by the UNFCCC		
	1	Title	Sampling frequency for COD analysis
		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> approved (approval No.: PRC-2148-001)
		Appr.date	28/12/2014
		Ref. No.	PRC-2148-001
	2	Title	Measuring frequency of depth of lagoons
		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> approved (approval No.: PRC-2148-001)
		Appr.date	28/12/2014
		Ref.No.	PRC-2148-001
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	During the verification of the current MP no need for a TDfrMP or TDfMM has been identified. The monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the PA		
<input type="checkbox"/>	An approval of the following TDfrMP or TDfMM is to be requested from the EB for the current MP as appendix 1 of the project standard does not apply. Please refer to the related PRC report submitted along with this issuance request for further details w.r.t. the assessment of the PRC.		
	1	Issue:	
	2	Issue:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	The following TDfrMP or TDfMM for which appendix 1 of the PS is applicable have been applied:		
	1	Issue:	

	2	Issue:	
--	---	--------	--

E.4.2. Corrections

It has been checked whether any corrections to project information or parameters fixed at validation have been approved during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report. The result is summarized in the table below.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	During the verification of the current MP no need for corrections has been identified.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The following corrections have been applied:		
1	Issue:	Change in PP's name from GTZ to GIZ	
2	Issue:	Improvements in technology description	
3	Issue:	Corrections in baseline and project emissions	
4	Issue:	Editorial corrections	
	The PDD has been revised accordingly: (New) version No.: 10 Revision date: 20/11/2014		
	It is confirmed that the updated / corrected information is an accurate reflection of the actual project information and that the corrected parameters are in accordance with the applied methodology and the monitoring plan.		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A related post registration change has been submitted prior to the issuance request. The approval has been received on 01/12/2018 via approval number PRC-2148-002. <input type="checkbox"/> A related post registration change is submitted along with this issuance request. Please refer to the related PRC report submitted along with this issuance request for further details w.r.t. the assessment of the PRC.		

E.4.3. Change to the start date of the crediting period of the project activity

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A - as this is not the first verification within the crediting period
<input type="checkbox"/>	The PPs do not intend to change the start date of the crediting period.
<input type="checkbox"/>	As the change in the start date was below the related time period as indicated in PS § 234 and § 235 no prior approval was required but only a notification. This notification has been submitted by the PP without involvement of the DOE. The change and new start date has been checked from the related UNFCCC project webpage.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The PPs intend to change the start date of the crediting period. As the intended change in start date beyond the related time period as indicated in PS § 236 and as per §237 prior approval by the Board is required. For detailed assessment of the change please refer to related PRC validation report. As per assessment in this report the DOE confirms that the change to the start date of the crediting period are in line with the related requirements of the VVS and PS.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The approval to change the start date of the crediting period has been received on DD/MM/YYYY via approval number PRC-XXXX-00Z

E.4.4. Inclusion of a monitoring plan

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A - as this monitoring plan was part of the registered PDD
<input type="checkbox"/>	In line with PS § 238 and §78 the PP has forwarded a monitoring plan to the DOE for validation. No prior approval of the monitoring plan was required as the PP in line with PS § 78 wished to submit the monitoring plan together with the request for issuance for the first monitoring period. Please refer to the related PRC report submitted along with this issuance request for further details w.r.t. the assessment of the PRC.

<input type="checkbox"/>	In line with PS § 238 and §78 the PP submitted a monitoring plan prior to the submission of the request for issuance for validation to the DOE. A DOE has assessed the monitoring plan in line with related VVS requirements and submitted a related PRC report for prior approval. The approval has been received on DD/MM/YYYY via approval number PRC-XXXX-00Z.
--------------------------	--

E.4.5. Permanent changes from registered monitoring plan, or permanent deviation of monitoring from the applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other applied standards or tools

It has been checked whether any permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan (PCfrMP) or applied methodologies (PCfMM) including standardized baselines (PCfSB) have been approved prior or during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report. The result is summarized in the table below.

<input type="checkbox"/>	No PCfrMP, PCfMM or PCfSB have been submitted to the UNFCCC prior to the current monitoring period		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The following PCfrMP, PCfMM or PCfSB have been approved or are under approval by the UNFCCC		
	1	Title	Flow rate and organic concentration of wastewater into digester (ID-1 and ID-2) are measured after the distribution tank instead of before the distribution tank as mentioned in the registered PDD.
		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> approved
		Appr.date	28/12/2014
		Ref. No.	PRC-2148-001
	2	Title	Inclusion of monitoring parameters related to sludge treatment
		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> approved
		Appr.date	28/12/2014
		Ref.No.	PRC-2148-001
	3	Title	The diagram was simplified and therefore not all monitoring points, such as monitoring points related to land application
		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> approved
		Appr.date	28/12/2014
		Ref.No.	PRC-2148-001
	4	Title	Permanent changes have been made to the registered monitoring plan with reference to the following monitoring parameters and the same have been incorporated in section B.7.1 of the revised PDD version 10.0
		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> approved
		Appr.date	28/12/2014
		Ref.No.	PRC-2148-001
	5	Title	Revision for the measurement of the outflow organic wastewater is required
		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> approved
		Appr.date	01/02/2018
		Ref.No.	PRC-2148-002
<input type="checkbox"/>	During the verification of the current MP no need for a PCfrMP, PCfMM or PCfSB has been identified. The monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the PA		
<input type="checkbox"/>	An approval of the following PCfrMP, PCfMM or PCfSB is to be requested from the EB for the current MP as appendix 1 of the project standard does not apply.		
	1	Issue:	

	2	Issue:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	The following PCfrMP, PCfMM or PCfSB for which appendix 1 of the PS is applicable have been applied:		
	1	Issue:	
	2	Issue:	

E.4.6. Changes to the project design

It has been checked whether any changes to the project design (CoPD) have been approved prior or during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report. The result is summarized in the table below.

<input type="checkbox"/>	No CoPD has been submitted to the UNFCCC prior to the current monitoring period		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The following CoPD have been approved or are under approval by the UNFCCC		
	1	Title	Wastewater intake to the project system
		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> approved
		Appr.date	28/12/2014
		Ref. No.	PRC-2148-001
	2	Title	Utilisation of biogas
		Status	<input type="checkbox"/> under approval; <input type="checkbox"/> approved
		Appr.date	28/12/2014
Ref.No.		PRC-2148-001	
<input type="checkbox"/>	During the verification of the current MP no need for a CoPD has been identified. The monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the PA		
<input type="checkbox"/>	An approval of the following CoPD is to be requested from the EB for the current MP as appendix 1 of the project standard does not apply.		
	1	Issue:	
	2	Issue:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	The following CoPD for which appendix 1 of the PS is applicable have been applied:		
	1	Issue:	
	2	Issue:	

E.4.7. Changes specific to afforestation and reforestation project activities

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A - as this is no A/R project activity
-------------------------------------	--

E.5. Compliance of the registered monitoring plan with the methodology including applicable tools and standardized baselines

Means of verification	By means of comparison of the MR with <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the applied CDM methodology (ii) all applicable CDM Meth tools and (iii) if applicable, a standardized baseline The verification team has checked whether the MP is in compliance with the MP related requirements of the applied methodology/tools/SB.
------------------------------	---

	<p>The monitoring report and emissions reduction calculations are in line with the requirements of the approved revised PDD version 12.0 monitoring plan as well as with the applied methodology AM0013 version 04.0.</p> <p>The reporting procedures reflect the requirements of the approved revised monitoring plan. The methane is captured and combusted in the boilers to generate heat for the palm oil mill and refinery were recorded continuous and consolidated once every month. Flaring is only necessary when there is a shutdown of the palm oil mill and refinery</p> <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /MR/ • /PDD3/ • /AM13/ • /ACM2/ • /TL/ • /unfccc/ 			
Findings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The MP is completely in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the CDM project (last registered/approved version of the PDD)		
		The breakdown of MP accordance of the referenced tools is as follows:		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	Title (of the tool)	Thai grid emissions factor is based on the Approved Consolidated Methodology ACM0002
			Version	6.0
			MP compliance	<input type="checkbox"/> full compliance <input type="checkbox"/> findings have been raised <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A (for MP)
		2	Title (of the tool)	Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing Methane”
			Version	version as of December 2006
			MP compliance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> full compliance <input type="checkbox"/> findings have been raised <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
	3	Title (of the tool)	Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality	
		Version	03	
MP compliance		<input type="checkbox"/> full compliance <input type="checkbox"/> findings have been raised <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A		
<input type="checkbox"/>	The breakdown of MP accordance of the applicable SB is as follows:			
	1	Title (of the SB)	Name of SB	
		Version		
<input type="checkbox"/>		MP compliance		
	In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised:			

Conclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs/FARs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.
	<p>The applied methodology and subscribed applicable tools are consistent with the versions in UNFCCC website.</p> <p>No standardised baseline established by the host country DNA</p>	

E.6. Compliance of monitoring activities with the registered monitoring plan

E.6.1. Data and parameters fixed ex ante or at renewal of crediting period

Means of verification

The verification team has checked the ex-ante parameters and data stated in Section D.1 of MR and compared with section B.6.2 of the approved revised PDD whether all parameters fixed ex-ante for the crediting period have been applied correctly

Further it has been checked whether the GWP for the respective period have been correctly applied.

The following list of ex-ante fixed parameters have been applied:

Nbr.	Parameter abbreviation	Description	Value	Unit
1	Bo	Biogas producing capacity	0.21 kg CH ₄ /kg COD	%
2	Hu_PS	Calorific value of palm shells	13.8 MJ/kg	-
3	Hu_Heavy Oil	Calorific value of heavy oil	35.1 MJ/litre (40.19 MJ/t @ 0.86 t/litre)	MJ/litre
4	GWp_CH ₄	Global warming potential of CH ₄	21	-
5	CEF _{BI, elec,y}	CO ₂ emission factor for electricity consumed at the project site in the absence of the project activity	0.523	t CO ₂ /MWh
6	D _{Ing}	Depth of lagoon	>5	m
7	F _d	Fraction of anaerobic degradation due to depth as per table 1 of AM0013	70	%
8	E	Activation energy constant	15,175	Cal/mol
9	COD _{a,in}	COD that enters the lagoon	Refer MR	kg COD/yr
10	COD _{a,out}	COD that leaves lagoon with the effluent	Refer MR	kg COD/yr
11	COD _{available}	Monthly COD available for conversion which is equal to the monthly COD entering the digester or directed to land application COD _{baseline,m} plus COD carried on from the previous month	Refer MR	kg COD/yr
12	Uncertainty conservativeness factor	Uncertainty conservativeness factor	0.89	-
13	T ₁	Temperature	303.16	Kelvin
14	R	Ideal gas constant	1,987	Cal/K mol
15	EG _y	Electricity consumption of existing waste water treatment system	0	MWh
16	CEF _{BI,therm}	CO ₂ emissions intensity for thermal energy generation	77.37	CO ₂ e/TJ
17	HG _{BI}	Quantity of [additional] thermal energy that would	11,172,825	MJ

		be consumed in year y at the project site in the absence of the project activity using fossil fuel		
18	HG _{p,y}	Quantity of thermal energy that is consumed in year y at the project site due to the project activity using fossil fuel	0	MJ
19	CEF _{Pr,therm,y}	CO ₂ emissions intensity for thermal energy generation	0	tCO ₂ e/TJ
20	EF _{N₂O}	Emission factor of nitrogen from sludge applied to land	0.016	Kg N ₂ O/ Kg N
21	COD _{dw}	Chemical Oxygen Demand in the wastewater from the dewatering process	0	kg COD/yr
<p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /MR/ • /PDD1/PDD2/PDD3/ • /AM13/ • /TL/ • /PS/ • /VVS/ • /unfccc/ 				
Findings	<input type="checkbox"/>	The MR and the ER calculation have considered the parameters fixed ex-ante or at the renewal of the crediting period correctly, no deviations have been observed.		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The following deviations from the parameters fixed ex-ante or at renewal of crediting period have been identified in the course of this verification: - N/A		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised:</p> <p>Refer CAR E.6-01. CAR E.6-02, CAR E.6-03, CAR E.6-04 and CAR E.6-05</p>		
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs/FARs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.		
	Where corrections were required a revised MR was prepared by the PPs and presented to the verification team. All raised issues were addressed appropriately. It could be concluded, the data and parameters listed in the section D.1 of MR was cross checked with the applied methodology, subscribed tools, approved revised PDDs, ER and are consistent			

E.6.2. Data and parameters monitored

Means of verification	<p>The monitoring equipment used to monitor the respective parameters stated in the MR has been checked to confirmed whether all the equipment used are consistent with the registered / approved revised PDDs. The type and specification of the equipment were checked against the specification to confirm the suitability and accuracy for measuring the respective parameters</p> <p>During the verification all relevant monitoring parameters (as listed in chapter B.7.1 of the PDD) have been verified with regard to the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) appropriateness of the applied measurement / determination method, (ii) the correctness of the values applied for ER calculation, (iii) the accuracy, and applied QA/QC measures.
------------------------------	--

	The results as well as the verification procedure are described parameter-wise in the project specific verification checklist (Appendix 5).		
Findings	CAR E.6-06, CAR E.6-07, CAR E.6-08, CAR E.6-09, CAR E.6-10, CAR E.6-11, CAR E.6-12, CAR E.6-12, CAR E.6-13, CAR E.6-14, CAR E.6-15, CAR E.6-16, CAR E.6-17, CAR E.6-18, CAR E.6-19, CAR E.6-20, CAR E.7-05, CAR E.8-11 For details please refer to appendix 5		
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs/FARs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.	
	<p>During the verification all relevant monitoring parameters (as listed in chapter B.7.1 of the approved revised PDD) have been verified with regard to the appropriateness of the applied measurement / determination method, the correctness of the values applied for ER calculation, the accuracy, and applied QA/QC measures. The results as well as the verification procedure are described parameter-wise in the project specific verification checklist.</p> <p>All records needed for monitoring are archived in line with the requirements of the monitoring plan in the approved revised PDD version 12.</p> <p>Where corrections were required a revised MR was prepared by the PPs and presented to the verification team. All raised issues were addressed appropriately. It can be confirmed that all monitoring parameters have been measured / determined without material misstatements and in line with all applicable standards and relevant requirements.</p> <p>It can be confirmed that all monitoring parameters have been measured / determined without material misstatements and in line with all applicable standards and relevant requirements.</p>		

E.6.3. Implementation of sampling plan

Means of verification	<p>The verification team has been checked whether the PPs have applied a sampling approach to determine the monitored values.</p> <p>Further it has been checked whether the PPs have correctly applied the implemented sampling plan including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) description of the implemented sampling design (ii) collected data (iii) analysis of collected data (iv) demonstration on whether the required confidence/precision has been met. <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /MR/ • /ER/ • /PDD1-PDD3/. 		
Findings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The PPs have not applied sampling approaches for the parameters monitored.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The PPs have applied sampling approaches for the following parameters monitored.	
		1	Parameter:
			Name:

		Description on how the sampling efforts and survey comply with the validated sampling plan:	
	2	Parameter:	
		Name:	
		Description on how the sampling efforts and survey comply with the validated sampling plan:	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised:	
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs/FARs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.	
	No sampling was applied to determine the monitored parameters		

E.7. Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments

Means of verification	<p>During the verification the relevant monitoring equipment has been checked whether the calibration requirements have been met; especially if the calibration frequency is in line with the requirements of the validated PDD and/or the applicable calibration standards.</p> <p>The calibration frequency of the electricity meters, flow meters, temperature transmitters, pressure transmitters and methane gas analysers were cross-checked with the approved revised PDD against the calibration reports.</p> <p>The calibration frequency, validity and calibration dates for all instruments are listed in Appendix 6. The calibration records cover the monitoring period were verified by the verification team.</p> <p>The calibration reports for all meters covering the reporting period were verified for the frequency and traceability to third party calibration laboratory.</p> <p>The results as well as the verification procedure are described equipment-wise in the project specific verification checklist (Appendix 6).</p> <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /MR/ • /ER/ • /C1 – C12/ 	
Findings	<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on the details listed in appendix 6 the verification team can confirm that all installed monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Based on the assessment and information as per appendix 6 delay(s) in calibration have been identified. The PP has applied the maximum permissible error of the instrument to the measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.</p> <p>From the related calibration certificates and emission reduction calculation the verification team confirms that the maximum permissible error has been applied in a conservative manner so that the adjusted measured values due to the delayed calibration result in fewer claimed emission reductions.</p> <p>For details please refer to appendix 6</p>

Conclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised:
		CAR E.7-01, CAR E.7-02, CAR E.7-03, CAR E.7-04, CAR E.7-05
	<input type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs/FARs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.
Where corrections were required a revised MR was prepared by the PPs and presented to the verification team. All raised issues were addressed appropriately. The DOE could confirm that the measuring instruments have been duly calibrated and remained valid for this monitoring period. The monitoring and instruments diagram is in accordance with the actual situation implemented at project site		

E.8. Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions or net removals

E.8.1. Calculation of baseline GHG emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks

Means of verification	<p>According to the approved revised / registered PDD and the applied methodology the baseline emissions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lagoon baseline emissions ▪ Electricity/heat baseline emissions <p>Baseline emission is calculated in the following manner: $BE_y = BE_{lagoon,y} + BE_{heat,y}$ $BE_{lagoon,y}$:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Baseline methane emission less the physical leakage: $BE_{lagoon,theoretical,y} = 56,005 \text{ t CO}_2\text{e}$ 2. Monitored methane captured and flared/used for energy generation: $BE_{lagoon,monitored,y} = 45,087 \text{ t CO}_2\text{e}$ <p>According to the applied methodology, a comparison of the baseline methane emissions and monitored methane emissions and the lower value applied in the baseline emissions for methane.</p> <p>The project activity does involve in electricity generation and heat is generated. $BE_{heat,y} = 951 \text{ tCO}_2\text{-e}$ Therefore: $BE_y = BE_{lagoon,y} + BE_{heat,y}$ $= 45,087 + 951$ $= 46,038 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transparency: It has been checked whether the calculation of baseline emissions is fully traceable and, where used, the Excel calculation provides all calculation formulae. • Parameter consistency: It has been checked whether all internal and external parameters and data used for the calculation are applied consistently in the monitoring report and the calculation spreadsheet. • Correctness: It has been checked whether the applied formulae and methods for calculating baseline emissions are in accordance with the monitoring plan and the approved methodology. • Completeness: It has been checked whether all calculations are complete and without omissions. <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /MR/ • /ER/
-----------------------	--

Findings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The calculation of the baseline emissions was found to be fully compliant with the above stated principles.</p> <p>The calculations of baseline GHG emissions or baseline net GHG removals have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline. Any assumptions used in emission or removal calculations have been justified. Appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values, GWPs and other reference values have been correctly applied.</p> <p>No errors, miscalculations, omissions, misstatements or incomplete information has been identified.</p>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The verification team has identified mistakes in the baseline emissions calculation or the underlying calculation approaches.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised:
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CL E.8-01, CAR E.8-02, CAR E.8-03, CAR E.8-04, CAR E.8-05, CAR E.8-06, CAR E.8-07
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs/FARs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.
		<p>The calculations of baseline GHG emissions have been carried out in accordance with the equations and methods described in the approved revised monitoring plan and applied methodology.</p> <p>Any assumptions used in emission or removal calculations have been justified. Appropriate emission factor and other reference values have been correctly applied.</p> <p>Where corrections were required a revised MR and ER spreadsheet was prepared by the PPs and presented to the verification team. All raised issues were addressed appropriately. It can be confirmed that the baseline calculation is overall correct.</p>

E.8.2. Calculation of project GHG emissions or actual net GHG removals by sinks

Means of verification	<p>The project emission included in this project activity is emission from following source:</p> <p>Methane emissions from lagoons derived from further treatment of wastewater in open aerobic ponds after the digester. Therefore:</p> $PE_{\text{lagoon}} = 5,994 \text{ t CO}_2\text{e (Round up from 5,993.98)}$ <p>Physical Leakage from biodigesters derived from the leakage from the digester according to the applied methodology. Therefore:</p> $PE_{\text{leakage digester}} = 6,763 \text{ t CO}_2\text{e (Round up from 6,763.14).}$ <p>Stack emissions from the flare or energy generation due to incomplete combustion either in the flaring option or in case of biogas use for electricity and/or heat production. Therefore:</p> $PE_{\text{flare, y}} = 7,045 \text{ t CO}_2\text{e (Round up from 7,036.73)}$ $PE_{\text{stack}} = 108 \text{ t CO}_2\text{e (Round up from 107.55)}$ <p>Emissions from heat use and electricity use due to the project activity for used of grid electricity from the grid. Therefore.</p> $PE_{\text{elec}} = 119 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$ <p>Emissions from land application of sludge derived from land application treatment process of the sludge. Therefore</p> $PE_{\text{sludge}} = 0 \text{ t CO}_2\text{e}$
------------------------------	--

	<p>For this monitoring period, there is no land application for sludge. There was no sludge produced.</p> <p>Emissions from wastewater removed in the dewatering process due to the unprocess oranic matter by the digester. Therefore:</p> $PE_{\text{dewatering}} = 0 \text{ t CO}_2\text{e}$ <p>In this monitoring period, there were no dewatering has taken place in the sludge treatment as confirmed during the onsite visit.</p> <p>Therefore:</p> $PE_y = PE_{\text{lagoon}} + PE_{\text{leakage digester}} + PE_{\text{flare, y}} + PE_{\text{stack}} + PE_{\text{elec}} + PE_{\text{sludge}} + PE_{\text{dewatering}}$ $= 5,994 + 0 + 7,045 + 108 + 119 + 0 + 0$ <p>PE_y = 13,265 tCO₂e</p> <p>During the verification the calculation of project GHG emissions has been checked. In detail the following has been verified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transparency: It has been checked whether the calculation of project emissions is fully traceable and, where used, the Excel calculation provides all calculation formulae. • Parameter consistency: It has been checked whether all internal and external parameters and data used for the calculation are applied consistently in the monitoring report and the calculation spreadsheet. • Correctness: It has been checked whether the applied formulae and methods for calculating project emissions are in accordance with the monitoring plan and the approved methodology. • Completeness: It has been checked whether all calculations are complete and without omissions. <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /MR/ • /ER/ 						
Findings	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td> <p>The calculation of the project emissions was found to be fully compliant with the above stated principles.</p> <p>The calculations of project GHG emissions or actual net GHG removals have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline. Any assumptions used in emission or removal calculations have been justified. Appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values, GWPs and other reference values have been correctly applied.</p> <p>No errors, miscalculations, omissions, misstatements or incomplete information have been identified.</p> </td></tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td>The verification team has identified mistakes in the project emissions calculation or the underlying calculation approaches.</td></tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td> <p>In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised:</p> <p>CAR E.8-08, CAR E.8-12</p> </td></tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The calculation of the project emissions was found to be fully compliant with the above stated principles.</p> <p>The calculations of project GHG emissions or actual net GHG removals have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline. Any assumptions used in emission or removal calculations have been justified. Appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values, GWPs and other reference values have been correctly applied.</p> <p>No errors, miscalculations, omissions, misstatements or incomplete information have been identified.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The verification team has identified mistakes in the project emissions calculation or the underlying calculation approaches.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised:</p> <p>CAR E.8-08, CAR E.8-12</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The calculation of the project emissions was found to be fully compliant with the above stated principles.</p> <p>The calculations of project GHG emissions or actual net GHG removals have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline. Any assumptions used in emission or removal calculations have been justified. Appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values, GWPs and other reference values have been correctly applied.</p> <p>No errors, miscalculations, omissions, misstatements or incomplete information have been identified.</p>						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The verification team has identified mistakes in the project emissions calculation or the underlying calculation approaches.						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised:</p> <p>CAR E.8-08, CAR E.8-12</p>						
Conclusion	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.</td></tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td> <p>The raised CARs/CLs/FARs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.</p> <p>Where corrections where required a revised PE calculation was prepared by the PPs and presented to the verification team. All raised issues were addressed appropriately so that it can be confirmed that the baseline calculation is overall correct.</p> </td></tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The raised CARs/CLs/FARs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.</p> <p>Where corrections where required a revised PE calculation was prepared by the PPs and presented to the verification team. All raised issues were addressed appropriately so that it can be confirmed that the baseline calculation is overall correct.</p>		
<input type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The raised CARs/CLs/FARs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.</p> <p>Where corrections where required a revised PE calculation was prepared by the PPs and presented to the verification team. All raised issues were addressed appropriately so that it can be confirmed that the baseline calculation is overall correct.</p>						

E.8.3. Calculation of leakage GHG emissions

Means of verification	<p>During the verification it has been checked whether leakage emissions have to be considered and, in cases where leakage emissions have to be calculated, the respective calculation of leakage GHG emissions has been checked. In such cases the same verification principles have been considered as for the baseline and project emissions calculation. Please refer to E.8.1 and E.8.2.</p> <p>According to the approved revised PDD, there is no GHG emission caused by leakage emission of the proposed project activity</p> <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /MR/ • /ER/ 	
Findings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No leakage emissions were to be considered (LE = 0).
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The calculation of the leakage emissions was found to be fully compliant with the above stated principles (see 8.1 and 8.2).</p> <p>The calculations of leakage GHG emissions have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline. Any assumptions used in leakage emissions calculations have been justified. Where applicable, appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values, GWPs and other reference values have been correctly applied.</p> <p>No errors, miscalculations, omissions, misstatements or incomplete information have been identified.</p>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The verification team has identified mistakes in the project emissions calculation or the underlying calculation approaches.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised:
Conclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs/FARs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.
	No leakage has to be considered according to the approved revised PDD.	

E.8.4. Summary of calculation of GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks

Means of verification	<p>Section E.4 of MR demonstrates the summary of GHG emission reductions for the monitoring period and calculated according to the applied methodology.</p> <p>According to the approved revised / registered PDD, the approved baseline and monitoring methodology applied by the project is AM0013 version 4.0. The GHG emission reduction of the project is calculated as follows:</p> <p>$ER_y = BE_y - PE_y$</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>ER_y = Emissions reduction in year y (tCO₂e/y)</p> <p>BE_y = Baseline emissions in year y (tCO₂e/y)</p> <p>PE_y = Project emissions in year y (tCO₂e/y)</p> <p>The emission reduction is calculated for this monitoring period as follows:</p> <p>$ER = BE_y - PE_y$</p> <p>$= 53,084 - 13,265$</p>
------------------------------	--

	<p>= 39,819 tCO₂e</p> <p>To be conservative, the total baseline emissions for biogas extracted are rounded down as integer. Project emissions are rounded-up to the next integer.</p> <p>The verification team has checked if the MR includes a summary table of the emission reductions calculation specifying separately</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Total baseline emissions, - Total project emissions, - Total leakage, - Total emission reductions. <p>It has been assessed whether the values are correct or need to be revised as a consequence of issues identified above.</p>	
Findings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Section E.4 of the MR includes in a summary table of the emission reductions calculation.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The summary table specified the total baseline, project and leakage emissions as well as the total emission reductions separately.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The values as specified in the ER summary table are correct; no issues have been identified during the verification which requires changes in the ER calculation.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	During the verification issues with impact on the ER calculation have been identified.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised: CAR E.8-09
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs/FARs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.
		<p>Where corrections were required a revised MR and ER spreadsheet was prepared by the PPs and presented to the verification team. All raised issues were addressed appropriately.</p> <p>To conclude, from the reviewed and replication of data input to the ER calculation, it can be confirmed the data stated in the MR is overall correct</p> <p>The summary table in the MR has been filled correctly and the values are in line with the related emissions reduction spreadsheet</p>

E.8.5. Comparison of actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks with estimates in registered PDD

Means of verification	<p>The verification team has checked if the MR includes a comparison of actual values of the monitoring period with the estimations in the registered PDD.</p> <p>Section E.5 of the MR includes a comparison of the calculated actual emission reductions with the ex-ante calculated values in the approved revised PDD.</p> <p>For this monitoring period from 01/09/2010 to 30/09/2011 (both days included) the project achieved 39,819 tCO₂e of GHG emission reductions.</p> <p>The estimated ex-ante GHG emission reductions in the approved revised / registered PDD for this monitoring period are 30,445 tCO₂e.</p> <p>The verification team has checked if the MR includes a comparison of actual values of the monitoring period with the estimations in the registered PDD.</p> <p>It has further checked which of the below listed cases is applicable for the calculated ER of the current monitoring period.</p>
------------------------------	---

Findings	<input type="checkbox"/>	Case 1: The ex-ante estimated value was found to be proportionally higher than the ex-post determined value. No further action is deemed required.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Case 2: The ex-ante estimated value fits very good to the actually monitored value. No further justification is deemed required.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Case 3: The ex-ante estimated value was found to be proportionally lower than the ex-post determined value.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised: CAR E.8-10
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs/FARs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.
		Where corrections were required a revised MR and ER spreadsheet was prepared by the PPs and presented to the verification team. All raised issues were addressed appropriately. It could be concluded the ex-ante estimated value was found to be proportionally lower than the ex-post determined value.

E.8.6. Remarks on difference from estimated value in registered PDD

Means of verification	On the basis of the above comparison of actual values of the monitoring period with the estimations in the registered PDD the verification team has checked whether (in case 3) an appropriate explanation is included in the MR.	
Findings	<input type="checkbox"/>	No further justification or explanation is deemed required as actual emissions of this MP do not exceed significantly the ex-ante calculated emission reductions (applicable for case 1 and 2).
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	For case 3: The PP has provided a related justification in the MR. The reasons for the increase are as follows: 1. Increase of available COD compared to the reference period in the registered PDD (2006, by approximately 39%.) 2. The average 709,347 kgCOD/month in the revised approved PDD whilst in the monitoring period the average of 1,231,795 kgCOD/month. The average COD measured was 102 KgCOD/m ³ compared to 74.1 KgCOD/m ³ in revised approved PDD that caused an increase by 38 %.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised:
Conclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs/FARs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.
		The PP has demonstrated the reasons for higher CERs in section E.6 of MR. Therefore, the justification for the increased in ERs provided is comprehended.

E.8.7. Actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks during the first commitment period and the period from 1 January 2013 onwards

Means of verification	The verification team has checked Section E.5 of the MR and the emission reduction calculation sheet.
Findings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The MR in section E.4 includes a summary table of the ER breakdown

	a) ER before 01/01/2013 and b) ER from 01/01/2013 onwards			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The breakdown of the ERs before 01/01/2013 (during the first commitment period) and from 01/01/2013 onwards is as follows:			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The ER have completely been generated before 01/01/2013 (during the first commitment period)			
	<input type="checkbox"/> The ERs have completely been generated from 01/01/2013 onwards,			
	<input type="checkbox"/> The ERs have partly been generated before 01/01/2013 (during the first commitment period) and partly from 01/01/2013 onwards.			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The breakdown of the ERs is correct, considering the applicable guidance.			
		before 01/01/2013	from 01/01/2013	Sum
	Emission reductions [tCO_{2e}]	39,819	0	39,819
	<input type="checkbox"/> In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised:			
Conclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.			
	<input type="checkbox"/> The raised CARs/CLs/FARs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.			
The emission reductions generated for this monitoring period are from the 1st commitment period which is up to 31/12/2012				

E.9. Assessment of reported sustainable development co-benefits

Means of verification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A – as the PP has not monitored the sustainable development co-benefits of the registered CDM project activity or not requested the DOE to verify them.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The project participants have monitored the sustainable development co-benefits of the registered CDM project activity, and requested the DOE to verify them. The following sources of information have been used in this context: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /MR/ • /PDD/ • /DSD/ • /unfccc/.
Findings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A – as the PP has not monitored the sustainable development co-benefits of the registered CDM project activity or not requested the DOE to verify them.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Therefore the DOE has assessed and confirms that: (a) The monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the document for monitoring sustainable development co-benefits, if such document was developed and published on the UNFCCC CDM website in accordance with the “CDM project standard for project activities”; (b) The reported monitoring results correspond to the sustainable development co-benefits of the project activity as observed by the DOE.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised:

Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs/FARs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A – as the PP has not monitored the sustainable development co-benefits of the registered CDM project activity or not requested the DOE to verify them.

E.10. Global stakeholder consultation

Means of verification		<p>In accordance with the PCP the DOE has submitted the initial version of the monitoring report provided by the PP for this monitoring period to be published on the UNFCCC webpage.</p> <p>The monitoring report has been published for the period 08/11/2016- to 05/01/2017 (Onsite date).</p> <p>The following sources of information have been used in this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • /MR/ • /unfccc/.
Findings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No comments have been received on the published monitoring report for this monitoring period.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comments have been received and the DOE has concluded that comments are related to issues outside the CDM rules and requirements. Please refer to the list provided under Conclusion of this Section below for related information.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Comments have been received.</p> <p>The DOE has</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - requested further information from the submitters of the comments - informed the project participants of the comments received, and requested their feedback within a specified timeframe, - considered the input received and has assessed whether such comments are relevant to the CDM project activity, - acknowledged receipt of all submitted comments on the MR of the proposed CDM project activity, - assessed whether the comments are related to the CDM rules and requirements (if so related findings have been raised as per below), - used all possible means to determine the authenticity of the name and contact details of the individual or organization on whose behalf the comments have been submitted, - contacted the secretariat to make them publicly available (if only addressed to the DOE), - determined whether authentic and relevant comments in the global stakeholder consultation were taken into due account in the PDD of the proposed CDM project activity.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>In this context the following CARs, CLs, FARs have been raised, i.e. as the DOE concludes that the comments are related to the CDM rules and requirements:</p>

Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/>	No CARs/CLs/FARs have been raised in this context. No correction was required. The project is in line with the respective requirements.		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The raised CARs/CLs/FARs have been addressed appropriately. The PP has carried out the requested corrections. All respective findings could be closed out. For details please refer to Appendix 4.		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A – as the PP has not monitored the sustainable development co-benefits of the registered CDM project activity or not requested the DOE to verify them.		
	As the DOE has concluded that comments are related to issues outside the CDM rules and requirements the comments and information gathered are listed as follows:			
	Nbr.	Original comment received	Feedback by the PP	Statement by DOE
	1			
	2			
3				
4				

SECTION F. Internal quality control

Before the submission of the final verification report a technical review of the whole verification procedure was carried out. The technical reviewers are competent GHG auditors being appointed for the scope this project falls under. The technical reviewers are not considered to be part of the verification team and thus not involved in the decision making process up to the technical review.

As a result of the technical review process the verification opinion and the topic specific assessments as prepared by the verification team leader may have been confirmed or revised. Furthermore reporting improvements might have been achieved.

After the successful technical review an overall (esp. procedural) assessment of the complete verification has been carried out by a senior assessor located in the accredited premises of TÜV NORD.

After this step the submission for requesting for issuance is conducted.

SECTION G. Verification opinion

Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH has commissioned the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program to carry out the 2nd periodic verification of the project: **“Chumporn applied biogas technology for advanced waste water management”**, with regard to the relevant requirements for CDM project activities. The project reduces GHG emissions due to capturing of methane using anaerobic tank digesters for onsite heat generation. This verification covers the period from 01/09/2010 to 30/09/2011 (including both days).

As a result of this verification, the verifier confirms that:

- all operations of the project are implemented and installed as planned and described in the validated project design document,
- the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied approved CDM methodology,
- the installed equipment essential for measuring parameters required for calculating emission reductions are calibrated appropriately,
- the monitoring system is in place and functional. The project has generated GHG emission reductions,
- the GHG emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements in a conservative and appropriate manner.

TÜV NORD JI/CDM CP further confirms that the project has achieved emission reductions in the above mentioned reporting period as stated on the title page.

SECTION H. Certification statement

As a duly accredited DOE, TÜV NORD CERT confirms that the project

“Chumporn applied biogas technology for advanced waste water management”

registered under

UNFCCC-No. : 2148

has achieved emission reductions in accordance with all applicable requirements for registered CDM project activities during the current monitoring period

MP-No.: 02

from: 01/09/2010

to: 30/09/2011

(including both days) as follows:

Emission reductions: 39,819 tCO₂e

Puchong, 17/10/2018




Cheong, Chun Yuen (Robert)
Team leader

Appendix 1. Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Full texts
CLZ	Corrective Action / Clarification Action
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emission Reduction
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
CO _{2eq}	Carbon dioxide equivalent
CL	Clarification Request
DVerR	Draft Verification Report
ER	Emission Reduction
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
GSC	Global Stakeholder Consultation
IM	Interview Memo
MP	Monitoring Plan or Monitoring Period
MR	Monitoring Report
PA	Project Activity
PDD	Project Design Document
PP	Project Participant
PS	Project Standard
QA/QC	Quality Assurance / Quality Control
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VVS	Validation and Verification Standard
XLS	Emission Reduction Calculation Spread Sheet

Appendix 2. Competence of team members and technical reviewers



Statement of Competence
Appointment and authorization according to the procedures
of the TUV NORD J/CDM Certification Program


Mr. David Lubanga

SCHEME	STATUS	VALID UNTIL
CDM	Lead Assessor (Validation, Verification)	2018-10-20
VCS / ISO 14064-2	Lead Assessor	2018-10-20

Authorization status for technical areas within sectoral scopes:

CODE	TECHNICAL AREA
1.2	Renewables
3.1	Energy demand

251 - Rev. 4, Date: 2015-10-21



Statement of Competence
Appointment and authorization according to the procedures
of the TUV NORD J/CDM Certification Program


Mr. Robert Cheong

SCHEME	STATUS	VALID UNTIL
CDM	Senior Assessor (Validation, Verification)	2018-04-01
VCS	Senior Assessor	2018-04-01

Authorization status for technical areas within sectoral scopes:

CODE	TECHNICAL AREA
1.2	Renewables
3.1	Energy demand
13.1	Solid waste and wastewater
13.2	Manure

128 - Rev. 8, Date: 2016-01-28



Statement of Competence
Appointment and authorization according to the procedures
of the TUV NORD J/CDM Certification Program

Mr. Rainer Winter

SCHEME	STATUS	VALID UNTIL
CDM	Senior Assessor (Validation, Verification) Technical Reviewer	2019-07-01
J1	Senior Assessor Technical Reviewer	2019-07-01
VCS / ISO 14064-2	Senior Assessor Technical Reviewer	2019-07-01

Authorization status for technical areas within sectoral scopes:

CODE	TECHNICAL AREA
1.1	Thermal Energy Generation
1.2	Renewables
4.1	Cement and lime production
4.2	Paper
5.1	Chemical Industry
5.2	Caprolactam, nitric and adipic acid
8.1	Mining/mineral production
9.1	Aluminium and magnesium production
9.2	Iron, steel and Ferro-alloy production
11.1	Emissions of fluorinated gases
11.2	Refrigerant gas production
12.1	Chemical industry
13.1	Solid waste and wastewater

003 - Rev. 10, Date: 2016-07-01

Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced

No.	Author	Reference	Title	References to the document	Provider
1	UNFCCC	/AM13/	AM0013: Avoided methane emissions from organic waste-water treatment Version 04.0	http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/approved	Others
2	UNFCCC	/ACM2/	ACM0002: Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources version 06	http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/approved	Others
3	DOE	/CPM/	TÜV NORD JI / CDM CP Manual (incl. CP procedures and forms)		Others
4	UNFCCC	/GT/	Glossary “CDM terms” (version 09.1)	https://cdm.unfccc.int/filestorage/e/x/t/extfile-20150226124447549-glos_CDM.pdf/glos_CDM.pdf?t=UmZ8bnFjODI3fDCW9A3vJwR03kQQh4sbLiYu	Others
5	IPCC	/IPCC/	1. 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: work book 2. 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: work book	www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp	Others
6	UNFCCC	/KP/	Kyoto Protocol (1997)	http://unfccc.int/kyoto_protocol/items/2830.php	Others
7	UNFCCC	/MA/	Decision 3/CMP. 1 (Marrakesh – Accords)	http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/CO2PMOP/index.html	Others
8	UNFCCC	/MRT/	Monitoring Report Form (CDM-MR-FORM), Version 06.0	https://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/PDDs_Forms/index.html	Others
9	UNFCCC	/PDD1/	Project Design Document for CDM project: “ Chumporn applied biogas technology for advanced waste water management ” version 07 dated 10/05/2007	http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/TUEV-SUED1218620986.14/view	Others
11	UNFCCC	/PDD2/	Revised Project Design Document for CDM project: “ Chumporn applied biogas technology for advanced waste water management ” version 10 dated 20/11/2014	http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/TUEV-SUED1218620986.14/view	Others
11	UNFCCC	/PDD3/	Revised Project Design Document for CDM project: “ Chumporn applied biogas technology for advanced ”	http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/TUEV-	Others

No.	Author	Reference	Title	References to the document	Provider
			waste water management” version 12 dated 30/11/2017	SUED121862098 6.14/view	
12	UNFCCC	/PRC1/	Post Registration Changes Report for CDM project “ Chumporn applied biogas technology for advanced waste water management” version 09 dated 24/11/2014	http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/TUEV-SUED121862098 6.14/view	Others
13	UNFCCC	/PRC2/	Post Registration Changes Report for CDM project “ Chumporn applied biogas technology for advanced waste water management” version 1.0 dated 13/12/2017	http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/TUEV-SUED121862098 6.14/view	Others
14	UNFCCC	/PS/	CDM Project Standard (Version 01.0)	http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Standards/index.html	Others
15	UNFCCC	/TL/	Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality version 03 Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane version 1	http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/tools/index.html	Others
16	PP	/VAL/	Validation Report for CDM project “ Chumporn applied biogas technology for advanced waste water management” version 5, dated 06/07/2008		Others
17	PP	/VER/	Documents of previous verifications (Monitoring report, verification report, ER calculation sheet)		Others
18	UNFCCC	/VVS/	CDM Validation and Verification Standard (Version 01.0)	http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Standards/index.html	Others
19	PP	/MR/	Monitoring Report version 01 dated 27/10/2016 Monitoring Report version 02 dated 08/03/2018 Monitoring Report version 03 dated 04/09/2018 Monitoring Report version 4.0 dated 03/10/2018 Monitoring Report version 5.0 dated 16/10/2018		PP
20	PP	/ER/	ER spreadsheet version 2.01 dated 27/10/2016 ER spreadsheet version 2 dated 08/03/2018 ER spreadsheet version 3 dated 04/09/2018 ER spreadsheet version 4 dated 03/10/2018 ER spreadsheet version 5.0 dated 16/10/2018		PP

No.	Author	Reference	Title	References to the document	Provider
Calibration					
21	MIT	/C1/	FTBG001 Magnetic Flowmeter for POME by MIT on 01/10/2010 and 14/04/2011		Others
22	MIT and Kanes	/C2/	FTBG003 Magnetic Flowmeter for sludge calibrated by Kanes on 15/09/2009 and by MIT on 01/10/2010 and 14/04/2011		Others
23	MIT and Fox	/C3/	FTBG004 Fox 6511 4 inch pipe flowmeter for main biogas calibrated by Fox on 22/08/2008 and by MIT on 01/10/2010 and 14/04/2011		Others
24	MIT and Fox	/C4/	FTBG005 Fox 6510 4 inch pipe flowmeter for biogas to flare calibrated by Fox On 21/08/2008 and by MIT on 01/10/2010 and 14/04/2011		Others
25	MIT and Fox	/C5/	FTBG006 Fox 7714 10 inch pipe flowmeter biogas to Boiler 3 calibrated by Fox on 25/06/2009 and by MIT on 01/10/2010 and 11/04/2011		Others
26	MIT and Fox	/C6/	FTBG007 Fox 7715 4 inch pipe flowmeter for biogas to burner RF1 calibrated by by Fox on 25/06/2009 and MIT on 01/10/2010 and on 14/04/2011		Others
27	MIT and Fox	/C7/	FTBG008 Fox 6509 6 inch pipe flowmeter for biogas to burner RF2 calibrated byFox on 22/08/2008 and MIT on 01/10/2010 and on 29/09/2011		Others
28	MIT and Kanes	/C8/	TTBG003 Flare Temperature Sensor calibrated by Kanes on 15/09/2008 and by MIT on 15/04/2011		Others
29	EnviScience and SPC	/C9/	COD spectrometer serial #HAC070790C64568 tested by Envi Science on 15/05/2009, 23/03/2010 and 20/10/2010. COD spectrometer serial #1308841 by SPC on 01/11/2010, on 28/04/2011 and 08/12/2011 and by SPC on 13/03/2011		Others
30	Binder	/C10/	Handheld CH4 Gas Analyser calibrated by Binder on 21/09/2010		Others
31	Mettler	/C11/	Weighbridge calibrated by Mettler Toledo dated 19/03/2010		Others
32	Schneider	/C12/	Schneider Electric Meter calibrated by Schhneider Electric / energy management dated 06/02/2011		Others
Equipment & Instruments					
33	Yokogawa	/EI1/	Yokogawa Magnetic Flow Meter		Others

No.	Author	Reference	Title	References to the document	Provider
34	Fox	/EI2/	Fox Thermal Mass Flow Meter		Others
35	Binder Gasboard	/EI3/	Binder Gas Handheld Analyser Gasboard Biogas Analyser		Others
36	Schneider	/EI4/	Schneider Power Logic Electricity Meter		Others
37	HACH	/EI5/	HACH COD tester		Others
	QA/QC procedures				
38	PP	/QA1/	Operating Procedure rev. 4.0		PP
	Test Reports				
39	PP	/TR1/	Internal - External COD for October to December 2010 and January to September 2011		PP
40	PP	/TR2/	Boilers Stack Emission Test Reports year 2010 & 2011		PP
41	PTT	/TR3/	Analysis of Biogas by PTT for year 2010 to 2011.		
	Others				
42	PP	/O1/	Ambient Temperature from Chumporn weather station for September 2010 to September 2011		PP
43		/dna-HP/	DNA of Thailand	http://www.tgo.or.th/english/	
44		/dna-A1/	DNA of Germany	http://www.dehst.de/EN/Home/home_node.html	
45		/unfccc/	UNFCCC	http://cdm.unfccc.int	
46		/ipcc/	IPCC publications	www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp	

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

Table 3. Remaining FAR from validation and/or previous verifications

FAR ID	xx	Section no.	E.2	Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description of FAR				
Project participant response				Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Documentation provided by project participant				
DOE assessment				Date: DD/MM/YYYY

Table 4. CL from this verification

CL ID	E.8-01	Section no.	D.2 & ER spreadsheet	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CL					
MR version 01, Section D.2, Parameter NC & ER spreadsheet: There were reported data in the ER spreadsheet data (processing) tab but it is reported zero in MR.					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date: 22/03/2018
The parameter NC (nitrogen content of sludge) is not applicable for this monitoring period, as no dry sludge was produced by the sludge treatment system. Therefore, no data is available. Correction was made in the ER spreadsheet to delete the reported data, which was incorrectly keyed-in					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in the PDD	Section(s):		New version No.:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in MR	Section(s): D.2		New version No.: v.02	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS "MR CPI 2nd period_CER Calculation_v2.0"	Worksheet(s): Data (processing)		New version No.: v2.0	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:				
DOE assessment (1st round)					Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section D.2, Parameter NC & ER spreadsheet: The data in ER spreadsheet have been corrected to reflect there is no dry sludge generated during the monitoring period. This was confirmed during onsite interview and document reviewed. Therefore, zero data is observed.					
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed			

Table 5. CAR from this verification

CAR ID	E.1-01	Section no.	Cover page	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, cover page: The unit of representation for the emissions reductions is not indicated.					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date: 22/03/2018
The unit for emission reductions t CO ₂ e was added.					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in the PDD	Section(s):		New version No.:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in MR	Section(s): Cover page		New version No.: v 02	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):		New version No.:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:				
DOE assessment (1st round)					Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02, cover page: The unit of representation for the emissions reductions is added and is correct.					
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed			

CAR ID	E.3-01	Section no.	B.1	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section B.1:					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The respective post registration changes for corrections and previously approved changes are updated in respective sections of B.2. 2. During this monitoring period, there are changes in monitoring instruments such as COD test equipment and electricity meter is not reported. 3. The downtime of the equipment and biogas system were not reported. 4. The main project equipment for biogas digester and flare capacity is not indicated. 					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date: 22/03/2018
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The corrections and previously approved changes were included in the respective sections of B.2 for post registration changes. 2. A table with changes in the monitoring instruments was included. 3. It was now reported in section B.1 of the monitoring report that no major downtime of the system occurred during the period covered by the monitoring report. 4. Information about the biogas digester capacities have been included in table 2 of the revised MR. 					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					

<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): B.1	New version No.: v 02
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:		
DOE assessment (1st round)		Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section B.1:		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The corrections and previously approved changes shall be reported in the respective sections of B.2 Post registration changes. 2. A table is added to include the change in instruments for COD test equipment. There is no change for the electricity meter. 3. A sentence is included there is no major downtime on the system during the monitoring period. 4. The biogas digester is reported. However the flare capacity is not included. 		
Project participant response (2nd round)		Date: 06/09/2018
4: The flare capacity was included, together with more details on the flare type.		
Documentation provided by project participant (2nd round)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): B.1	New version No.: v 03
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:		
DOE assessment (1st round)		Date: 06/09/2018
MR version 03, Section B.1:		
4. The flare capacity is updated in the MR and in accordance to the manufacturer's specification.		
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed	

CAR ID	E.3-02	Section no.	B.2.1	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section B.2.1: Type of temporary deviations under PRC-2148-001 approved by EB on 28/12/2014 was not reported.					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date:
Type of temporary deviations under PRC-2148-001 approved by EB on 29/12/2014 was added.					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): B.2.1	New version No.: v2			
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:			
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:					
DOE assessment (1st round)					Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section B.2.1: Type of temporary deviations under PRC-2148-001 approved by EB on 28/12/2014 is updated in revised MR.					
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed				

CAR ID	E.3-03	Section no.	B.2.2	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section B.2.2: Type of corrections under PRC-2148-001 approved by EB on 28/12/2014 was not reported.					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date: 22/03/2018
Type of corrections under PRC-2148-001 approved by EB on 28/12/2014 was added.					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): B.2.2	New version No.: v02			
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:			
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:					
DOE assessment (1st round)					Date: 01/04/2018

MR version 02, Section B.2.2: Type of corrections under PRC-2148-001 approved by EB on 28/12/2014 is updated in revised MR.	
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed

CAR ID	E.3-04	Section no.	B.2.4	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section B.2.5: The permanent changes to several monitoring parameters during the 1 st MP under PRC-2148-001 approved by EB on 28/12/2014 were not reported					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date:
					22/03/2018
The permanent changes to several monitoring parameters during the 1 st MP under PRC-2148-001 approved by EB on 28/12/2014 was added.					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD		Section(s):		New version No.:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR		Section(s): B.2.4		New version No.: v.02	
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS		Worksheet(s):		New version No.:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:					
DOE assessment (1st round)					Date:
					01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section B.2.5: The permanent changes to several monitoring parameters during the 1 st MP under PRC-2148-001 approved by EB on 28/12/2014 is updated in revised MR.					
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed			

CAR ID	E.3-05	Section no.	B.2.6	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section B.2.6: The design changes to the project activity during the 1 st MP under PRC-2148-001 approved by EB on 28/12/2014 was not reported					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date:
					22/03/2018
The design changes to the project activity during the 1 st MP under PRC-2148-001 approved by EB on 28/12/2014 was added.					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD		Section(s):		New version No.:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR		Section(s): B.2.6		New version No.: v.02	
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS		Worksheet(s):		New version No.:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:					
DOE assessment (1st round)					Date:
					01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section B.2.6: The design changes to the project activity during the 1 st MP under PRC-2148-001 approved by EB on 28/12/2014 is updated in revised MR.					
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed			

CAR ID	E.6-01	Section no.	D.1	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section D.1, Parameter E:					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The value stated is inconsistent with approved revised PDD version 12. The choice of data or measurement methods and procedures is not stated according to approved revised PDD. 					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date:
					22/03/2018
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The value for E = 15,175 Cal/mol, is correct as per methodology AM0013 ver.04, page 8. The mistake lies in the approved registered PDD (5.175 Cal/mol), which erroneously diverts from the default value given in the methodology (mistake of the originally revised PDD not noticed and not corrected during previous PRC). Nevertheless, the value has been adjusted to be in line with the approved PDD, E = 15,175 Cal/mol. Information has been included as per approved revised PDD. 					

Documentation provided by project participant (1 st round)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): D.1	New version No.: v02
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:		
DOE assessment (1st round)		Date: 01/04/2018
<p>MR version 02, Section D.1, Parameter E:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The value stated is icorrected and onsistent with approved revised PDD version 12. The choice of data or measurement methods and procedures is updated and according to approved revised PDD. 		
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed

CAR ID	E.6-02	Section no.	D.1	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
<p>MR version 01 section D.1, parameter COD_{a,in}:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The description for value applied is inconsistent with approved revised PDD version 12. Choice of data or measurement methods and procedures is not stated according to approved revised PDD version 12. 					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date: 22/03/2018
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The description of value applied for parameter COD_{a,in} in section D.1 of the approved revised PDD (version 12): "Monthly values, see Table 10". The description in the MR is "Monthly values as per table 10 "Results of wastewater analysis 2006 in row "COD in (CPO)" of the revised registered PDD", is slightly different to make it more user friendly to find the right row.' The description "See description at COD_{c, baseline}" was added as per approved revised PDD. 					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): D.1	New version No.: v.02			
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:			
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:					
DOE assessment (1st round)					Date: 01/04/2018
<p>MR version 02 section D.1, parameter COD_{a,in}:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The description for value applied is corrected and consistent with approved revised PDD version 12. Choice of data or measurement methods and procedures is updated and according to approved revised PDD version 12. 					
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed			

CAR ID	E.6-03	Section no.	D.1	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
<p>MR version 01 section D.1, parameter COD_{a,out}:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The description for value applied is inconsistent with approved revised PDD version 12. Choice of data or measurement methods and procedures is not stated according to approved revised PDD version 12. 					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date: 22/03/2018
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> A table of the values (from table 10 of the revised approved PDD) was added for convenience of the reader. The "choice of data or measurement methods and procedures" is now stated according to approved revised PDD version 12, parameter COD_{c,baseline} "Measurement methods and procedures" 					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): D.1	New version No.: v.02			
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:			
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:					

DOE assessment (1st round)	Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02 section D.1, parameter COD _{a,out} :	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The description for value applied is corrected and consistent with approved revised PDD version 12. Choice of data or measurement methods and procedures is updated and according to approved revised PDD version 12 	
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed

CAR ID	E.6-04	Section no.	D.1	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section D.1, Parameter COD _{available} :					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The description for the value applied is not consistent with the approved revised PDD version 12.0 Choice of data or measurement methods and procedures is not stated according to approved revised PDD version 12. 					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date: 22/03/2018
Both, the value applied and the choice of data or measurement methods and procedures have been aligned with the approved revised PDD version 12.					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in MR	Section(s): D.1	New version No.: v.02		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:				
DOE assessment (1st round)					Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section D.1, Parameter COD _{available} :					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The description for the value applied is corrected and consistent with the approved revised PDD version 12.0 Choice of data or measurement methods and procedures is updated and according to approved revised PDD version 12. 					
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed				

CAR ID	E.6-05	Section no.	D.1	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section D.1: The choice of data or measurement methods and procedures for the following parameters were not stated according to the approved revised PDD version 10.					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Bo Hu_PS CEF_{Bl,elec,y} D_{Ing} F_d Uncertainty conservativeness factor T1 R EGy CEF_{Bl,therm} HG_{Bl} HG_{p,y} CEF_{Pr,therm,y} EF_{N2O} COD_{dw} 					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date: 22/03/2018

The missing information on choice of data or measurement methods and procedures for the parameter above parameters was added in section D.1 of the monitoring report			
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in MR	Section(s): D.1	New version No.: v.02
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:		
DOE assessment (1st round)			Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section D.1: The choice of data or measurement methods and procedures for the above stated parameters are updated and according to the approved revised PDD version 10.			
Conclusion Tick the appropriate checkbox		<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed	

CAR ID	E.6-06	Section no.	D.2	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section D.2, Parameter $F_{\text{Dig,out}}$:					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. According to PRC-2148-001 that this parameter is monitored by a separate flow meter. The data applied in MR and ER spreadsheet are the same as $F_{\text{Dig,in}}$ which is incorrect. 2. The information for the separate flow meter is not reported. 3. The description for QA/QC procedures is inconsistent with the approved revised PDD version 12. 4. There is no additional comment description in the approved revised PDD version 12. 					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date: 22/03/2018
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. According to the approved PRC-2148-002, to obtain the outflow of the wastewater from the digester, the PP applies the inflow organic wastewater measured data as the outflow data for the organic wastewater from the digester. The following determination of project emissions shall be used $F_{\text{Dig,out}} = F_{\text{Dig}}$ 2. The measured data from the separate meter has been included in the MR.. 3. The actual description was inserted (same as $F_{\text{Dig,in}}$). 4. The comment was removed. 					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in the PDD	Section(s): D.2	New version No.: 12		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in MR	Section(s): D.2	New version No.: v.02		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:				
DOE assessment (1st round)					Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section D.2, Parameter $F_{\text{Dig,out}}$:					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. According to approved PRC-2148-002 the monitoring of this parameter does not require a separate flow meter. The data applied in MR and ER spreadsheet are the same as $F_{\text{Dig,in}}$. 2. The information for the separate flow meter is updated. 3. The description for QA/QC procedures is corrected and consistent with the approved revised PDD version 12. 4. The additional comment description is deleted and appropriated since it is not stated in the approved revised PDD version 12. 					
Conclusion Tick the appropriate checkbox		<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed			

CAR ID	E.6-07	Section no.	D.2	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					

MR version 01, Section D.2, Parameter COD _{c,baseline} :			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The measuring / recording / recording frequency is not according to the approved revised PDD version 12. 2. The value monitored shall be consistent with ER spreadsheet with 2 decimal points 3. There was a change of monitoring equipment during the monitoring period. The detail of the previous equipment was not reported. 4. The calibration information of the previous equipment was not reported. 5. The QA/QC procedures descriptions were not consistent with the approved revised PDD version 12. 			
Project participant response (1st round)			Date: 22/03/2018
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The description of Section D.2, Parameter COD_{c,baseline} (Monitoring frequency) has now been corrected. 2. The values monitored has been brought in line with the ER spreadsheet (2 decimal points). 3. Information on the previous equipment has been included. 4. All calibration dates for both instruments are now included. 5. The description of the QA/QC procedure has been brought in line with the description in the approved revised PDD. 			
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in MR	Section(s): D.2	New version No.: v.02
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:		
DOE assessment (1st round)			Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section D.2, Parameter COD _{c,baseline} :			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The measuring / recording / recording frequency is updated and according to the approved revised PDD version 12. 2. The value monitored is updated and consistent with ER spreadsheet with 2 decimal points 3. The detail of the previous equipment is added and appropriate. 4. The calibration information of the previous equipment is included and appropriate. 5. The QA/QC procedures descriptions is updated and consistent with the approved revised PDD version 12. 			
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed	

CAR ID	E.6-08	Section no.	D.2	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 1.0, Parameters COD _{a,in} & COD _{a,out} :					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The reference for the value of monitoring parameter was not referred 2. The description for measured / calculated / default, monitoring equipment, measuring / recording / recording frequency, QA/QC procedures and additional comments are inconsistent with approved revised PDD version 12. 					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date: 22/03/2018
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The reference and a data table has been included 2. The descriptions have been adjusted to match the revised PDD version 12. 					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in MR	Section(s): D.2	New version No.: v.02		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:				
DOE assessment (1st round)					Date: 01/04/2018

MR version 02, Parameters COD _{a,in} & COD _{a,out} :	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The reference for the value of monitoring parameter is updated in revised MR and traceable to ER spreadsheet. 2. The description for measured / calculated / default, monitoring equipment, measuring / recording / recording frequency, QA/QC procedures and additional comments are corrected and consistent with approved revised PDD version 12 	
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed

CAR ID	E.6-09	Section no.	D.2	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 1.0, Parameter T _{Ing} :					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is unclear how the values monitored were determined? 2. The details of the measuring instrument were not stated. 					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date:
Details on the measuring instrument and how the values monitored were determined added to the description in the parameter table in section D.2					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in MR	Section(s): D.2	New version No.: v.02		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: additional supporting documents	Thermometer11.pdf, Thermometer12.pdf			
DOE assessment (1st round)					Date:
MR version 02, Section D.2, Parameter T _{Ing} :					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The method of measuring of the monitored data is not consistent with the approved revised PDD version 12.0 2. The details of the measuring instrument is not according to approved registered PDD version 12. 					
Project participant response (2nd round)					Date:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The description of monitoring of parameter T_{Ing} has been adjusted in the revised MR. 2. The details of measuring instrument in PDD version 12 mention "Standard industrial temperature meter", this has been re-incerted in the revised MR 					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in MR	Section(s): D.2	New version No.: v03		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: additional supporting documents	Thermometer11.pdf, Thermometer12.pdf			
DOE assessment (2nd round)					Date:
MR version 03, Section D.2, Parameter T _{Ing} :					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The description of the monitoring is corrected and in accordance to the approved revised PDD version 12.0 2. The details of the instrument is updated and in accordance to the approved revised PDD version 12.0 					
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed				

CAR ID	E.6-10	Section no.	D.2	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section D.2: The following parameters were not included:					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parameter HG_{BL} 2. Parameter D_{Ing} 					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A table for the parameter HG_{BL} was included under D.2. 2. A table for the parameter D_{Ing} was included under D.2. 					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					

CDM-VCR-FORM

<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): D.2	New version No.: v.02
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:		
DOE assessment (1st round)		Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section D.2: The following parameters were added in revised MR and in accordance to approved revised PDD version 12.: Both parameters are added and in accordance to approved revised PDD version 12.		
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed	

CAR ID	E.6-11	Section no.	D.2	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 1.0, Parameter COD _{c,dig_out} :					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The description for the measuring frequency was not consistent with the approved revised PDD version 12. The monitored value for March 2011 is inconsistent with the ER spreadsheet. A delay in the calibration for the COD measuring instrument and MPE was not applied in the data for period 20/10/2010 to 01/11/2010. The QA/QC procedures descriptions were not consistent with parameter COD_{c,baseline}. 					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date: 22/03/2018
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The description of Section D.2, Parameter COD_{c,dig_out} (Monitoring frequency) been corrected. The value was corrected in the MR to reflect the actual value from the ER spreadsheet. The old equipment (HACH Model: DR/890) was used until 04/11/2010, the calibration of this instrument happened on 20/10/2010, which is a 28 days delay from the due date on 23/09/2010 (the calibration error was adjusted for the period Sept-Oct. 2010, conservatively because calculation with full month) Since calibration was within standards range the accuracy of +/- 3% is applied for correction. The QA/QC description of this parameter table was re-aligned with the description of the parameter COD_{c,baseline} 					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): D.2	New version No.: v.02			
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:			
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:	CODTest procedure.pdf; CODTest procedurEng.pdf; DR890.pdf; DR3800.pdf				
					Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02, Parameter COD _{c,dig_out} :					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The description for the measuring frequency is corrected and consistent with the approved revised PDD version 12. The monitored value for March 2011 is corrected and consistent with the ER spreadsheet. The instrument MPE of 3% was applied to the data for period 23/09/2010 to 01/11/2010. The QA/QC procedures description is updated and consistent with parameter COD_{c,baseline}. 					
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed				

CAR ID	E.6-12	Section no.	D.2	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					

MR version 01, Section D.2, Parameter COD _{la} :			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is unclear why there was reported data in the ER spreadsheet for October, December 2010 and February, April, June and August 2011 since there was no sludge used for land application. 2. The measuring / recording / recording frequency is not according to the approved revised PDD version 12. 3. There was a change of monitoring equipment during the monitoring period. The detail of the previous equipment was not reported. 4. The description for measured / calculated / default, monitoring equipment, measuring / recording / recording frequency, QA/QC procedures and additional comments are inconsistent with approved revised PDD version 12. 			
Project participant response (1st round)			Date: 22/03/2018
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No dried sludge for land application was produced; Correction was made in the ER spreadsheet to delete the reported data, which was incorrectly keyed-in 2. The measuring / recording / recording frequency has been adjusted to be in line with the revised PDD vers.12. 3. In line with the revised PDD, a reference has been inserted "See description at COD_c, baseline." 4. The QA/QC description of this parameter table was re-aligned with the description of the parameter COD_{c, baseline} 			
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)			
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): D.2	New version No.: v.02	
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:			
DOE assessment (1st round)			Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section D.2, Parameter COD _{la} :			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data in ER spreadsheet has been deleted, therefore is appropriate since there is no sludge used for land application. 2. The measuring / recording / recording frequency is updated and according to the approved revised PDD version 12. 3. Since the parameter is measured using the same monitoring equipment of COD_{baseline} the reference is appropriate. 4. The description for measured / calculated / default, monitoring equipment, measuring / recording / recording frequency, QA/QC procedures and additional comments are updated and consistent with approved revised PDD version 12. 			
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed	

CAR ID	E.6-13	Section no.	D.2	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section D.2, Parameter F _{c,dw} :					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on the reviewed of data, there were monitored values and were not reported. 2. The flow meter information is not stated. 3. The description for measuring / reading / recording frequency is inconsistent with the approved revised PDD version 12. 4. The calibration frequency is every 6 months. The previous calibration information is not reported. 					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date: 22/03/2018
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No dried sludge for land application is produced and no dewatering was taking place; therefore F_{c,dw} is „0“, which was corrected in the ER spreadsheet. 2. Flow meter information were included in the parameter table. 3. The measuring / recording / recording frequency has been adjusted to be in line with the revised PDD. 4. Calibration date 01/10/2010 and 14/04/2010 are included in the MR, an earlier calibration is not available. Since there is not dewatering taking place a correction is not possible and needed (F_{c,dw} = 0) 					

Documentation provided by project participant (1 st round)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): D.2	New version No.: v.02
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:		
DOE assessment (1st round)		Date: 01/04/2018
<p>MR version 02, Section D.2, Parameter Fc_{dw}:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data in ER spreadsheet are corrected since there are no sludge produced. Therefore, the deletion is appropriate. 2. The flow meter information is updated and is appropriate. 3. The description for measuring / reading / recording frequency is updated and consistent with the approved revised PDD version 12. 4. The calibration frequency information is updated and according to the calibration reports. 		
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed

CAR ID	E.6-14	Section no.	D.2	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
<p>MR version 01, Section D.2, Parameter COD_{c,dw}:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on the reviewed of data, there were monitored values and were not reported. 2. The measuring / recording / recording frequency is not according to the approved revised PDD version 12. 3. There was a change of monitoring equipment during the monitoring period. The detail of the previous equipment was not reported. 4. The description for measured / calculated / default, monitoring equipment, measuring / recording / recording frequency, QA/QC procedures and additional comments are inconsistent with approved revised PDD version 12. 					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date: 22/03/2018
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No real dewatering, therefore the spreadsheet data was corrected and reported "0".. 2. The measuring / recording / recording frequency was adjusted to be in line with the approved revised PDD version 12. 3. Information on the previous equipment has been included. 4. The description for measured / calculated / default, monitoring equipment, measuring / recording / recording frequency, QA/QC procedure has been brought in line with the description in the approved revised PDD vers.12 					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD	Section(s):		New version No.:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): D.2		New version No.: v.02		
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):		New version No.:		
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:					
DOE assessment (1st round)					Date: 01/04/2018
<p>MR version 02, Section D.2, Parameter COD_{c,dw}:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The PP explains above there were no dewatering during the monitoring period and this was confirmed during the site inspection. Therefore, the ER spreadsheet is corrected and report as "0" is appropriate. 2. The measuring / recording / recording frequency is updated and according to the approved revised PDD version 12. 3. The information of the change monitoring equipment during the monitoring period is updated. 4. The description for measured / calculated / default, monitoring equipment, measuring / recording / recording frequency, QA/QC procedures and additional comments are updated and consistent with approved revised PDD version 12. 					
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>					<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed

CAR ID	E.6-15	Section no.	D.2	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section D.2, Parameter P _{CH4Bio} :					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manufacturer for the gas analyser is incorrect. 2. The calibration date 21/09/2010 is inconsistent with the calibration report. 3. The description for measuring / reading / recording frequency is inconsistent with the approved revised PDD version 12. 4. The sentence for calibration delayed in QA/QC procedures is not applicable for this monitoring period. 					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manufacturer for the gas analyser was corrected. 2. The calibration date 21/09/2010 is consistent with the calibration report. 3. The description for measuring / reading / recording frequency as adjusted to be consistent with the approved revised PDD version 12. 4. The sentence for calibration delayed in QA/QC procedures was removed. 					22/03/2018
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in MR	Section(s): D.2	New version No.: v.02		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:				
DOE assessment (1st round)					Date:
MR version 02, Section D.2, Parameter P _{CH4Bio} :					01/04/2018
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manufacturer for the gas analyser is corrected and according to instrument installed. 2. The calibration date 21/09/2010 is corrected and consistent with the calibration report. 3. The description for measuring / reading / recording frequency is updated and consistent with the approved revised PDD version 12. 4. The sentence for calibration delayed in QA/QC procedures is deleted since it not applicable for this monitoring period and is appropriate. 					
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed			

CAR ID	E.6-16	Section no.	D.2	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section D.2, Parameter FR _{f,inlet} :					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. During the calibration on 15/04/2011, calibration error of 2.8% was found and the error was not applied to the April 2011 month monitored data 2. The sentence for first calibration in QA/QC procedures is of no relevance to this monitoring period. 3. The error stated in QA/QC procedures is incorrectly presented and it is calibration error and not maximum measured error. 					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The calibration error of 2.8% is now applied to the April 2011 month monitored data. 2. The sentence for first calibration in QA/QC procedures was of no relevance to this monitoring period, therefore it was removed. 3. The description in the QA/QC procedure was corrected, now also saying "the calibration error of 2.8 % was applied for the month of April". 					22/03/2018
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in MR	Section(s): D.2	New version No.: v.02		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s): MR CPI 2nd period_CER Calculation	New version No.: v.2.0		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:				
DOE assessment (1st round)					Date:
					01/04/2018

MR version 02, Section D.2, Parameter $FR_{f,inlet}$:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The calibration error of 2.8% is applied to the April 2011 month monitored data 2. The sentence for first calibration in QA/QC procedures is deleted since not applicable to this monitoring period. 3. The error stated in QA/QC procedures is corrected to the calibration error and not the maximum measured error. 	
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed

CAR ID	E.6-17	Section no.	D.2	Date:	06/01/2017	
Description of CAR						
MR version 1.0, Section D.2, Parameter $T_{comb,f}$:						
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The monitoring equipment used to monitor this parameter is run-time meter and not Thermal mass flow meter and thermocouple. The information of the run-time meter is not stated. 2. The description for QA/QC procedures is not consistent with the approved revised PDD version 12. 						
Project participant response (1st round)					Date:	22/03/2018
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The observation is correct, therefore the description of the monitoring equipment in parameter $T_{comb,f}$ was adjusted to provide information about the run-time meter. 2. The description for QA/QC procedures was adjusted to be consistent with the approved revised PDD version 12. 						
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in the PDD	Section(s):		New version No.:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in MR	Section(s):	D.2	New version No.:	v.02	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):		New version No.:		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:					
DOE assessment (1st round)					Date:	01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section D.2, Parameter $T_{comb,f}$:						
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The description for the monitoring equipment is corrected to reflect the run-time meter. The information of the run-time meter is not stated. 2. The description for QA/QC procedures is correct and consistent with the approved revised PDD version 12. 						
Project participant response (2nd round)					Date:	06/09/2018
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Information on the run-time meter, other than the description in the MR are not available. Because of this information gap and the gaps in monitoring data from the flare, the flare efficiency of "0" (zero) was applied conservatively for the calculation of project emissions. 						
Documentation provided by project participant (2nd round)						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in the PDD	Section(s):		New version No.:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in MR	Section(s):	D.2	New version No.:	v.03	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):		New version No.:		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:					
DOE assessment (2nd round)					Date:	06/09/2018
MR version 03 Section D.2, Parameter $T_{comb,f}$: Information of the run-time meter was available other description stated in MR. Since the flare efficiency is considered as zero, the run-time has not impact to the project emissions. Therefore, it acceptable.						
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed					

CAR ID	E.6-18	Section no.	D.2	Date:	06/01/2017	
Description of CAR						
MR version 01, Section D.2, Parameter $PE_{flare,y}$: The description for QA/QC procedures is not consistent with the stated parameters.						
Project participant response (1st round)					Date:	22/03/2018
The description for QA/QC procedures for the parameter $PE_{flare,y}$ is now referring to the description of the stated parameters.						

Documentation provided by project participant (1 st round)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): D.2	New version No.: v.02
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:		
DOE assessment (1 st round)		Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section D.2, Parameter PE _{flare,y} : The description for QA/QC procedures is corrected and consistent with the stated parameters		
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed	

CAR ID	E.6-19	Section no.	D.2	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section D.2, Parameter FR _{e,s} :					
1. The monitored value unit of measure is not stated correctly 2. The monitored value is not calculated according to the calculation method stated					
Project participant response (1 st round)					Date: 22/03/2018
1. The reported unit was corrected in the MR. 2. The calculation was corrected in the MR..					
Documentation provided by project participant (1 st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD	Section(s):		New version No.:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): D.2		New version No.: v.02		
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):		New version No.:		
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:					
DOE assessment (1 st round)					Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section D.2, Parameter FR _{e,s} :					
1. The monitored value unit of measure is corrected 2. The monitored value is calculated according to the calculation method stated					
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed				

CAR ID	E.6-20	Section no.	D.2	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section D.2, All Parameters: The version of the referred CER calculation is inconsistent with the version .01 submitted for review.					
Project participant response (1 st round)					Date: 22/03/2018
The version no. of the CER calculation for all parameters in section D.2 is deleted to avoid and state refer to MR CPI 2nd period_CER Calculation					
Documentation provided by project participant (1 st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD	Section(s):		New version No.:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): D.2		New version No.: v.02		
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):		New version No.:		
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:					
DOE assessment (1 st round)					Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section D.2, All Parameters: The version of the referred CER calculation is deleted to avoid confusion. .					
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed				

CAR ID	E.7-01	Section no.	D.2	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					

MR version 01, Parameters $F_{Dig,in}$:		
1. There was a delay in calibration conducted on 01/10/2010 with an error of 3.9%. The data for September and October is incorrectly determined. 2. The previous calibration date before 01/10/2010 was not reported		
Project participant response (1st round)		Date: 22/03/2018
1. The calibration was conducted on 01/10/2010, the calibration error of 3.9 is now applied for September 2010 and for October 2010. This was corrected in the ER calculation sheet. 2. The date of the previous calibration was included in the parameter table.		
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): D.2	New version No.: v.02
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s): MR CPI 2nd period_CER Calculation	New version No.: v.2.0
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:		
DOE assessment (1st round)		Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02, Parameters $F_{Dig,in}$:		
1. The error of 3.9% is corrected for September and October data. 2. The previous calibration date before 01/10/2010 is added.		
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed	

CAR ID	E.7-02	Section no.	D.2	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section D.2, Parameter $EL_{P,y}$: The meters specification and calibration information for both external and internal are not stated.					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date: 22/03/2018
The specification of the internal meter is stated in the MR. It was not possible for CPI to obtain the information (specification and calibration) for the external meter. The information for the internal meter was included in the parameter table in MR. No calibration information available, prior to the date in the MR (03/02/2011). CPI has always relied on the information from the PEA meter and was under the impression that it is normal and acceptable that calibration information is not given by PEA (even after several attempts).					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD	Section(s):		New version No.:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): D.2		New version No.: v.02		
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):		New version No.:		
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:	pl_meter710_user_manual.pdf; Schneider Electric marked.pdf				
DOE assessment (1st round)					Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section D.2, Parameter $EL_{P,y}$: The meters specification and calibration information for internal is added. Since the external meter data is not released by the grid operator PEA, therefore, the internal recorded data is applied in the ER spreadsheet.					
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed				

CAR ID	E.7-03	Section no.	D.2	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section D.2 Parameter F_{la} : The calibration date for the previous calibration was not reported					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date: 22/03/2018
The reported calibration information is dated 19/03/2010, which is before the start of the monitoring period (September 2010) and with a minimum every two years calibration frequency of the instrument is covering the full duration of the monitoring period. The calibration sheet states: Date of Calibration: 19 March 2553/2010; Expire date: 18 March 2555/2012					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD	Section(s):		New version No.:		

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): D.2	New version No.: v.02
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:		
DOE assessment (1st round)		Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section D.2 Parameter F _{la} : The calibration date for the previous calibration is reported and according to the calibration report.		
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed	

CAR ID	E.7-04	Section no.	D.2	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section D.2, Parameter FR _{Bio} :					
1. The previous calibration date before 01/10/2010 was not reported. 2. The calibration error of 4.4% is inconsistent with the calibration report.					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date: 22/03/2018
1. The previous calibration date (28/08/2008) was included in the report 2. The calibration report (01/10/2010) states an error of 4.44%, which was applied for September 2010 (correction: not October as calibration was done on 01/10/2010).					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD	Section(s):		New version No.:		
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): D.2		New version No.: v.02		
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):		New version No.:		
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:					
DOE assessment (1st round)					Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section D.2, Parameter FR _{Bio} :					
1. The previous calibration date before 01/10/2010 was on 22/08/2008 is added in revised MR. 2. The calibration error is corrected to read as 4.44% and consistent with the calibration report.					
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed				

CAR ID	E.7-05	Section no.	D.2	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section D.2, Parameter FR _{e,inlet} :					
1. During the review of boiler 2 data, there were gas flow recorded but there is no run-time captured for several months. The recorded gas flow rate shall be considered as zero since the gas is not combusted due to no run time is captured for the combustion. 2. During review of calibration report for FTBG006, there was calibration error of 24.64% found during the calibration on 01/10/2010 and error was not applied to September 2010 data. 3. During review of calibration report for FTBG007, there was calibration error of 5.86% found during the calibration on 14/04/2011 and error was not applied to April 2011 data. 4. During review of calibration report for FTBG008, there was calibration error of 2.02% found during calibration on 01/10/2010 and error of 7.22% found during calibration on 14/04/2011. The calibration errors were not applied to the data for September 2010 and April 2011 data.					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date: 22/03/2018
1. We checked the boiler 2 data and could not find the period that is indicated in the finding above, for which no run-time data is available. Nevertheless, with small flows the run-time meter does not work well and Fraction of time gas combusted in the boilers is recorded zero (0). Consequently all such data were eliminated from the calculations (days with biogas flow to boiler and zero combustion time). 2. to 4. All calibration errors, are now applied in the ER calculation sheet for the cumulative gas stream to the boilers. Column T is the cumulative gas stream, the errors and correction periods stated in no.2-4 above are all applied in the columns U to X to the individual gas streams, which are summed up in column T.					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD	Section(s):		New version No.:		

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): D.2	New version No.: v.02
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s): MR CPI 2nd period_CER Calculation	New version No.: v.2.0
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:		
DOE assessment (1st round)		Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section D.2, Parameter FR _{e,inlet} :		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The spreadsheet was reviewed and the data have been deleted and no combustion is considered. Zero combustion time is reported appropriately. 2. The calibration error of 24.64% is applied appropriately to the September 2010 data. 3. The calibration error of 5.86% is applied appropriately to April 2011 data. 4. The calibration error of 2.02% and error of 7.22% are applied appropriately to the data for September 2010 and April 2011. 		
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed	

CAR ID	E.8-02	Section no.	D.2	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section D.2, Parameter T2: There are no values in the table					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date: 22/03/2018
The values in the table have been completed, based on data from the weather station.					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD	Section(s):		New version No.:		
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): D.2.		New version No.: v.02		
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):		New version No.:		
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:	E.08.02 Weather2010.xls; E.08.02 Weather2011.xls				
DOE assessment (1st round)					Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section D.2, Parameter T2: The table is updated to include data derived from the local weather station and converted to K value.					
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed				

CAR ID	E.8-03	Section no.	D.2	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section D.2, Parameter P _{CH4e,s} :					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The half year data was not stated. 2. It is unclear how the value monitored was derived? 					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date: 22/03/2018
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The half yearly data was included in the monitoring report. 2. The value monitored and applied for the monitoring period was derived at the average of both half-yearly values 					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD	Section(s):		New version No.:		
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): D.2		New version No.: v.02		
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):		New version No.:		
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:					
DOE assessment (1st round)					Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section D.2, Parameter P _{CH4e,s} :					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The half yearly data is included in the monitoring report. 2. The value monitored and applied for the monitoring period is based on the average of both half-yearly values and is appropriate. 					
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed				

CAR ID	E.8-04	Section no.	D.2	Date:	06/01/2017
---------------	--------	--------------------	-----	--------------	------------

Description of CAR		
MR version 01, Section D.2, Parameter NCV_BG:		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The description for measured / calculated / Default is incorrect. The data is measured and not default 2. The value monitored is inconsistent with the test reports. 		
Project participant response (1st round)		Date: 22/03/2018
The description was corrected the parameter value is measured. The value was replaced with values from the test reports. Data was added in the ER calculation sheet		
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s): D.2	New version No.: v.02
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s): MR CPI 2nd period CER Calculation	New version No.: v.2.0
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:	UnitConversion(1).xlsx; PTTAnalysisResult 2010-2011[1].pdf	
DOE assessment (1st round)		Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section D.2, Parameter NCV_BG:		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The description for measured / calculated / Default is correct as measured data derived from test reports. 2. The value monitored is corrected and consistent with the test reports. 		
Conclusion Tick the appropriate checkbox	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed	

CAR ID	E.8-05	Section no.	D.2	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section D.2, Parameter T _{FI} : The data was not captured in the ER spreadsheet data (processing) and monitored tabs.					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date: 22/03/2018
Even though the data was measured, it was not possible to access the data in the system at time intervals that would allow to demonstrate the full combustion of biogas in the flare. Accordingly, the flare efficiency of zero (0%) was used in the calculation of the project emissions.					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD	Section(s):		New version No.:		
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR	Section(s):		New version No.: V 02		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s): MR CPI 2nd period CER Calculation		New version No.: v.2.0		
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:					
DOE assessment (1st round)					Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section D.2, Parameter T _{FI} : Since captured data are not accessible, therefore for conservativeness, the PP has applied zero for flare efficiency to calculate project emissions.					
Conclusion Tick the appropriate checkbox	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed				

CAR ID	E.8-06	Section no.	E.1	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section E.1, Lagoon Baseline Emissions – monitored:					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data representation is incorrect. 2. The data applied for BE_{biogas,boiler,y} shall be rounded down to the integral. 3. The data applied for PE_{flare} is incorrect. 4. The total for BE_{lagoon,monitored,y} is incorrect and shall be rounded down to the integral 					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date: 22/03/2018

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data representation was corrected. 2. The data applied for BE_{biogas,boiler,y} shall was now rounded down to the integral. 3. The data applied for PE_{flare} was corrected. 4. The total for BE_{lagoon,monitored,y} was corrected and rounded down to the integral 			
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in MR	Section(s): E.1	New version No.: v.02
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:		
DOE assessment (1st round)			Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section E.1, Lagoon Baseline Emissions – monitored:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data representation is corrected. 2. The data applied for BE_{biogas,boiler,y} is rounded down to the integral. 3. The data applied for PE_{flare} is corrected 4. The total for BE_{lagoon,monitored,y} is corrected and rounded down to the integral. 			
Conclusion Tick the appropriate checkbox		<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed	

CAR ID	E.8-07	Section no.	E.1	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section E.1, total baseline emissions:					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The value for BE_{lagoon,y} = BE_{lagoon,monitored,y} is incorrect. 2. BE_{total,y} shall be rounded down to the integral. 					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date: 22/03/2018
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The value for BE_{lagoon,y} = BE_{lagoon,monitored,y} was corrected. 2. BE_{total,y} was rounded down to the integral 					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in MR	Section(s):	New version No.: v.02		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:				
DOE assessment (1st round)					Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section E.1, total baseline emissions:					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The value for BE_{lagoon,y} = BE_{lagoon,monitored,y} is corrected. 2. BE_{total,y} is rounded down to the integral. 					
Conclusion Tick the appropriate checkbox		<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed			

CAR ID	E.8-08	Section no.	E.2	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section E.2: The project emissions are not demonstrated.					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date: 22/03/2018
This happened accidentally, project emissions were re-included into section E.2					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in the PDD	Section(s):	New version No.:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in MR	Section(s):	New version No.: v.02		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s):	New version No.:		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:				
DOE assessment (1st round)					Date: 01/04/2018
MR version 02 Section E.2: The project emissions are included in revised MR. Calculations are consistent with ER spreadsheet.					
Conclusion Tick the appropriate checkbox		<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed			

CAR ID	E.8-09	Section no.	E.4	Date	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section E.4:					
1. The baseline emissions and project emissions values shall be corrected accordingly. 2. The GHG emission reductions shall be rounded down to the integral.					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date
					22/03/2018
1. The baseline emissions and project emissions values were corrected accordingly. 2. The GHG emission reductions are now rounded down to the integral.					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD		Section(s):		New version No.:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR		Section(s):		New version No.: v.02	
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS		Worksheet(s):		New version No.:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:					
DOE assessment (1st round)					Date
					01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section E.4:					
1. The baseline emissions and project emissions values are corrected after corrections made 2. For conservativeness, the GHG emission reductions were rounded down to the integral. Therefore is appropriate.					
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed			

CAR ID	E.8-10	Section no.	E.5	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
MR version 01, Section E.5: The phrase "MP2, first monitoring period" is incorrect.					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date:
					22/03/2018
The phrase "MP2, first monitoring period" was corrected, to "MP2, second monitoring period"					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD		Section(s):		New version No.:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR		Section(s):		New version No.: v.02	
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS		Worksheet(s):		New version No.:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:					
DOE assessment (1st round)					Date:
					01/04/2018
MR version 02, Section E.5: The phrase is corrected to read as "MP2, second monitoring period" to reflect the current monitoring period.					
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed			

CAR ID	E.8-11	Section no.	ER spreadsheet	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
ER spreadsheet version 2.01: Parameters that are not monitored shall be removed to avoid confusion.					
Project participant response (1st round)					Date:
					06/09/2018
Parameters not monitored were removed from the ER spreadsheet.					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in the PDD		Section(s):		New version No.:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Changes in MR		Section(s):		New version No.:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes in XLS		Worksheet(s): MR CPI 2nd period_CER Calculation		New version No.: v3.0	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:					
DOE assessment (1st round)					Date:
					06/09/2018

ER spreadsheet version 3.0: Parameters that are not monitored have been removed to avoid confusion. Therefore is appropriate.

Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed

CAR ID	E.8-12	Section no.	ER spreadsheet	Date:	06/01/2017
Description of CAR					
ER spreadsheet version .01, Project Total tab: PEflare and PEstack shall be demonstrated separately.					
Project participant response (1st round)				Date:	06/09/2018
The project emissions PEflare and PEstack were separated in the ER spreadsheet.					
Documentation provided by project participant (1st round)					
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in the PDD	Section(s):		New version No.:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in MR	Section(s):		New version No.:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Changes in XLS	Worksheet(s): MR CPI 2nd period_CER Calculation		New version No.: v3.0	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:				
DOE assessment (1st round)				Date:	06/09/2018
ER spreadsheet version 3.0, Project Total tab: PEflare and PEstack is separated.					
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken (finding remains open)				
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The finding is closed				

Table 6. FAR from this verification

FAR ID	xx	Section No.		Date:	DD/MM/YYYY
Description of FAR					
Project participant response				Date:	DD/MM/YYYY
Documentation provided by project participant					
DOE assessment				Date:	DD/MM/YYYY

Appendix 5. Monitored Parameters

Table A-5: Periodic Verification Checklist – Monitored Parameters

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
1. T2		Description: Ambient temperature (Kelvin) for the climate		
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) <i>Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements. Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.</i>	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/ /O1/	Description: The ambient temperature of the project site is based on data obtained from Chumporn weather station and converted to Kelvin values.	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.8-02	OK
		Verifier's action: The data was reviewed and cross-checked with the ER spreadsheet for correctness		
		Conclusion: The parameter is monitored according to the approved revised PDD and methodology		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.8-02 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.6-20		
b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374) <i>In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions</i>	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /QA1/ /IM01/	<input type="checkbox"/> It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	CAR E.8-02	OK
		<input type="checkbox"/> For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6		
		<input type="checkbox"/> No delayed calibration has occurred		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs. Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance. Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: End date of delay:		
		<input type="checkbox"/> A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:		
		<input type="checkbox"/> The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration		
		<input type="checkbox"/> The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/> The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/> The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals		
		<input type="checkbox"/> The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised: <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>CAR E.8-02</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.8-02			
<input type="checkbox"/>				

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
2. F_{Dig,in}		Description: Flow rate of organic wastewater into the digester		
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements. Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/ /CI1/	Description: The data is measured continuously using a flow meter, transferred online and recorded in the data logger	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.7-01	OK
		Verifier's action: The data was reviewed and cross-checked with the ER spreadsheet A delay in calibration for this monitoring period. The data for September and October 2010 did not include the calibration error of 3.9%		
		Conclusion: The parameter is monitored according to the approved revised PDD and applied methodology.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.7-01 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.6-20		
b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374) In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs. Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance.	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /QA1/ /IM01/ /CI1/	<input type="checkbox"/> It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	CAR E.7-01	OK
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6		
		<input type="checkbox"/> No delayed calibration has occurred		
		<input type="checkbox"/> As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: 01/09/2010 End date of delay: 01/10/2010 Start date of delay: 01/04/2011 End date of delay: 14/04/2011		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.7-01		
<input type="checkbox"/>					
3. F _{Dig_out}		Description: Flow rate of organic wastewater out of the digester			
a) Measurement / Determination method	/MR/	Description:			OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
(VVS, §§ 363-367) Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements. Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.	/ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/ /IC1/	The data is measured continuously using a flow meter, transferred online and recorded in the data logger. According to the approved revised PDD version 12.0, the data applied will be the data from parameter F _{Dig} .	CAR E.6-06 CAR E.6-20	
		Verifier's action: The data was reviewed and cross-checked with the ER spreadsheet. The delay in calibration for the monitoring period. The data for September and October 2010 did not include the calibration error of 3.9%		
		Conclusion: The parameter is monitored according to the approved revised PDD and applied methodology.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.6-06		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.6-20		
b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374) In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs. Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance.	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /QA1/ /IM01/ /IC1/	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	CAR E.6-06	OK
		<input type="checkbox"/> For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6		
		<input type="checkbox"/> No delayed calibration has occurred		
		<input type="checkbox"/> As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: 01/09/2010 End date of delay: 01/10/2010 Start date of delay: 01/04/2011 End date of delay: 14/04/2011		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-06		
		<input type="checkbox"/>			
4. COD _{C,baseline}		Description: COD - concentration of organic wastewater into the digester			
a) Measurement / Determination method	/MR/	Description:			OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
(VVS, §§ 363-367) Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements. Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.	/ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/ /C9/	The parameter is tested 2 times weekly internally and one per month externally by accredited laboratory. The results are compared at the end of each month and the lower value was applied in the ER calculation	CAR E.6-07 CAR E.6-20	
		Verifier's action: The data was reviewed and cross-checked with the ER spreadsheet for correctness. There was error found during calibration and the error was not applied to the October 2010 data.		
		Conclusion: The parameter is monitored in accordance to the applied methodology and approved revised PDD.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.6-20 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.6-07		
b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374) In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs. Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance.	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /QA1/ /IM01/ /C9/	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	CAR E.6-07	OK
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No delayed calibration has occurred		
		<input type="checkbox"/> As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.		<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY End date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-07			
	<input type="checkbox"/>				
5. COD_{a,in}		Description: COD that enters the lagoon.			
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/	Description: The parameter is tested 2 times weekly internally and one per month externally by accredited laboratory. The data for this parameter is same as the parameter COD _{c,dig_out} .		CAR E.6-08 CER E.6-20	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>(ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements. Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.</i>	/AM13/ /C9/	Verifier´s action: The data was reviewed and cross-checked with the ER spreadsheet for correctness. There was error found during calibration and the error was not applied to the October 2010 data.			
		Conclusion: The parameter is in accordance to the approved revised PDD and applied methodology.			
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-08		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20		
b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374) <i>In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs. Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance. Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.</i>	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /QA1/ /C9/ /IM01/	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	CAR E.6-08	OK
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	No delayed calibration has occurred		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY End date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.										
		<input type="checkbox"/> A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the: <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration</td></tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument</td></tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument</td></tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals</td></tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.</td></tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration	<input type="checkbox"/>	The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument	<input type="checkbox"/>	The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument	<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals	<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.		
<input type="checkbox"/>	The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration													
<input type="checkbox"/>	The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument													
<input type="checkbox"/>	The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument													
<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals													
<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.													
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised: <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td>CAR E.6-08</td></tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td></td></tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-08	<input type="checkbox"/>									
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-08													
<input type="checkbox"/>														
6. COD_{a,out}		Description: COD that leaves the lagoon												
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/ /C9/	Description: The parameter is tested 2 times weekly internally and one per month externally by accredited laboratory. The data for this parameter is the COD outflow from the digester. Verifier's action: The data was reviewed and cross-checked with the ER spreadsheet for correctness.	CAR E.6-08 CAR E.6-20	OK										

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.																
used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements. Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.		<p>There was error found during calibration and the error not was applied to the October 2010 data.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>The parameter is in accordance to the approved revised PDD and applied methodology.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td>In this context the following findings have been raised:</td></tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td>CAR E.6-08</td></tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td>CAR E.6-20</td></tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-08	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20												
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:																			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-08																			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20																			
<p>b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374)</p> <p><i>In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs.</i></p> <p><i>Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance.</i></p> <p><i>Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.</i></p>	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD/3 /QA1/ /IM01/ /C9/	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td>It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan</td></tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td>For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6</td></tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>No delayed calibration has occurred</td></tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td>As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.</td></tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td>Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.</td></tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY End date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY</td></tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:</td></tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between</td></tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6	<input type="checkbox"/>	No delayed calibration has occurred	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY End date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY	<input type="checkbox"/>	A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:	<input type="checkbox"/>	The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between	CAR E.6-08	OK
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan																			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6																			
<input type="checkbox"/>	No delayed calibration has occurred																			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.																			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.																			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY End date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY																			
<input type="checkbox"/>	A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:																			
<input type="checkbox"/>	The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between																			

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
			<input type="checkbox"/> scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration <input type="checkbox"/> The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument <input type="checkbox"/> The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument <input type="checkbox"/> The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals <input type="checkbox"/> The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-08		
		<input type="checkbox"/>			
7. T_{Ing}		Description: Temperature of the lagoon			
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements. Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/ /O1/	Description: The data is measured daily at site and aggregated monthly to obtain the average temperature and converted to Kelvin values. However, the data from the local weather station will be applied in the ER calculations. Verifier's action: The data was cross-checked with ER spreadsheet and the data applied is from the local weather station. Conclusion: The parameter is in accordance to the approved revised PDD and applied methodology.		CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-09	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.																		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised: <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>CAR E.6-09</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>CAR E.6-20</td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20																
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-09																					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20																					
<p>b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374) <i>In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs.</i> <i>Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance.</i> <i>Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.</i></p>	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /QA1/ /IM01/ /O1/	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>No delayed calibration has occurred</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td> Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY End date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY </td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument</td> </tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/>	It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6	<input type="checkbox"/>	No delayed calibration has occurred	<input type="checkbox"/>	As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY End date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY	<input type="checkbox"/>	A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:	<input type="checkbox"/>	The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration	<input type="checkbox"/>	The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument	CAR E.6-09	OK
<input type="checkbox"/>	It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan																					
<input type="checkbox"/>	For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6																					
<input type="checkbox"/>	No delayed calibration has occurred																					
<input type="checkbox"/>	As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.																					
<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.																					
<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY End date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY																					
<input type="checkbox"/>	A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:																					
<input type="checkbox"/>	The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration																					
<input type="checkbox"/>	The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument																					

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.												
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td> In this context the following findings have been raised: <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>CAR E.6-09</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> </td> </tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument	<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals	<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised: <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>CAR E.6-09</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-09	<input type="checkbox"/>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument															
<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals															
<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.															
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised: <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>CAR E.6-09</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-09	<input type="checkbox"/>												
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-09															
<input type="checkbox"/>																
8. D_{ing}		Description: Depth of the lagoons														
<p>a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) <i>Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements. Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.</i></p>	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/	<p><i>Description:</i> The data is measured daily at site and aggregated monthly to the average value and converted to Kelvin value for the ER calculations</p> <p><i>Verifier's action:</i> There was no data available to cross-check with ER spreadsheet for correctness.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The parameter is in accordance to the approved revised PDD and applied methodology.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>In this context the following findings have been raised:</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>CAR D.6-10</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR D.6-10	<input type="checkbox"/>		CAR E.6-10	OK						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:															
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR D.6-10															
<input type="checkbox"/>																

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p>b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374) <i>In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs.</i> <i>Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance.</i> <i>Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.</i></p>	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /QA1/ /IM01/	<input type="checkbox"/>	It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	CAR E-6-10	OK
		<input type="checkbox"/>	For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	No delayed calibration has occurred		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY End date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-10		
		<input type="checkbox"/>			
9. HG_{BL}		Description: Quantity of [additional] thermal energy that would be consumed in year y at the project site in the absence of the project activity (MJ) using fossil fuel			
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements. Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/	Description: The parameter monitored quantity of [additional] thermal energy that would be consumed at the project site in the absence of the project activity using fossil fuel. The value is calculated based on calorific values and quantity of biogas as well as standard calorific values of fossil fuel. Verifier's action: There was no data available for review to cross-check for correctness. Conclusion: The parameter is in accordance to the approved revised PDD and applied methodology. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.6-10 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.6-20		CAR E.6-10 CAR E.6-20	OK
b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374)	/MR/ /ER/	<input type="checkbox"/>	It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	CAR E.6-10	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p><i>In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs.</i></p> <p><i>Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance.</i></p> <p><i>Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.</i></p>	/PDD3/ /QA1/ /IM01/	<input type="checkbox"/> For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6		
		<input type="checkbox"/> No delayed calibration has occurred		
		<input type="checkbox"/> As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY End date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY		
		<input type="checkbox"/> A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:		
		<input type="checkbox"/> The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration		
		<input type="checkbox"/> The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/> The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/> The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals <input type="checkbox"/> The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised:		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-10		
		<input type="checkbox"/>			
10. COD_{c,dig_out}		Description: COD-concentration in discharged effluent from digester			
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements. Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/ /C9/	Description: The parameter is tested once a month internally according to the approved revised PDD. There was delay in calibration and MPE was not applied to the data for period 20/10/2010 to 01/11/2010 Verifier's action: The data in ER spreadsheet was cross-checked. Conclusion: The parameter is in accordance to the approved revised PDD and applied methodology. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.6-11 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.6-20		CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-11	OK
b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374) In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs.	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/ /QA1/ /IM01/	<input type="checkbox"/> It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan <input type="checkbox"/> For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6 <input type="checkbox"/> No delayed calibration has occurred <input type="checkbox"/> As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.		CAR E.6-11	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.						
<p><i>Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance.</i></p> <p><i>Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.</i></p>		<input type="checkbox"/> Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.								
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: 23/09/2010 End date of delay: 20/10/2010								
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the: <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.</td> </tr> </table>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration	<input type="checkbox"/>	The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument	<input type="checkbox"/>	The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration									
<input type="checkbox"/>	The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument									
<input type="checkbox"/>	The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument									
<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals									
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.									
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised: <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>CAR E.6-11</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-11	<input type="checkbox"/>							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-11									
<input type="checkbox"/>										
Description: Amount of electricity in the year y that is consumed at the project site for the project activity										
11. EL _{P,y}										

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements. Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/	Description: The parameter measure the amount of electricity consumed at the project activity site. The data is captured montly based on the invoices issued by the grid operation Provincial Electricity Authority.	CAR E.6-20	OK
		Verifier's action: The data was cross checked with ER spreadsheet for consistency		
		Conclusion: The parameter is in accordance to the approved revised PDD and applied methodology.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.6-20 <input type="checkbox"/>		
b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374) In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs. Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance. Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/ /QA1/ /IM01/	<input type="checkbox"/> It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	OK	OK
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6		
		<input type="checkbox"/> No delayed calibration has occurred		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		<div>End date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY</div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the: <div> <input type="checkbox"/> The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration <input type="checkbox"/> The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument <input type="checkbox"/> The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument <input type="checkbox"/> The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals <input type="checkbox"/> The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration. </div> </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised: <div> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> </div> </div>		
12. F_{la}		Description: Quantity of sludge used for land application after dewatering		
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)).	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/	Description: This parameter monitored the amount of sludge used for land application after dewatering system The data is measured by the weighbridge. During this monitoring period, no sludge was sent for land application.	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.7-03	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.														
<p><i>Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements.</i></p> <p><i>Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.</i></p>		<p><i>Verifier's action:</i></p> <p>There was no data in ER spreadsheet since there was no sludge disposed for land application for this monitoring period</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>The parameter is in accordance to the approved revised PDD and applied methodology.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td>In this context the following findings have been raised:</td></tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td>CAR E.6-20</td></tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td>CAR E.7-03</td></tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.7-03										
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:																	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20																	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.7-03																	
<p>b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374)</p> <p><i>In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs.</i></p> <p><i>Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance.</i></p> <p><i>Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.</i></p>	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/ /PO1/ /IM01/	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan</td></tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6</td></tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>No delayed calibration has occurred</td></tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td>As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.</td></tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.</td></tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY End date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY</td></tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:</td></tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/>	It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6	<input type="checkbox"/>	No delayed calibration has occurred	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY End date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY	<input type="checkbox"/>	A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:	OK	OK
<input type="checkbox"/>	It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan																	
<input type="checkbox"/>	For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6																	
<input type="checkbox"/>	No delayed calibration has occurred																	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.																	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.																	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY End date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY																	
<input type="checkbox"/>	A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:																	

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.7-03		
		<input type="checkbox"/>			
13. COD_{la}		Description: COD of the sludge used for land application after dewatering			
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements.	/MR/ /Er/ /PDD3/ /AM13/	Description: This parameter measured COD of sludge sent for land application. Verifier's action: During this monitoring period, there was reported data in the ER spreadsheet for October, December 2009 and February, April, June and August 2011 since there was no sludge used for land application. Conclusion: The parameter is in accordance to the approved revised PDD and applied methodology.		CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-12	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-12		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20		
b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374) <i>In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs.</i> <i>Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance.</i> <i>Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.</i>	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/ /PO1/ /IM01/	<input type="checkbox"/>	It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	CAR E.6-12	OK
		<input type="checkbox"/>	For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	No delayed calibration has occurred		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY End date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-12		
		<input type="checkbox"/>			
14. F_{c,dw}		Description: Flow rate of organic wastewater from the dewatering process			
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements. Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/	Description: The parameter measure wastewater discharged from the dewatering process continuously using a flow meter, transferred online and recorded in the data logger. Verifier's action: The ER spreadsheet was reviewed and there were monitored values and were not reported Conclusion: The parameter is in accordance to the approved revised PDD and applied methodology.		CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-13	OK
		<input type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-13		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p>b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374) <i>In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs.</i> <i>Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance.</i> <i>Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.</i></p>	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD/3 /AM13/	<input type="checkbox"/>	It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	CAR E.6-13	OK
		<input type="checkbox"/>	For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	No delayed calibration has occurred		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY End date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-13		
		<input type="checkbox"/>			
15. COD_{c,dw}		Description: COD of the wastewater from the dewatering process			
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements. Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/	Description: The parameter monitored the COD of wastewater discharged from the dewatering system. The tested weekly, 4 samples per hour, total 12 samples per day Verifier's action: The ER spreadsheet was reviewed and there were monitored values and were not reported. Conclusion: The parameter is in accordance to the approved revised PDD and applied methodology. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.6-14 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.6-20		CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-14	OK
b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374) In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/	<input type="checkbox"/> It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan <input type="checkbox"/> For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6	CAR E.6-14	OK	

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p><i>monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs.</i></p> <p><i>Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance.</i></p> <p><i>Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.</i></p>		<input type="checkbox"/> No delayed calibration has occurred		
		<input type="checkbox"/> As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY End date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY		
		<input type="checkbox"/> A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:		
		<input type="checkbox"/> The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration		
		<input type="checkbox"/> The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/> The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/> The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals		
		<input type="checkbox"/> The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.6-14		
<input type="checkbox"/>				

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
16. FR_{Bio}		Description: Biogas flow rate at digester outlet		
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements. Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/	Description: This parameter is measured continuously by a flow meter with temperature and pressure functions and data captured by the data logger. There was calibration error of 4.44% found during calibration and error applied was not consistent with the calibration report.	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.7-04	OK
		Verifier's action: During this monitoring, a delay in calibration and an error found during calibration in February 2009. The MPE of 4.44% is applied to the measured data. The ER spreadsheet was reviewed for the MPE applied is not consistent.		
		Conclusion: The parameter is in accordance to the approved revised PDD and applied methodology.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.7-04 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.6-20		
b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374) In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs.	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/ /C3/	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	CAR E.7-04	OK
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6		
		<input type="checkbox"/> No delayed calibration has occurred		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p><i>Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance.</i></p> <p><i>Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.</i></p>		<input type="checkbox"/> Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: 01/09/2010 End date of delay: 01/10/2010 Start date of delay: 21/03/2011 End date of delay: 14/04/2011		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:		
		<input type="checkbox"/> The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals		
		<input type="checkbox"/> The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.7-04 <input type="checkbox"/>		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
17. P_{CH4,bio}		Description: Biogas CH4 content at digester outlet		
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements. Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/ /C10/	Description: The parameter is measured by a handheld methane analyser on an hourly basis and aggregated monthly to obtain the weighted average. According to the approved revised PDD, the quarterly measured data needs to meet the 95% confidence level. During this monitoring period, a delay in the calibration and MPE of 8.97% applied to measure data for October 2010 and 2% applied in the measured data for April 2011	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-15	OK
		Verifier's action: The data in the ER spreadsheet was reviewed and MPE is applied to April 2011 data		
		Conclusion: The parameter is in accordance to the approved revised PDD and applied methodology.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.6-20 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.6-15		
b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374) In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs.	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/ /C10/ /QA1/	<input type="checkbox"/> It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	CAR E.6-15	OK
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6		
		<input type="checkbox"/> No delayed calibration has occurred		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.	
<p><i>Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance.</i></p> <p><i>Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.</i></p>	/IM01/	<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.			
			Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: 01/09/2010 End date of delay: 21/09/2010 Start date of delay: 21/03/2011 End date of delay: 15/04/2011			
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:			
			<input type="checkbox"/> The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration			
			<input type="checkbox"/> The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument			
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument			
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals			
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.			
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:			
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-15		
			<input type="checkbox"/>			

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
18. FR_{f,inlet}		Description: Biogas flow rate at flare inlet		
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements. Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/ /C4/	Description: This parameter is measured continuously by a flow meter with temperature and pressure functions and data captured by the data logger. The data from this parameter is used for calculating PE physical leakage according to the applied methodology. A delay in calibration during the monitoring period and MPE applied is the calibration error to data..	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-16 CAR E.7-05	OK
		Verifier's action: The data applied in the ER spreadsheets were cross checked and MPE was applied correctly. MPE applied is the error found during calibration		
		Conclusion: The parameter is in accordance to the approved revised PDD and applied methodology.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.6-16 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.7-05 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.6-20		
b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374) In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/ /C4/	<input type="checkbox"/> It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	CAR E.6-16 CAR E.7-05	OK
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6		
		<input type="checkbox"/> No delayed calibration has occurred		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs. Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance. Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.</i>	/QA1/ /IM01/	<input type="checkbox"/>	As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: 01/09/2010 End date of delay: 01/10/2010		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-16			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.7-05			
19. $T_{comb,f}$		Description: Fraction of time gas is combusted in the flare			

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements. Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/	Description: The parameter is measured using a run time meter connected to a flame continuous temperature controller. The signals of the transmitter are recorded by the electronic data logging system and show run time of the boiler.	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-17	OK
		Verifier's action: The ER spreadsheet was reviewed.		
		Conclusion: The parameter is in accordance to the approved revised PDD and applied methodology.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.6-20 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.6-15		
b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374) In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs. Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance. Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /QA1/ /IM01/	<input type="checkbox"/> It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	CAR E.6-15	OK
		<input type="checkbox"/> For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6		
		<input type="checkbox"/> No delayed calibration has occurred		
		<input type="checkbox"/> As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		<div>End date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY</div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the: <div> <input type="checkbox"/> The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration <input type="checkbox"/> The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument <input type="checkbox"/> The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument <input type="checkbox"/> The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals <input type="checkbox"/> The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration. </div> </div> <div> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised: <div> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.6-17 <input type="checkbox"/> </div> </div>		
20. PE_{flare, y}		Description: Project emissions from flaring of the residual gas stream in year y		
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/	Description: The parameter is calculated and not measured. The data from amount of biogas entering the flare system, methane content and flare exhaust temperature are used to calculate this parameter Verifier's action:	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-18	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements. Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.</i>		The input values of the 3 parameters applied in the ER spreadsheets were reviewed.			
		There was no data captured for the flare temperature, therefore PE is considered as maximum			
		<i>Conclusion:</i> The parameter is in accordance to the approved revised PDD and applied methodology.			
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-18		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20			
b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374) <i>In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs. Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance. Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.</i>	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/ /QA1/ /IM01/	<input type="checkbox"/>	It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	CAR E.6-18	OK
		<input type="checkbox"/>	For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	No delayed calibration has occurred		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY End date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-18		
		<input type="checkbox"/>			
21. FR_{e,inlet}		Description: Flow rate of the biogas entering the heat generation equipment			
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements.	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/ /C5-C7/	Description: The parameter is measured continuously by a flow meter with pressure and temperature sensors function and data captured by the data logger. MPE was not applied for the errors found during calibration of the respective flow meters. Verifier's action: The data applied in the ER spreadsheets were cross checked and MPE was applied for those period there calibration error found.		CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-16 CAR E.7-05	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.																
Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.		<p>Conclusion:</p> <p>The parameter is in accordance to the approved revised PDD and applied methodology.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td>In this context the following findings have been raised:</td></tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td>CAR E.7-05</td></tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td>CARE E.6-16</td></tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td>CAR E.6-20</td></tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.7-05	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CARE E.6-16	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20										
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:																			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.7-05																			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CARE E.6-16																			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20																			
<p>b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374)</p> <p><i>In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs.</i></p> <p><i>Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance.</i></p> <p><i>Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.</i></p>	/MR/ /PDD3/ /ER/ /C5-C7/ /QA1/ /IM01/	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan</td></tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td>For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6</td></tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>No delayed calibration has occurred</td></tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.</td></tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td>Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.</td></tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: End date of delay:</td></tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:</td></tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration</td></tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/>	It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6	<input type="checkbox"/>	No delayed calibration has occurred	<input type="checkbox"/>	As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: End date of delay:	<input type="checkbox"/>	A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:	<input type="checkbox"/>	The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration	CAR E.6-16 CAR E.7-05	OK
<input type="checkbox"/>	It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan																			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6																			
<input type="checkbox"/>	No delayed calibration has occurred																			
<input type="checkbox"/>	As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.																			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.																			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: End date of delay:																			
<input type="checkbox"/>	A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:																			
<input type="checkbox"/>	The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration																			

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.7-05		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-16		
22. FR_{e,s}		Description: Flow rate of the heat generation equipment stack gases			
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements. Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/ /TR2/	Description: The data is measured and calculated by external 3 rd party. The data is measured half yearly. Verifier's action: The data in ER was cross-checked with the test report for correctness. Conclusion: The parameter is in accordance to the approved revised PDD and applied methodology. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.6-19		CAR E.6-20 CAR E.6-19	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20		
b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374) <i>In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs.</i> <i>Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance.</i> <i>Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.</i>	/MR/ /ER/	<input type="checkbox"/>	It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	CAR E.6-19	OK
		<input type="checkbox"/>	For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	No delayed calibration has occurred		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY End date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
			calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-19		
		<input type="checkbox"/>			
23. P_{CH4,e,s}		Description: Methane content in stack gas of heat generation stack gases			
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements. Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.	/MR/	Description:		CAR E.6-20	OK
	/ER/	This parameter is measured by external 3 rd party laboratory.		CAR E.8-03	
	PDD3/	Verifier's action:			
	/AM13/	The approved revised PDD was reviewed for the historical data			
	/TR2/	Conclusion:			
b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374) In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.8-03		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	CAR E.8-03	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	No delayed calibration has occurred		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.										
<i>theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs. Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance. Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.												
		<input type="checkbox"/> Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.												
		<input type="checkbox"/> Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY End date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY												
		<input type="checkbox"/> A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the: <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.</td> </tr> </table>			<input type="checkbox"/>	The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration	<input type="checkbox"/>	The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument	<input type="checkbox"/>	The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument	<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals	<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.
		<input type="checkbox"/>			The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration									
		<input type="checkbox"/>			The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument									
		<input type="checkbox"/>			The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument									
		<input type="checkbox"/>			The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals									
		<input type="checkbox"/>			The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.									
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised:												
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.8-03														
<input type="checkbox"/>														

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
24. $T_{comb,e}$		Description: Fraction of time gas is combusted in the heat generation equipment.		
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements. Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/	Description: The parameter is measured using a run time meter connected to a flame continuous temperature controller. The signals of the transmitter are recorded by the electronic data logging system and show run time of the boiler	CAR E.6-20	OK
		Verifier's action: The data in the was reviewed and cross-checked with the ER spreadsheet		
		Conclusion: The parameter is in accordance to the approved revised PDD and applied methodology.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.6-20 <input type="checkbox"/>		
b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374) In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs. Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance.	/MR/ /ER/	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	OK	OK
		<input type="checkbox"/> For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6		
		<input type="checkbox"/> No delayed calibration has occurred		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.		<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY End date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input type="checkbox"/>			
		<input type="checkbox"/>			
25. Sa		Description: Amount of sludge applied to land.			
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level	/MR/ /PDD3/ /ER/	Description: The parameter measured the amount of sludge applied to land. During this monitoring period, no sludge was sent for land application.		CAR E.6-20	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p>(ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements. Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.</p>	/AM13/	<p>Verifier's action:</p> <p>The data in the Carbon MR was cross-checked with ER spreadsheet and there were no data measured for this monitoring period.</p>		
		<p>Conclusion:</p> <p>The parameter is in accordance to the approved revised PDD and applied methodology.</p>		
		<input type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.6-20 <input type="checkbox"/>		
<p>b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374)</p> <p>In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs.</p> <p>Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance.</p> <p>Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.</p>	/MR/ /ER/ /AM13/	<input type="checkbox"/> It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	OK	OK
		<input type="checkbox"/> For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6		
		<input type="checkbox"/> No delayed calibration has occurred		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY End date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY		
		<input type="checkbox"/> A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input type="checkbox"/>			
		<input type="checkbox"/>			
26. NC		Description: Nitrogen content in the sludge.			
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) <i>Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements.</i>	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/	Description: This parameter will be measured externally by 3 rd party laboratory. Verifier's action: During this monitoring period, no sludge was sent for land application Conclusion: The parameter is monitored in accordance to the approved revised PDD <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised:		CAR E.6-20	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<i>Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E.6-20 <input type="checkbox"/>		
<p>b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374) <i>In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs.</i> <i>Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance.</i> <i>Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.</i></p>	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ /AM13/	<input type="checkbox"/>	It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	OK	OK
<input type="checkbox"/>		For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6			
<input type="checkbox"/>		No delayed calibration has occurred			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.			
<input type="checkbox"/>		Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.			
<input type="checkbox"/>		Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY End date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY			
<input type="checkbox"/>		A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:			
		<input type="checkbox"/> The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration			
		<input type="checkbox"/> The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument			
		<input type="checkbox"/> The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument			

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input type="checkbox"/>			
		<input type="checkbox"/>			
27. EG _y		Description: Amount of electricity in the year y that would be consumed at the project site in the absence of the project activity			
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements. Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.	/MR/ /PDD3/ /AM13/	Description: The amount of electricity is the historic consumption where no emissions reductions claimed Verifier's action: The data is the ER spreadsheet was checked to confirm no ER is claimed Conclusion: The parameter is in accordance to the approved revised PDD and applied methodology.		CAR E.6-20	OK
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.6-20		
		<input type="checkbox"/>			
b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374)	/MR/ /ER/	<input type="checkbox"/>	It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	OK	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p><i>In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs.</i></p> <p><i>Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance.</i></p> <p><i>Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.</i></p>	/PDD3/ /AM13/	<input type="checkbox"/> For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6		
		<input type="checkbox"/> No delayed calibration has occurred		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY End date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY		
		<input type="checkbox"/> A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:		
		<input type="checkbox"/> The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration		
		<input type="checkbox"/> The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/> The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/> The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals		
		<input type="checkbox"/> The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.		
		<input type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised:		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
		<div><input type="checkbox"/></div> <div><input type="checkbox"/></div>		
28. NCV_BG		Description: Net calorific value of biogas (dry)		
<p>a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level (ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements. Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.</p>	/ MR / / PDD3 / / ER / / TR3 / / AM13 /	<p><i>Description:</i> The data is derived from 3rd party external testing laboratory.</p> <p><i>Verifier's action:</i> The ER spreadsheet was reviewed to cross-checked the data applied.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The parameter is in accordance to the approved revised PDD and applied methodology.</p> <div> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised: <div> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.8-04 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.6-20 </div> </div>	CAR E.6-20 CAR E.8-04	OK
<p>b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374) In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs. Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance.</p>	/ MR / / ER / / TR3 / / AM13 /	<div><input type="checkbox"/></div> <div><input type="checkbox"/></div> <div><input type="checkbox"/></div> <div><input type="checkbox"/></div> <div><input type="checkbox"/></div>	CAR E.8-04	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.		<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY End date of delay: DD/MM/YYYY		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAR E.8-04			
	<input type="checkbox"/>				
29. T_{FI}		Description: Temperature of Flare			
a) Measurement / Determination method (VVS, §§ 363-367) Describe how the monitoring parameter was measured / determined. Focus primarily on the original data level	/MR/ /PDD3/ /ER/	Description: The parameter that monitored the flare is in operating condition is the flare exhaust temperature. A thermocouple is used to monitor the flare exhaust temperature.		CAR E.6-20 CAR E.8-05	OK

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)	Draft Concl.	Final Concl.
<p>(ODL) but also describe the applied data aggregation trails (from ODL to data aggregation level zero (DAL0)). Check if relevant equipment has been exchanged and if in cases of failures / downtimes of standard equipment other measurement / determination methods have been used. Furthermore, verify the frequency of measurements as per the requirements. Assess whether the measurement / determination method is in line with the registered monitoring plan of the PDD and the applied methodology.</p>	/AM13/	During this monitoring period, the operation of the flare was not monitored properly, therefore no data available		
		Verifier's action: The ER spreadsheet was reviewed and no data available		
		Conclusion: This parameter is monitored according to the approved revised PDD and applied methodology		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In this context the following findings have been raised:		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR E.8-05		
<p>b) Accuracy, correctness and QA/QC Procedure (VVS, §§ 368-374) In case of measured (or estimated) values, check whether the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan or if significant inaccuracies occur; in this case, make sure that the most conservative assumptions theoretically possible have been made for calculating ERs. Describe whether all applicable QA/QC procedures are met. Assess further if the calibration of the monitoring equipment has been carried out in line with the latest EB guidance. Include calibration dates and information in validity of the installed monitoring equipment in the table in Appendix 6.</p>	/MR/ /ER/ /PDD3/ AM13/	<input type="checkbox"/> It is confirmed that the accuracy of the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan	CAR E.8-05	OK
		<input type="checkbox"/> For details regarding the accuracy and calibration details please refer to Appendix 6		
		<input type="checkbox"/> No delayed calibration has occurred		
		<input type="checkbox"/> As per the initial assessment the monitored value is deemed to be correct.		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Based on calibration certificates checked it can be confirmed that the monitoring equipment has been duly calibrated for this entire monitoring period.		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Based on calibration certificates checked a delay in calibration has been identified for the following period: Start date of delay: 16/09/2010 End date of delay: 30/09/2010		
		<input type="checkbox"/> A delay in calibration has been identified, the PP applied related actions and therefore the DOE can confirm that the:		

Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the verification team)	Reference	Verification Team Comments (Means and results of assessment)		Draft Concl.	Final Concl.	
			<input type="checkbox"/> The maximum permissible error of the instrument has been applied to the values during the period between scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration			
			<input type="checkbox"/> The result of the delayed calibration did not identify an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument			
			<input type="checkbox"/> The error as identified during the delayed calibration has been applied as the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the instrument			
			<input type="checkbox"/> The error has been applied in a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals			
			<input type="checkbox"/> The error has been applied all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.			
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In this context the following findings have been raised:			
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			CAR E.8-05
			<input type="checkbox"/>			

Appendix 6. Calibration dates and validity of installed monitoring equipment

Table A-6: Periodic Verification Checklist – Calibration details

Monitoring equipment	Related monitoring parameter as per applicable approved revised monitoring plan	Serial number	Type	Accuracy or accuracy class	Previous Calibration	Current Calibration	Calibration Frequency	Delay in calibration: yes/no	Period of delayed calibration
Flow Meter – FTBG001	F _{Dig,in} F _{Dig_out}	S5H904107 834	Yokogawa	±0.35 %	17/09/2009	01/10/2010	Every 6 months	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	From: 01/09/2010 To: 01/10/2010
					01/10/2010	14/04/2011		<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	From: 01/04/2011 To: 14/04/2011
					14/04/2011	29/09/2011		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	From: To:
Flow Meter - FTBG0003	FC _{,dw}	AXFA14C	Yokogawa	±0.35 %	15/09/2009	01/10/2010	Every 6 months	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	From: 01/09/2010 To: 01/10/2010
					01/10/2010	14/04/2011		<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	From: 01/04/2011 To: 14/04/2011
COD Reactor	COD _{c,baseline} COD _{c,dig_out} COD _{c,dw} COD _{a,in}	HAC070790C64 568	Hach	±3%	23/03/2010	20/10/2010	Every 6 months	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	From: 23/09/2010 To: 20/10/2010
					20/10/2010			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	From: To:
		HACH130844 1	Hach		01/11/2010	13/03/2011		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	From: To:
					13/03/2011	28/04/2011		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	From: To:

Electricity Meter - PEA	EL _{P,y}	NA	Genius	NA	NA	NA	NA	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	From: 01/09/2010 To: 30/09/2011
Electricity Meter - Internal		4D6EF3F2	Schneider	±1%	NA	03/02/2011		<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	From: To:
Weighbridge	F _{la} Sa	5159588- 5HB	Methler Toledo	±10kg	19/03/2010		Every years 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	From: To:
		4373963-4qw			1903/2010			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	From: To:
Flow meter – FTBG004	FR _{Bio}	6511	Fox	±1.0%	22/08/2008	01/10/2010	Every months 6	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	From: 01/09/2010 To: 01/10/2010
					01/10/2010	14/04/2011		<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	From: 21/03/2011 To: 14/04/2011
Gas Analyser	P _{CH4Bio}	10830	Binder	±1.0%	21/10/2008	21/09/2010	Every months 6	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	From: 01/09/2010 To: 21/09/2010
					21/09/2010	15/04/2011		<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	From: 21/03/2011 To: 15/04/2011
Flow meter – FTBG005	FR _{f,inlet}	6510	Fox	±1.0%	21/08/2008	01/10/2010	Every years 2	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	From: 01/09/2010 To: 01/10/2010
					01/10/2010	14/04/2011		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	From: To:
Run time meter – TTB003	T _{comb,f}	-	-	-	15/09/2008	15/09/2009	Every years 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	From: To:
					15/09/2009	15/04/2011		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	From: To:
Flow meter – FTBG006	FR _{e,inlet}	7714	Fox	±1%	25/06/2009	01/10/2010	Annual	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	From: 01/09/2010

								To: 01/10/2010
					01/10/2010	11/04/2011		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Flow meter – FTBG007		7715			25/06/2009	01/10/2010		<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
					01/10/2010	14/04/2011		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Flow meter – FTBG008		6509			22/08/2008	01/10/2010		<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
					01/10/2010	29/09//2011		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Thermocouple – TTBG003	T _{FI}	N/A	Type K	±1%	15/09/2009	15/04/2011	Annual	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
								From: 15/08/2010 To: 15/04/2011

- - - - -

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
02.0	31 October 2017	Revision to align with the requirements of 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: Issuance Keywords: project activities, verifying and certifying		