





Verification and certification report form for CDM project activities

(Version 01.0)

VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION REPORT

Title of the project activity	Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project
Reference number of the project activity	0822
Version number of the verification and certification report	1.2
Completion date of the verification and certification report	27/06/2017
Monitoring period number and duration of this monitoring period	12 th monitoring period 12/05/2016 - 31/12/2016
Version number of monitoring report to which this report applies	4.0; dated 26/06/2017
Crediting period of the project activity corresponding to this monitoring period	2 nd 7-year renewable crediting period (period from 17/03/2014 to 16/03/2021)
Project participant(s)	KDM S.A. The Kansai Electric Power Co., Inc. Urbaser S.A. ALLCOT A.G.
Host Party	Chile
Sectoral scope(s), selected methodology(ies), and where applicable, selected standardized baseline(s)	<u>Sectoral Scope:</u> 13 - Waste handling and disposal 1 - Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources) (project's electricity generation component) ACM0001 - "Flaring or use of landfill gas" (version 15.0)
Estimated GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals for this monitoring period in the registered PDD	809,032 tCO ₂ e
Certified GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals for this monitoring period	460,312 tCO ₂ e
Name of DOE	EPIC Sustainability Services Pvt. Ltd. (EPIC) ESSPL/CDM/2016/147
Name, position and signature of the approver of the verification and certification report	Mr. Marco Ratton (Lead Auditor) 

	<p>Mr. K Sudheendra (Director & Head - Operations)</p> 
--	--

SECTION A. Executive summary

>>

Brief summary of the project activity and performed verification assessment:

EPIC Sustainability Services Pvt. Ltd. (EPIC) has performed the 12th periodic verification assessment (3rd periodic verification within the project's 2nd 7-year renewable crediting period) for the registered CDM project activity titled "Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project". The project activity was registered by the UNFCCC on 17/03/2007 as CDM project activity with registration no. 0822 and it is currently under its 2nd 7-year renewable crediting period (period from 17/03/2014 to 16/03/2021). The performed verification assessment encompassed the monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016 (including both days) and it was performed on the basis of (i) document comprehensive review of the Monitoring Report + the latest version of the Project Design Document (PDD) valid for the 2nd 7-year renewable crediting period of the project activity (PDD version 1.6 dated 24/06/2017)^{1/2} + supporting documents; (ii) performed on-site assessment; (iii) conducted interviews with representatives of the host-country project participant and project owner/operator KDM S.A.; (iv) resolution of all identified outstanding issues (Corrective Action Requests (CARs) and Clarification Requests (CLs)) and finally (v) issuance of the Verification Report.

The project design encompasses (i) collection and destruction of landfill gas (LFG) at the Loma Los Colorados landfill through combustion under efficient and controlled conditions landfill in the 3 installed high temperature enclosed flares¹ and (ii) utilization of collected LFG as gaseous fuel for electricity generation in the installed electricity generation facility. During the whole considered monitoring period, the project activity thus promoted reduction of emissions of methane (CH₄) into the atmosphere (that would occur in the absence of the project activity (baseline scenario)). CH₄ is a powerful greenhouse gas (GHG). Furthermore, the project activity also promoted carbon dioxide (CO₂) emission reductions resulting from the displacement of CO₂ intensive electricity (under an equivalent amount to the amount of electricity generated by the project activity) which would otherwise be generated by existing grid-connected power plants, including fossil-fuel fired power plants (and addition of new power generation units) within the CDEC-SIC electricity grid of Chile in the absence of the project activity (baseline scenario).

LFG (which is rich in CH₄) has been historically generated at the Loma Los Colorados landfill as result of the anaerobic decomposition of municipal solid waste (MSW) disposed in the site using appropriate MSW landfilling techniques and procedures.

Under conformance with the project design, during the whole monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016, the electricity demand of the project activity was met by one of the following sources:

- electricity generated by the project's electricity generation infrastructure (with total combined installed capacity of 21.8 MW during the considered monitoring period);
- imports of grid electricity sourced by the CDEC-SIC electricity grid;
- electricity generated by the backup captive off-grid electricity generators (fuelled by diesel) which are installed at the project site².

The Loma Los Colorados landfill is located in the administrative district of Til-Til, 63.5 km North of Santiago. The geographical coordinates of the project site are as follows:

- 32°57'23" S (-32.9564)
- 70°48'04" W (-70.8013)

¹ As further assessed in Section E.3., the installed high temperature enclosed flares have not operated during the considered monitoring period.

² As appropriately and correctly indicated in the Monitoring Report, the installed backup captive off grid electricity generators were utilized only during temporary interruptions of supply of grid-sourced electricity to the project activity.

Scope of the verification:

The verification assessment shall ensure that reported GHG emission reductions are deemed complete and sufficiently accurate in order to be certified. The verification assessment, as an independent and objective review, shall assess and verify whether the implementation of the project activity and the measures taken to monitor and report emission reductions achieved during a considered monitoring period fully comply with the CDM criteria and relevant guidance provided by the CMP and the CDM Executive Board (CDM-EB). The verification assessment of the registered CDM project activity is based on comprehensive and detailed review of information and data made available in (i) the PDD ^{/2/}, (ii) the Monitoring Report ^{/3/} (incl. emission reduction calculation spreadsheets that are enclosed to the Monitoring Report) ^{/5/} and (iii) all other supporting documents made available to the EPIC verification team + review of information collected through performance of interviews and/or collected as part of the performed on-site visit. Furthermore, as part of the verification assessment, publicly available information is considered and reviewed as far as available and required.

The verification assessment was carried out on the basis of the following rules and requirements that are applicable for the CDM project activity:

- Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol ^{/9/},
- Guidelines for the implementation of Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol as presented in the Marrakech Accords under decision 3/CMP.1 ^{/9/} and subsequent decisions made by the Executive Board and COP/MOP,
- Other relevant rules, including applicable and valid host country legislation/regulations,
- The CDM Validation and Verification Standard (CDM-VVS) version 9.0.0 ^{/1/},
- The monitoring plan of the revised version of the PDD applicable for the 2nd 7-year renewable crediting period (PDD version 1.6) ^{/2//},
- The CDM baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0001 "Flaring or use of landfill gas" (version 15.0) ^{/7/},
- The Monitoring Report for the considered monitoring period (all versions) ^{/3/ /4/},
- The following methodological tools, which are referred in the Monitoring Report ^{/3/}:
 - "Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption" (version 01) ^{/13/}
 - "Tool to calculate project or leakage CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion" (version 02) ^{/15/}
 - "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system" (version 04.0 ^{/17/})
 - "Project emissions from flaring" (version 02.0.0) ^{/12/}
 - "Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream" (version 03.0) ^{/14/}

Verification process:

The verification process is based on applicable verification guidelines described in the latest version of the CDM validation and verification standard (CDM-VVS) ^{/1/}. In addition to that, standard auditing techniques have been applied by the appointed EPIC verification team. As part of the verification assessment, the EPIC verification team initially performed a desk review on all verification related documents, followed by an on-site visit to the project site in order to review the project implementation and its operation. For all identified inconsistencies and lack of clarity, related findings (list of outstanding issues) are raised. The next steps are to close out the findings through direct communication with the project participants and receipt of updated version of the Monitoring Report ^{/3/} and/or supporting documents and finally preparing the Verification Report. The draft version of the Verification Report undergoes a technical review by EPIC prior to its submission to the CDM-EB.

Verification assessment conclusion and summary of the verification opinion:

As part of the conducted verification assessment, the EPIC verification team identified outstanding issues (10 Correction Action Requests (CARs) and 1 Clarification Request (CL)) that were appropriately/sufficiently addressed and resolved by the host-country PP KDM S.A. (*inter alia* through revision of the Monitoring Report and supporting documents) as part of the performed verification assessment. As an outcome of the performed assessment, the EPIC verification team was able to confirm that GHG emission reductions achieved by the project activity during the considered monitoring period are correctly calculated and reported in the latest version of the Monitoring Report (version 4.0, dated 26/06/2017). Reported emission reductions are correctly determined and are in accordance with applicable monitoring requirements and GHG calculation approaches as per both the PDD and applied CDM baseline and monitoring methodology + applicable methodological tools.

Therefore, EPIC confirms and certifies that achieved GHG emission reductions for the monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016 (including both days) are correctly determined and reported as 460,312 tCO₂e.

EPIC thus requests the CDM Executive Board (CDM-EB) to issue equivalent amount of CERs for the project activity.

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 review	On-site inspection	Interview(s)	Verification findings
1.	Team Leader / Technical Expert	EI	Ratton	Marco	EPIC- Central Office	X	X	X	X
2.	Auditor	IR	Vishnu	Govindarao	EPIC- Central Office	X	-	-	X

EI: External individual

Demonstration how the appointed verification team meets the competence required for the performance of the verification assessment is included in Appendix 2.

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	IR	Radhamadhavan	Vijayaraghavan	EPIC - Central office
2.	Approver	IR	Krishnachar	Sudheendra	EPIC -Central office

IR: Internal resource

Demonstration how the appointed technical reviewer and approver of the Verification Report meet the competence required for the performance of the verification assessment is included in Appendix 2.

SECTION C. Application of materiality

C.1. Consideration of materiality in planning the verification

By acknowledging that an individual or an aggregation of undetected errors, omissions and misinterpretations could potentially undermine the possibility of achieving a verification opinion under reasonable and fair level assurance as an outcome of the verification assessment, aspects of the concept of materiality were thus considered in the context of the verification assessment in line with the requirements of both the “Guideline - Application of materiality in verification” (version 02.0)^{/44/} and the CDM Validation and Verification Standard (CDM-VVS) version 9.0.0^{/1/}.

In the context of the verification planning, while aiming to minimize the risk of having material discrepancies not being detected (detection risk) in the course of the verification assessment, EPIC performed an identification of risks that could lead to quantitative material errors, omissions and misstatements in its verification opinion.

Furthermore, the identification of actions to be performed by the appointed EPIC verification team during the verification assessment as responses to such identified risks were also included/considered in both the verification planning and later performed in the subsequent phases of the verification assessment (document desk review, on-site visit, identification/addressing of findings and reporting).

In order to ensure a deemed complete, transparent and timely execution of the verification assessment, the appointed EPIC verification team (that holds sufficient experience and expertise in CDM verification assessments for project activities encompassing LFG collection and destruction/utilization) planned a complete sequence of assessment events that were regarded as necessary to detect potentially existent major potential material errors, omissions and discrepancies and, upon addressing of such outstanding issues, arrive at a substantiated and reasonable final verification opinion (with the risks that could lead to quantitative material errors, omissions and misstatements in its verification opinion being thus sufficiently identified and addressed).

By taking into account applicable guidance from both the “Guideline - Application of materiality in verification” (version 02.0)^{/44/} and the CDM-VVS version 9.0.0^{/1/}, the threshold of materiality for the performed verification assessment was evaluated and it was concluded that the materiality threshold applicable to the project activity (based on actual emission reductions reported as achieved during the considered monitoring period as per the initial version of the Monitoring Report and the length of the considered monitoring period) is 0.5 %³.

³ As indicated in the latest version of the PDD, emission reductions to be achieved by the project activity within the whole year of 2016 were previously ex-ante estimated as being 1,261,952 tCO₂e. Such annual emission reduction estimates result in a threshold of materiality of 0.5 %. This assumption is in accordance with applicable guidance of the CDM-VVS.

As part of the verification planning, no sampling approach was considered as required for monitoring and cross-checking of data against primary data source (no sampling based-monitoring or no data cross-checking based on sampling)⁴.

While it was later confirmed that no sampling approach was required in the context of assessment of monitoring data, risks related to sampling for these particular aspects were thus not identified and, therefore no design of sampling plan for addressing such aspects was considered in the context of the verification planning.

The table below summarizes the following elements of the verification planning:

- Identified risks that could lead to material errors, omissions or misstatements (including their assessment details)
- Summary of the responses/actions to such identified risks that were later considered during the performance of the verification assessment.

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.	Inadequate installation/configuration or malfunction in measuring instruments/equipment (e.g. insufficient accuracy or inappropriateness of installed equipment/instruments)	High	Potential generation of measurement and data errors/inconstancies due to inappropriate installation/configuration or malfunction in related measuring instruments/equipment. This risk might lead to material error in calculation and reporting of achieved emission reductions.	The EPIC verification team shall confirm whether modern/state-of-the art and/or best-practice monitoring instruments/equipment are appropriately installed/configured as part of the implementation and operation of the project activity. By taking into account the significantly rate of monitoring data being recorded (LFG and LFG flaring/utilization related measurements being recorded/reported with an every-minute frequency), ideally, it is expected that a reliable process control automation is in place for typical CDM project activities encompassing LFG collection and destruction/utilization. Moreover, it should be confirmed whether trained

⁴ The EPIC verification team was also able to confirm that no sampling approach for monitoring and cross-checking of data against primary data source was applicable/required for the verification assessment covered by this Verification Report since:

- (i) as per the monitoring and GHG calculation approaches applied for the project activity (as established in the PDD and applied CDM baseline and monitoring methodology + applicable methodological tools) no sampling procedure and no sampling-based monitoring are valid/required for the determination of emission reductions achieved by the project activity during a given monitoring period;
- (ii) there is a possibility for cross-checking/reproducing all reported continuous measurement records valid for the considered monitoring period against the related primary data sources (with all reported related monitoring data being cross-checked/reproduced instead of having selected samples of data being cross-checked/reproduced). Further related assessment details valid for the performed verification assessment encompassed by this Verification Report are included in Section E.6.2, under *Data authenticity checking*.

				<p>personnel staff are in charge of operation of the project's monitoring system and that there are related QA/QC procedures in place.</p> <p>Moreover, for minimizing the risk of having incorrect monitoring data (measurement records) being considered in the context of the calculation and reporting of achieved emission reductions (in a way that calculated emission reductions are overestimated), the verification assessment ideally shall encompass a comprehensive and deemed sufficient checking of all reported data (e.g. checking of authenticity of monitoring data).</p> <p>Finally, it shall also be ensured that, in case of identification of uncertainties related to correctness/reasonability of reported monitoring data for a particular time period (e.g. measurements of LFG or flaring/utilization related monitoring for a particular minute), no emission reductions for such particular time period are accounted/claimed under such circumstances (thus minimizing risks of overestimations of claimed GHG emission reductions).</p>
2.	Inadequate accuracy and lack of correctness of monitoring data and or evaluations supplied by independent 3 rd parties (e.g. measurements of residual outgoing methane in the flare for the determination of project emissions of methane through the flare; evaluation of the compliance of management practices of the landfill as per previously established design and operation requirements for the landfill)	High	Potential generation of measurement and data errors/inconsistencies due to inappropriate installation / configuration or malfunction in related measuring instruments and/or inappropriate evaluation procedures being applied by company(ies) in charge of related measurements and evaluations to be performed by independent 3 rd party inspection service company(ies). These risks might lead to material error in calculation/determination and reporting of baseline emissions.	<p>The EPIC verification team shall confirm whether all measurements performed by independent 3rd parties are performed by company(ies) with required accreditation. It shall also be confirmed whether modern/state-of-the art and/or best-practice equipment/instruments and/or procedures are appropriately applied for related 3rd party measurements and/or evaluations. Moreover, it should be confirmed whether there are related QA/QC procedures in place.</p> <p>Finally, it shall also be ensured that, in case of identification of uncertainties related to correctness/reasonability of reported monitoring data for a particular time period (e.g. measurements of residual</p>

				<p>outgoing methane in the flare for the determination of project emissions of methane through the flare valid for a particular time period); no emission reductions for such particular time period are accounted/claimed under such circumstances (thus minimizing risks of overestimations of claimed GHG emission reductions).</p>
3.	<p>Inadequate installation/configuration or malfunction in installation/configuration of data processing/management equipment such as the project's PLC infrastructure and Win CC data management platform and data storage infrastructure (database for monitoring records).</p>	High	<p>Potential recording and reporting of monitoring data with errors and/or inconsistencies due to inappropriate installation/configuration or malfunction in related data management/processing equipment (PLC infrastructure and Win CC data management platform). This risk might lead to material error in calculation and reporting of achieved emission reductions.</p>	<p>The EPIC verification team shall confirm whether modern, state-of-the art and best practice data management/processing infrastructure (PLC infrastructure and Win CC data management platform) is appropriately installed/configured as part of the project activity implementation and operation.</p> <p>By taking into account the significantly rate of monitoring data being recorded (LFG and LFG flaring/utilization related measurements being recorded/reported with an every-minute frequency), ideally, the risk response details included under item 1 above (risk of "<i>Inadequate installation/configuration or malfunction in measuring instruments/equipment</i>") related to process control automation, training of personnel staff in charge of operation of the project's monitoring system and related QA/QC procedures are all also applicable.</p> <p>Moreover, for minimizing the risk of having incorrect monitoring data (measurement records) being considered in the context of the calculation and reporting of achieved emission reductions (in a way that calculated emission reductions are overestimated), the risk response details included under item 1 above (risk of "<i>Inadequate installation/configuration or malfunction in measuring instruments/equipment</i>") related to comprehensive and deemed sufficient checking of all</p>

				<p>reported data (e.g. checking of authenticity of monitoring data) are also applicable.</p> <p>Finally, it shall also be ensured that, in case of identification of uncertainties related to correctness/reasonability of reported monitoring data for a particular time period (e.g. measurements of LFG or flaring related monitoring for a particular minute), no emission reductions for such particular time period are accounted/claimed under such circumstances (thus minimizing risks of overestimations of claimed GHG emission reductions).</p>
4.	Errors and inconsistencies in the procedure(s) of transferring of monitoring data to a main aggregated reporting form/spreadsheet used for the determination of emission reductions.	High	Potential recording and reporting of monitoring data with errors and/or inconsistencies due to occurrence of errors and inconsistencies in the procedure(s) of transferring of monitoring data to a main aggregated reporting form/spreadsheet used for the determination of emission reductions. This risk might lead to material error in calculation and reporting of achieved emission reductions.	<p>The EPIC verification team shall confirm whether appropriate and reliable procedure(s) of transferring of monitoring data to a main aggregated reporting form/spreadsheet are in place.</p> <p>By taking into account the significantly rate of monitoring data being recorded (LFG and LFG flaring/utilization related measurements being recorded/reported with an every-minute frequency), ideally, it is expected that a reliable process control automation (or at least a semi-automated procedure(s)) are in place for transferring of monitoring data to a main aggregated reporting form/spreadsheet used for the determination of emission reductions. Moreover, it should be confirmed whether trained personnel staff are in charge of transferring of monitoring data to a main aggregated reporting form/spreadsheet and that there are related QA/QC procedures in place.</p> <p>Moreover, for minimizing the risk of having incorrect monitoring data (measurement records) being considered in the context of the calculation and reporting of achieved emission reductions (in a way that calculated emission reductions are overestimated),</p>

				<p>the risk response details included under item 1 above (risk of “<i>Inadequate installation/configuration or malfunction in measuring instruments/equipment</i>”) related to comprehensive and deemed sufficient checking of all reported data (e.g. checking of authenticity of monitoring data) are also applicable.</p> <p>Finally, it shall also be ensured that, in case of identification of uncertainties related to correctness/reasonability of reported monitoring data for a particular time period (e.g. measurements of LFG or flaring related monitoring for a particular minute), no emission reductions for such particular time period are accounted/claimed under such circumstances (thus minimizing risks of overestimations of claimed GHG emission reductions).</p>
5.	Errors and/or inconsistencies (e.g. human mistakes) in the procedure(s) for entering the values of ex-ante determined parameters and entering/applying calculation formulas to a main aggregated reporting form/spreadsheet used for the determination of emission reductions + reporting of such information in the Monitoring Report.	High	Potential reporting of monitoring data and GHG calculations with errors and/or inconsistencies due to occurrence of errors and/or inconsistencies (e.g. human mistakes) in the procedure(s) for entering the values of ex-ante determined parameters and entering/applying calculation formulas to a main aggregated reporting form/spreadsheet used for the determination of emission reductions + reporting of such information in the Monitoring Report. This risk might lead to material error in calculation and reporting of achieved emission reductions.	<p>The EPIC verification team shall confirm whether appropriate and reliable procedure(s) for entering the values of ex-ante determined parameters and entering/applying calculation formulas to a main aggregated reporting form/spreadsheet used for the determination of emission reductions are in place.</p> <p>The EPIC verification team shall also confirm whether appropriate and reliable procedure(s) for checking the correctness of such data entries and /or application of calculation formulas are in place.</p> <p>This may be checked through evaluation of the project's related working/operational procedures (incl. QA/QC procedures) and through performance of recalculations and detailed inspection in such forms/spreadsheets by the verification team.</p> <p>Moreover, it should be confirmed whether trained personnel staff are in charge of</p>

				entering the values of ex-ante determined parameters and entering/applying calculation formulas to such main aggregated reporting form/spreadsheet.
--	--	--	--	---

C.2. Consideration of materiality in conducting the verification

>>

By taking into account applicable guidance from the “Guideline - Application of materiality in verifications” (version 02.0) ^{/44/}, materiality was considered in conducting the verification.

As part of the performance of the verification assessment, the previously elaborated verification plan was applied without being revised for having potentially detected errors, omissions or misstatements being addressed through additional (and not previously planned) audit/verification procedures during the sub-sequential phases of the performance of verification assessment (e.g. document desk review, on-site visit, identification and resolution of outstanding issues (CARs and CLs), etc.).

As per the monitoring and QA/QC procedures adopted as part of operation of the project activity, as confirmed by the EPIC verification team, emission reductions are per se accounted only for monitoring data that is deemed correct, authentic and reliable (based proof of measurements performed by calibrated and well maintained monitoring equipment/instruments, checking of correctness and reasonability in recorded/reported monitoring data (e.g. data values within an acceptable/plausible range)).

In this context it is also crucial to note that, as also confirmed by the EPIC verification team, in case of identification of uncertainties related to correctness/reasonability of reported monitoring data for a particular time period (e.g. continuous measurements related monitoring for a particular minute) as part of the monitoring of the project activity, the monitoring procedure applied by the project participant KDM S.A. ensures that no emission reductions for such particular time period are claimed/accounted under such circumstances (thus minimizing risks of overestimations of claimed GHG emission reductions).

Furthermore, it is also crucial to note that as per the monitoring and GHG calculation approaches that are valid for the project activity (as established in the PDD ^{/2/} and applied CDM baseline and monitoring methodology + applicable methodological tools ^{/13/ /15/ /17/ /12/ /14/}) no sampling procedure and no sampling-based monitoring are valid/required for the determination of achieved emission reductions. Finally, it is also relevant to note that, as a response to risks identified during the planning phase of the verification, for minimizing the risks of having incorrect monitoring data (measurement records) being considered in the context of the calculation and reporting of achieved emission reductions (in a way that calculated emission reductions are overestimated), the verification assessment encompassed the performance of a checking of authenticity of all LFG and LFG flaring/utilization related monitoring data.

Data authentic check: As part of the performed verification assessment, the EPIC verification team was able to confirm that the main emission reduction calculation spreadsheet ^{/5/} completed by the host country project participant KDM S.A. is basically a MS-Excel spreadsheet that, in theory, could have recorded data being easily edited/modified (intentionally or unintentionally). Thus, this spreadsheet, if inappropriately edited, could potentially tamper reported monitoring records, thus resulting in unreal and incorrect calculation and reporting of emission reductions achieved by the project activity during the considered monitoring period. In order to ensure that all emission reductions calculations are entirely and correctly based on authentic and real monitoring records valid for the considered monitoring period, a *data authenticity check* was performed as part of the

verification assessment. Such checking aimed to ensure that only authentic and unmodified monitoring data records were used by the project participant for performing the emission reduction calculation for the considered monitoring period (thus ensuring that measurement records made available in the MS-Excel “raw data” input file ^{/6/} and measurement records reported in the main emission reduction spreadsheet were not intentionally or unintentionally edited/modified during the generation or handling of these files). Assessment details for the performed data authenticity check are included in Section E.6.2, under *Data authenticity checking*.

SECTION D. Means of verification

D.1. Desk review

>>

The EPIC verification team conducted a comprehensive and detailed desk review of all documents initially provided by representatives of KDM S.A. + other publicly available documents that are relevant for the verification assessment. The main assessed documents are listed below:

- The latest version of the PDD (version 1.6, dated 24/06/2017) ^{/2/} valid for the 2nd 7-year renewable crediting period of the project activity (from now on referred as “PDD”) for which assessment is available in the Validation Opinion Report for Post-Registration Changes for the project activity (version 1.0 dated 25/06/2017) ^{/37/}).
- The initial version of the Monitoring Report for the 12th verification of the project activity ^{/4/};
- The applied CDM baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0001 “Flaring or use of landfill gas” (version 15.0) ^{/7/} + the following methodological tools:
 - “Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption” (version 01) ^{/13/}
 - “Tool to calculate project or leakage CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion” (version 02) ^{/15/}
 - “Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system” (version 04.0 ^{/17/})
 - “Project emissions from flaring” (version 02.0.0) ^{/12/}
 - “Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream” (version 03.0) ^{/14/}
- The findings from the previous period verifications for the project activity ^{/33/ /29/ /53/ /51/ /49/ /48/ /16/},
- Relevant decisions, clarifications and guidance from the CMP of the Kyoto Protocol and the CDM Executive Board;
- Any other information and references relevant to the project activity’s resulting emission reductions (e.g., IPCC reports, data on electricity generation in the national grid or laboratory analysis and national regulations).

Besides the above-mentioned documents, the EPIC verification team also assessed other additional documents that were required to assess the accuracy of the emission reduction calculations presented in the Monitoring Report ^{/3/}.

A detailed list of all assessed documents is included in Appendix 3 (documents reviewed or referenced) of this Verification Report.

The performed desk review for the initial version of the Monitoring Report for the 12th verification of the project activity ^{/4/} included the following assessments:

- a review of data and information presented in the Monitoring Report to verify their completeness;
- a review of the monitoring plan of the PDD ^{/2/} and applied CDM baseline and monitoring methodology (ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/}) + applicable methodological tools ^{/13/ /15/ /17/ /12/ /14/}, paying particular attention to the required frequency for measuring, recording and reporting of monitoring data. Requirements related to the quality of monitoring instruments/equipment (including calibration requirements, and the QA/QC procedures) were also observed.
- an evaluation of data management and the QA/QC system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of ERs.

Through the process of the verification, the Monitoring Report ^{/3/} + supporting documents were evaluated to confirm the actions taken by the project participants to address the raised CARs and CLs. EPIC also reviewed the latest version of the Monitoring Report ^{/3/} (version 4.0 dated 26/06/2017) to confirm that all required corrections and reporting improvements were appropriately incorporated.

D.2. On-site inspection

Duration of on-site inspection: 19/04/2017 to 20/04/2017				
No.	Activity performed on-site	Site location	Date	Team member
1.	Opening meeting for the on-site visit. During such initial meeting the EPIC verification team was introduced, it was confirmed/outlined the objectives and scope of the on-site visit and it was confirmed the previously planned agenda for the on-site visit. The representatives of the project participants also introduced themselves and completed/signed the EPIC list of participants form for the on-site visit.	Project's data storage and control room	19/04/2017	Marco A. Ratton
2.	Visual inspection of the project's LFG collection system (installed LFG collecting wells and high density polyethylene pipeline network) and confirmation of correctness of related information included in the Monitoring Report and PDD regarding the implementation (project design) and operation of the project activity.	Landfill cells	19/04/2017	Marco A. Ratton
3.	Visual inspection of the project's LFG flaring facility (set of instruments/equipment comprising 3 high temperature enclosed flares, centrifugal blowers and all LFG / flaring monitoring instruments/equipment) and confirmation of correctness of related information presented in the Monitoring Report and PDD regarding the implementation (project design) and operation of the project activity.	LFG flaring facility	19/04/2017	Marco A. Ratton
4.	Visual inspection of the project's electricity generation component (set of instruments/equipment comprising LFG cooling and treatment facility, 16 engine-generators, centrifugal blowers and all LFG utilization monitoring instruments/equipment) and confirmation of correctness of related information presented in the Monitoring Report and PDD regarding the implementation (project design) and operation of the project activity.	Electricity generation facility / power substation	19/04/2017	Marco A. Ratton
5.	Visual inspection of related monitoring equipment (PLC infrastructure and Win CC data management platform and monitoring instruments) and checking/confirmation of correctness and appropriateness of data processing and data recording by the project's monitoring infrastructure as well as correctness of related information included in the Monitoring Report and PDD.	Project's data storage and control room	19/04/2017	Marco A. Ratton
6.	Visual inspection and checking/confirmation of the correctness and appropriateness of the data	LFG flaring facility / electricity	19/04/2017	Marco A. Ratton

	<p>acquisition process and procedures (including the process for retrieval of new raw data file that is used as input data (raw data) for the calculation of emission reductions) as well as correctness of related information included in the Monitoring Report and PDD.</p> <p>In the context of the performed checking, measurement figures of selected LFG and LFG flaring/utilization monitoring parameter as visualized by the EPIC verification team in the screen of the project's data supervisory system (in the project activity's control room) were compared with figures displayed in displays existent in selected monitoring equipment/instruments (for the same time instant) at the time of the on-site visit. Such data checking/comparison confirmed correct data processing and recording by the project's Win CC data management platform and monitoring equipment respectively (at the time of the performed on-site visit to the project site). Further assessment details are included in Section E.6.2.</p>	<p>generation facility / project's data storage and control room</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

7.	<p>Checking of the documented evidences provided by the host-country project participant (original documents that are kept stored in the project site + additional documentation used for cross-checking of calculation and information) and confirmation of correctness of related information presented in the Monitoring Report.</p> <p>Such checking also encompassed assessment related to performance of calibration events in monitoring instruments/equipment and overall QA/QC practices as part of the operation of the project activity (incl. assessment of authorities and responsibilities of project management and training related issues).</p>	LFG flaring facility / project's data storage and control room	20/04/2017	Marco A. Ratton
8.	<p>Performance of the <i>data authenticity checking</i> for LFG and LFG flaring/utilization related monitoring data. A <i>data authenticity checking</i> was performed for all every minute basis measurement records for selected LFG and LFG flaring/utilization related monitoring parameters (incl. sub-parameters) in order to demonstrate and ensure that only authentic/not modified monitoring data was used as input data for the emission reduction calculations for the considered monitoring period. The performed checking aimed to ensure that monitoring data were not intentionally or unintentionally edited/modified by anyone prior of being used as primary data input for the processing of emission reduction calculations. The performed checking also aimed to ensure that the emission reduction calculation spreadsheets ^{/5/} include only authentic monitoring records. Details about the performed <i>data authenticity checking</i> related monitoring data) are included in the end of this Section E.6.2.</p>	Project's data storage and control room	20/04/2017	Marco A. Ratton
9.	<p>Closure meeting for the on-site visit. During such closure meeting the verification team summarized the main observations and finding from the performed on-site visit and indicated the next steps for the verification assessment.</p>	Project's data storage and control room	20/04/2017	Marco A. Ratton

D.3. Interviews

No.	Interviewee			Date	Subject	Team member
	Last name	First name	Affiliation			
1.	Zuniga	Jose, (Mr.)	KDM S.A.	20/04/2017	In-person interviews performed during the conducted on-site visit encompassing the following topics:	Marco A. Ratton
3	Barbosa	Nuno, (Mr.)	UniCarbo - Energia e Biogás Ltda. ⁵	20/04/2017	- General implementation and operational aspects of the project activity;	
3	Keller	Alejandro (Mr.)	KDM S.A.	20/04/2017	- Technical equipment and operational issues for installed equipment; - Changes in the project activity since CDM validation and commissioning dates; - Specifications and operation of monitoring and measurement equipment/instruments; - Remaining issues from the previously performed validation and verifications assessments; - Calibration procedures for installed monitoring instruments/equipment; - Quality management system and related compliance with valid QA/QC procedures; - Involved operational and management personnel and responsibilities; - Training and practice of the operational and management personnel; - Implementation and operation of the project's monitoring plan; - Monitoring data handling and management (incl.	

⁵ As appropriately outlined in the latest version of the Monitoring Report, UniCarbo Energia e Biogás Ltda. is a CDM consulting and advisory service company that has supported the host-country project participant KDM S.A. with CDM related issues (inter alia completion of the Monitoring Report). This CDM consulting and advisory service company is not a project participant.

					data gathering, recording and reporting); - Data uncertainty and residual risks; - Performance of emission reduction calculations; - Procedural aspects of the verification; - Performance of related maintenance and repair events; - Compilation of CDM documentation (incl. the Monitoring Report).	
3.	Barbosa	Nuno	UniCarbo - Energia e Biogás Ltda.	25/04/2017	Phone call to discuss the performed corrections in the Monitoring Report in order to address Corrective Action Requests (CARs) raised as outcome of the verification assessment.	Marco A. Ratton
3.	Barbosa	Nuno	UniCarbo - Energia e Biogás Ltda.	06/05/2017	Phone call to discuss further performed corrections in the Monitoring Report in order to address Corrective Action Requests (CARs) raised as outcome of the Technical Review as part of the verification assessment.	Marco A. Ratton

D.4. Sampling approach

>>

Not applicable. No sampling approach was applied for the verification assessment⁶.

D.5. Clarification requests, corrective action requests and forward action requests raised

Areas of verification findings	No. of CL	No. of CAR	No. of FAR
Compliance of the monitoring report with the monitoring report form	CL 1	CAR 1, CAR 2, CAR 3,	-

⁶ As confirmed by the EPIC verification team, as per the monitoring and GHG calculation approaches that are valid for the project activity (as established in the PDD and applied CDM baseline and monitoring methodology + applicable methodological tools) no sampling procedure and no sampling-based monitoring are valid/required for the determination of achieved emission reductions. Moreover, as assessed in Section E.6.2 (under *Data authenticity checking*), cross-checking/reproducing for all reported LFG and LFG flaring/utilization measurement records valid for the considered monitoring period against primary data sources was performed (with all reported related monitoring data being cross-checked/reproduced instead of having selected samples of data being cross-checked/reproduced).

		CAR 4, CAR 5	
Compliance of the project implementation with the registered PDD	-	-	-
Post-registration changes	-	-	-
Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology including applicable tool and standardized baseline	-	-	-
Compliance of monitoring activities with the registered monitoring plan	-	CAR 6, CAR 10	-
Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments	-		-
Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions or net removals	-	CAR 7, CAR 8, CAR 9	-
Others (please specify)	-	-	-
Total	1	10	-

SECTION E. Verification findings

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

Means of verification	The EPIC verification team has assessed whether the latest and valid version of the Monitoring Report Form (CDM-MR-FORM, version 05.1) ^{/57/} was applied and correctly completed for the elaboration of the Monitoring Report ^{/3/} . The EPIC assessment included checking whether the form was not changed in its formatting.
Findings	<p>One CL and five CARs were raised by the EPIC verification team regarding the compliance of the initial version of the Monitoring Report with the Monitoring Report form (incl. compliance with guidelines/instructions for the completion of the Monitoring Report form):</p> <p>CL 1: The monitoring Report does not clearly specify whether version 1.5.1 of the PDD is the latest registered version of the document.</p> <p>CAR 1: Name and details of all project participants are not fully in accordance with the latest version of the Modalities of Communication (MoC) form and its annexes.</p> <p>CAR 2: The schematic diagram of the project's monitoring system as presented in Section C of the Monitoring Report does not completely reflect the project's monitoring system during the considered monitoring period.</p> <p>CAR 3: Different sections of the Monitoring Report wrongly indicate the considered monitoring period as starting on 16/05/2016.</p> <p>CAR 4: Specifications of the installed flares are not correctly indicated in Section B.1. of the Monitoring Report.</p> <p>CAR 5: While the project activity encompasses generation of electricity using collected LFG as gaseous fuel, the Monitoring Report does not refer to sectoral scope 1 - Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources).</p> <p>The representatives of the project participant KDM S.A. were requested to address the above-summarized raised CARs and CL by providing to the EPIC verification</p>

	team sufficient evidences to determine that the applicable CDM requirements have been met and/or through performance sufficient modifications (corrections/improvements) in the initial version of the Monitoring Report and/or enclosed calculation spreadsheets if applicable.
Conclusion	As a conclusion of its assessment, upon closure of the raised CL and CARs, the EPIC verification team confirmed that the latest version of the Monitoring Report ^{/3/} was correctly completed by applying the latest and valid version of the Monitoring Report Form ^{/57/} and by also sufficiently taking into consideration all applicable requirements and guidance for its completion, including deemed complete and correct description of the project activity and its monitoring aspects.

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

>>

By assessing the previously issued “*Validation Report for Renewal of Crediting Period (RCP)*” for the project activity ^{/10/}, the EPIC verification team identified no missing steps or open issues from the validation phase that would need to be addressed in the context of the performed verification assessments within the 2nd 7-year renewable crediting period for the project activity.

Furthermore, through review of the Verification Reports for the previously concluded 1st to the 9th periodic verifications for the project activity ^{/33/ /29/ /53/ /51/ /49/ /48/ /28/} and also through review of the draft versions of the Verification Reports for the not yet concluded 10th and 11th periodic verification ^{/30/ /16/} for the project activity (which are also being performed by EPIC); the EPIC verification team identified no FARs to be considered/addressed in the context of the 12th and/or future periodic verification assessments.

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

Means of verification	<p>During the performed document desk review and on-site visit, the EPIC verification team assessed whether all physical features of the project activity (including, technology, project equipment and monitoring and metering instruments/equipment) as described in the PDD ^{/2/} were in place and functional. Moreover, during the performed document desk review and on-site visit, the EPIC verification team also assessed whether the project activity has been operated by KDM S.A. during the considered monitoring period under conformance with its technical design description as outlined in the PDD.</p> <p>As outlined in Box 1 of the Monitoring Report, while during the considered monitoring period there was no excess of collected LFG (all collected LFG was directed to the project's electricity generation component for its utilization as gaseous fuel), the shut-off valves of the flares were all temporarily manually selected under “closed” position on 10/03/2014, thus ensuring that no collected LFG was directed to the high temperature enclosed flares. The EPIC assessment team has confirmed, through assessment of historical monitoring data for the project activity, that the status of such valves has been continuously electronically monitored and recorded with an every-minute basis. EPIC has also confirmed that the status of the valves has remained under “closed” position for all the three high temperature enclosed flares during the whole considered monitoring period.</p>
Findings	No related findings were raised. No CARs and CLs were raised regarding the compliance of the occurred project implementation with project design details as per the PDD ^{/2/} .
Conclusion	As a result of the performed document desk review and on-site visit, the EPIC verification team was able to confirm that all physical features of the project activity (including, technology, project equipment and monitoring and metering instruments/equipment) as described in the PDD ^{/2/} were in place and that project activity has been operated by KDM S.A. during the considered monitoring period

	<p>under full conformance with its technical design description as outlined in the PDD. The so far occurred gradual/phased implementation of the project's electricity generation infrastructure (e.g. gradual/phased implementation of the CLLC-2 electricity generation facility) is also confirmed by the EPIC verification team as being under full conformance with the forecasted time plan included in the PDD ^{/2/}.</p> <p>Moreover, the EPIC verification team was also informed in further details about the overall operational performance of the project activity during the latest 10 years (with detailed assessment being performed regarding the project's operational performance during the considered monitoring period).</p> <p>In summary, the EPIC verification team was able to confirm that the project activity was implemented and has operated during the considered monitoring period under conformance with project design details as per the PDD ^{/2/}.</p>
--	---

E.4. Post-registration changes

E.4.1. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, monitoring methodology or standardized baseline

>>

Not applicable. The verification assessment for the considered monitoring period does not include any post-registration changes.

E.4.2. Corrections

>>

The verification assessment for the considered monitoring period includes post-registration changes under the category "Corrections".

The following corrections (as appropriately outlined in Appendix 6 of the revised version of the PDD ^{/2/}) were made:

- Missing default value (applicable for generated electricity exported through the electricity grid the project activity is connected to) is added in details for the ex-ante determined (fixed) parameter "Average technical transmission and distribution losses for providing electricity to the grid and/or for grid sourced electricity consumed by the project activity" ($TDL_{grid,y}$) in Section B.6.2. Furthermore, while the previously selected 20% default value became applicable only for grid-sourced electricity imported by the project activity and is termed as $TDL_{grid,import,y}$, the added 3% missing default value is termed as $TDL_{grid,export,y}$. Texts in Sections B.6.1 and B.6.3 are adjusted accordingly.
- Calculations of ex-ante estimates of emission reductions to be achieved by the project activity during the 2nd 7-year crediting period are corrected in both Section B.6.3 and in a revised version of the emission reduction calculation spreadsheet (that is enclosed to the PDD) by taking into account the missing 3% default value for the ex-ante determined (fixed) parameter $TDL_{grid,y}$ (value applicable for generated electricity exported through the electricity grid the project activity is connected to).
- Details for the project participants of project activity are updated (as per the latest version of the completed Modalities of Communication (MoC) form for the project activity).
- The estimated annual values for the monitoring parameter "Amount of electricity generated using LFG by the project activity in year y " ($EC_{BL,y}$) (applicable for years 2014 – 2021) are correctly reported in Section B.7.1.

Assessment details about the performed corrections (in information that do not affect the project design) as reflected in the revised version of the PDD (version 1.6, dated 24/06/2017)^{12/} are included in the Validation Opinion Report for Post-Registration Changes for the project activity (version 1.0 dated 25/06/2017)^{137/}.

E.4.3. Changes to the start date of the crediting period

>>

Not applicable. The verification assessment for the considered monitoring period does not include any post-registration changes.

E.4.4. Inclusion of a monitoring plan to a registered project activity

>>

Not applicable. The verification assessment for the considered monitoring period does not include any post-registration changes.

E.4.5. Permanent changes from registered monitoring plan, monitoring methodology or standardized baseline

>>

Not applicable. The verification assessment for the considered monitoring period does not include any post-registration changes⁷.

⁷ As appropriately outlined in the Monitoring Report^{13/}, prior to the starting of the verification assessment a revised version of the PDD including permanent post-registration changes (PRCs) was completed, assessed/validated by EPIC under the "Prior approval" process track as an independent assessment (not as part of the verification assessment for the considered monitoring period and/or any other verification assessment). A request of approval of changes was previously submitted to UNFCCC for approval (under ref. PRC-0822-002) on 13/02/2017 (and later approved on 05/04/2017). Such revised version of the PDD includes the following PRCs:

Revision of the monitoring plan from the registered PDD:

- Consideration/utilization of alternative monitoring approaches as per "Appendix - Additional data handling and monitoring guidance for determining the mass flow of methane in biogas" of the latest version of the methodological tool "Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream" (version 03.0) as follows:
 - o Depending on operational conditions, monitoring approach as per Item 1. "Data substitution for methane content or biogas flow" may be applied (in case missing data are encountered in the course of determining the methane mass flow as part of the determination of $F_{CH_4, sent_flare, y}$ and $F_{CH_4, EL, y}$ along the 2nd 7-year crediting period).
 - o Depending inter alia on availability of monitoring equipment, monitoring approach as per Item 2. "Use of a single flow meter for multi-use of recovered biogas" may be applied.
 - o Inclusion of the monitoring details for the new/additional monitoring parameter "Operational status of biogas destruction devices" (Status of the biogas destruction device)" as required by the later version of the applied methodological tool "Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream" (version 03.0).

Corrections (in information that do not affect the project design):

- Missing monitoring details for the monitoring parameter "Maintenance events completed in year y as monitored by the project participants (Maintenance_y)" are added in Section B.7.3.
- Figure 2 – "Schematic flow diagram: delineation of the project boundary for the project activity during the 2nd 7-year crediting period" is corrected in terms of the number of engine-generator sets for the project's CLLC-2 electricity generation facility and location of LFG flow meters
- The formula for the determination of baseline emissions of methane ($BE_{CH_4, y}$) in the context of ex-ante estimates of emission reductions to be achieved by the project activity is corrected in Section B.6.3. Related calculations of ex-ante estimates of emission reductions to be achieved by the project activity during the 2nd 7-year crediting period are also corrected in both Section B.6.3 and in a revised version of the emission reduction calculation spreadsheet (that is enclosed to the PDD).
- Reporting in Section B.6.2 of the previously determined value for the ex-ante determined parameter "Historical amount of methane in the LFG which is captured and destroyed in the year

E.4.6. Changes to the project design of a registered project activity

>>

Not applicable. The verification assessment for the considered monitoring period does not include any post-registration changes.

E.4.7. Types of changes specific to afforestation and reforestation project activities

>>

Not applicable.

E.5. Compliance of monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology including applicable tool and standardized baseline

Means of verification	As part of both the performed document review and the on-site visit, the EPIC verification team has reviewed the application of the implemented monitoring plan along the monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016 vis-à-vis the monitoring requirements of the PDD ^{/2/} . The application of the monitoring plan during the considered monitoring period was also verified against all applicable requirements of the monitoring methodology ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/} and applied methodological tools ^{/12/ /13/ /14/ /15/} in order to confirm its compliance.
Findings	<p>As part of its verification assessment, the EPIC verification team was able to confirm that the monitoring plan was correctly implemented and was operationalized during the monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016 under full compliance with applicable requirements of the monitoring methodology ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/} and applied methodological tools ^{/12/ /13/ /14/ /15/}.</p> <p>Thus, no CARs and CLs were raised regarding the compliance of the monitoring plan with applied monitoring methodology and applied methodological tools.</p>
Conclusion	Based on the performed document desk review and performed on-site visit, the EPIC verification team confirms that the monitoring plan was applied during the period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016 in conformance with the provisions of the PDD ^{/2/} . Moreover, the applied monitoring plan also sufficiently meets all applicable requirements of the baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/} and applicable methodological tools ^{/12/ /13/ /14/ /15/} .

prior to the implementation of the project activity (2006)" ($F_{CH_4,BL,x-1}$) is corrected from 41,122 tCH₄/yr to 516.16 tCH₄/yr.

- A clarification disclaimer referring to both the issuance of the environmental license for the CLLC-2 electricity generation facility + current compliance of the implementation and operation of the facility with all valid and applicable environmental requirements (as defined by the competent environmental authority in Chile) was added in Section D.2.
- Minor previously existent typo mistakes were corrected in different sections of the PDD.

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 EPIC verification team assessed the Monitoring Report ^{/3/} and emission reduction calculation spreadsheets ^{/5/} and verified that all ex-ante determined parameters that are applicable for the performed calculations of achieved emission reductions by the project activity were correctly reported in the latest version of the Monitoring Report ^{/3/} and correctly applied (as per the valid provisions of the PDD) in the context of related emission reduction calculations.			
	The following ex-ante determined parameters were correctly applied/considered in the context of emission reduction calculations for the considered monitoring period:			
	Parameter	Applied value		
	Fraction of methane that would be oxidized in the top layer of the SWDS in the baseline (OX _{top_layer})	0.1		
	Historical amount of methane in the LFG which is captured and destroyed in the year prior to the implementation of the project activity (2006) (F _{CH4,BL,x-1})	516.16 tCH ₄ /yr		
	Global Warming Potential of CH ₄ (GWP _{CH4})	25 tCO ₂ e/tCH ₄		
	Universal ideal gases constant (R _u)	8,314 Pa.m ³ /kmol.K		
	Molecular mass of gas k (MM _k) (For the particular case of the project activity, k = N ₂)	28.01 kg/kmol		
	Molecular mass of greenhouse gas i (MM _i) (For the particular case of the project activity, i = CH ₄)	16.04 kg/kmol		
	Total pressure at normal conditions (P _n)	101,325 Pa		
	Temperature at normal conditions (T _n)	273.15 K		
	Molecular mass of water (MM _{H2O})	18.0152 kg/kmol		
	Average technical transmission and distribution losses for providing electricity to the grid and for grid sourced electricity consumed by the project activity (TDL _{grid,y})	20% (for grid-sourced electricity consumed by the project activity) and 3% (for electricity generated by the project activity and provided to the grid)		
	Manufacturer's flare specifications for temperature, flow rate and maintenance schedule interval (SPEC _{flare})	SPEC _{flare,Flare-1} SPEC _{flare,Flare-2} Operational LFG flow for each flare (for continuous operation):	Min. 850 Nm ³ /h	Max. 5,097 Nm ³ /h

			Required temperature of the exhaust gas of the flare (to ensure LFG destruction (combustion) under high CH ₄ destruction efficiency):	760 °C	1,093 °C
			Required minimum frequency for inspection and maintenance service in each flare (incl. inspection in the conditions of the flare isolation ceramics revetment material):	Min. every year	
			Required/recommended minimum frequency for replacement of the flare isolation ceramics revetment material in each flare:	After 10 years of regular and appropriate operation	
			SPEC_{flare,Flare-3}	Min.	Max.
			Operational LFG flow for each flare (for continuous operation):	510 Nm ³ /h	5,097 Nm ³ /h
			Required temperature of the exhaust gas of the flare (to ensure LFG destruction (combustion) under high CH ₄ destruction efficiency):	760 °C	1,093 °C

		Required minimum frequency for inspection and maintenance service in each flare (incl. inspection in the conditions of the flare isolation ceramics revetment material):	Min. every year								
		Required/recommended minimum frequency for replacement of the flare isolation ceramics revetment material in each flare:	After 10 years of regular and appropriate operation								
	Build margin CO ₂ emission factor in year y ($EF_{grid,BM,y}$)	0.7046 tCO ₂ /MWh									
	Operating margin CO ₂ emission factor in year y ($EF_{grid,OM,y}$)	0.7479 tCO ₂ /MWh									
	Weighting of build margin emissions factor (w_{BM})	75%									
	Weighting of operating margin emissions factor (w_{OM})	25%									
	Rated capacity of the installed captive backup electricity generators fuelled by diesel ($PP_{CP,Diesel-generator}$)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Equipment id/tag</th> <th>Power (MW)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Diesel Backup Generator I</td> <td>0.276</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Diesel Backup Generator II</td> <td>0.352</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Diesel Backup Generator III</td> <td>0.080</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Equipment id/tag	Power (MW)	Diesel Backup Generator I	0.276	Diesel Backup Generator II	0.352	Diesel Backup Generator III	0.080
	Equipment id/tag	Power (MW)									
	Diesel Backup Generator I	0.276									
	Diesel Backup Generator II	0.352									
Diesel Backup Generator III	0.080										
Average technical transmission and distribution losses for electricity sourced by the captive electricity generator ($TDL_{captive,y}$)	0										
CO ₂ emission factor for electricity sourced by the captive off-grid electricity generators ($EF_{EL,captive,y}$)	1.3 tCO ₂ /MWh										
<p>Moreover, EPIC verification tem has also assessed that the following ex-ante determined parameters (which are also included/listed in the PDD) were correctly not considered/used for the purpose of ex-post determination of baseline emissions and/or project emissions achieved by the project activity during the considered monitoring period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Efficiency of the LFG capture system that will be installed in the project activity (η_{PJ}) - Default value for model correction factor to account for model uncertainties 											

	<p>(φ_{default})</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oxidation factor (reflecting the amount of methane from the considered SWDS that is oxidized in the soil (or other material covering the waste)) (OX) - Fraction of methane in the SWDS gas (volume fraction) (F) - Fraction of degradable organic carbon (DOC) in MSW that decomposes in the considered SWDS ($\text{DOC}_{f,\text{default}}$) - Methane correction factor ($\text{MCF}_{\text{default}}$) - Fraction of degradable organic carbon in the waste type j (weight fraction) (DOC_j) - Decay rate for the waste type j (k_j) - Weight fraction of the waste type j (W_j) <p>As also outlined in the Monitoring Report ^{/3/} and the PDD ^{/2/}, the above-listed parameters are only used in the context of ex-ante estimation of emission reductions to be achieved by the project activity during the 2nd 7-year renewable crediting period.</p>
Findings	<p>A CAR was raised by the EPIC verification team regarding the parameters fixed ex-ante:</p> <p>CAR 10:</p> <p>The determination of applicable value for the parameter $\text{TDL}_{\text{grid},y}$ in the context of determination of $\text{BE}_{\text{EC},y}$ is not in accordance with applicable guidance of ACM0001 (version 15.0) and the methodological tool "Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption" (version 01).</p>
Conclusion	<p>The EPIC verification team has confirmed, upon closure of the raised CAR, that all parameters fixed ex ante (which are applicable for the calculations of achieved emission reductions by the project activity) were correctly applied as per the PDD during the monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016.</p>

E.6.2. Data and parameters monitored

Means of verification	<p>The EPIC verification team has assessed that all monitoring parameters of which monitoring is required as per the monitoring plan of the PDD ^{/2/} and by considering the applied calculation options for the determination of baseline and project emissions achieved during the monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016.</p> <p>The following tables include assessment details for parameters monitored ex post during the monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016:</p> <p><i>Assessment details for the monitoring parameter "Management of the SWDS" (Management of SWDS):</i></p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Data / Parameter: (as per the monitoring plan of the PDD):</td><td>Management of the SWDS (Management of SWDS)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Measuring, recording and reporting frequencies:</td><td>The ex-post determination of the monitoring parameter "Management of the SWDS" is not based on measurements. As correctly outlined in the Monitoring Report ^{/3/}, management aspects of the Loma los Colorados landfill are annually verified and compared against defined landfill management practices as per the previously conceived original construction and operational design of the underlying landfill. This comparison aims to confirm that management and operation of the Loma los Colordados landfill (including relevant aspects related to landfilling practice) were not intentionally modified with the unique aim of increasing generation of methane on site.</td></tr> </table>	Data / Parameter: (as per the monitoring plan of the PDD):	Management of the SWDS (Management of SWDS)	Measuring, recording and reporting frequencies:	The ex-post determination of the monitoring parameter "Management of the SWDS" is not based on measurements. As correctly outlined in the Monitoring Report ^{/3/} , management aspects of the Loma los Colorados landfill are annually verified and compared against defined landfill management practices as per the previously conceived original construction and operational design of the underlying landfill. This comparison aims to confirm that management and operation of the Loma los Colordados landfill (including relevant aspects related to landfilling practice) were not intentionally modified with the unique aim of increasing generation of methane on site.
Data / Parameter: (as per the monitoring plan of the PDD):	Management of the SWDS (Management of SWDS)				
Measuring, recording and reporting frequencies:	The ex-post determination of the monitoring parameter "Management of the SWDS" is not based on measurements. As correctly outlined in the Monitoring Report ^{/3/} , management aspects of the Loma los Colorados landfill are annually verified and compared against defined landfill management practices as per the previously conceived original construction and operational design of the underlying landfill. This comparison aims to confirm that management and operation of the Loma los Colordados landfill (including relevant aspects related to landfilling practice) were not intentionally modified with the unique aim of increasing generation of methane on site.				

	Are measuring, recording and reporting frequencies in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes. As per the monitoring plan of the PDD ^{/2/} , monitoring for the parameter "Management of the SWDS" is to be performed on the basis of the performance of a technical evaluation assessment of the overall management and operation of the Loma los Colorados with an every-year frequency. The performance of three evaluation assessments (valid for the considered monitoring period) by the independent 3 rd party engineering company "Emerge Ingenieria Ltda." is reported on the technical reports dated 12/10/2015, 05/10/2016 and 21/02/2017 ^{/60/} . These 3 rd party independent assessments were performed as per the applicable monitoring procedure for the parameter "Management of the SWDS". Performed assessments sufficiently confirms that applied monitoring frequency for the parameter "Management of SWDS" is in accordance with both the monitoring plan from the PDD ^{/2/} and ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/} .
	Type of monitoring equipment/instrument:	Not applicable. While monitoring of the parameter "Management of the SWDS" is not performed based on measurements, there are no monitoring equipment/instruments utilized.
	Is the accuracy of the monitoring equipment/instrument as stated in the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment/instrument, does the utilization of the monitoring equipment/instrument represents good monitoring practice?	Not applicable. While monitoring of the parameter "Management of the SWDS" is not performed based on measurements, there are no monitoring equipment/instruments utilized.
	If applicable, has the reported monitoring data been cross-checked with other available data or source?	<p>The outcome of the latest technical evaluation assessments performed by the independent 3rd party engineering company "Emerge Ingenieria Ltda." that are valid for the considered monitoring period are reported in the technical evaluation/declaration reports ^{/60/} dated 12/10/2015, 05/10/2016 and 21/02/2017. These documents were made available and were assessed by the EPIC verification team.</p> <p>The following is appropriately outlined in the latest version of the Monitoring Report ^{/3/}:</p> <p><i>"(...)As part of the performed annual technical evaluation, the current configuration and operational conditions of the Loma Los Colorados landfill were compared against the previously conceived design and operational conditions of the landfill prior of the occurred implementation of the project activity on the basis of different</i></p>

		<p><i>sources and assessments including inter alia:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>The original design documents of the landfill (as described in the documentation required for all phases of the environmental licensing and operational permitting for the Loma Los Colorados landfill);</i> - <i>Applicable local or national regulations; (...)"</i> <p>The EPIC verification team has verified that the issued technical evaluation/declaration reports ^{/60/} sufficiently confirm that the original conceived design of the Loma los Colorados landfill has so far not been modified. No changes in the aspects, conditions and circumstances related to management of the landfill (e.g. operations related to waste disposal, waste covering, waste compacting, management of leachate, draining of rainwater, etc.) were promoted with an aim to increase methane generation on the project site.</p>	
	<p>How were the values in the Monitoring Report (and/or supporting documents, i.e emission reduction calculation spreadsheet) verified and/or compared?</p>	<p>The EPIC verification team was able to verify that related information included in the Monitoring Report ^{/3/} is fully in accordance with the content of the evaluation/declaration reports issued by Emerge Ingenieria Ltda. dated 12/10/2015, 05/10/2016 and 21/02/2017 ^{/60/}. These technical reports were made available and were assessed by the EPIC verification team.</p>	
	<p>Does the applied monitoring data management process (from monitoring equipment/instrument to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct recording, transfer and reporting of data to be used for the emission reductions calculations? Are necessary/applicable QA/QC processes in place?</p>	<p>Yes. Details for data transfer and reporting of emission reductions (incl. relevant QA/QC process) are further assessed in the end of this Section. In the particular case of the monitoring parameter "Management of the SWDS", there are no monitoring records (figures) to be considered/accounted in the context of emission reduction calculations for the considered monitoring period.</p> <p>However, the annual comparison of applied management aspects of the Loma los Colorados landfill against the defined landfill management practices (as per the previously conceived original construction and operational design of the landfill) is required in order to confirm that management and operation of the Loma los Colorados landfill (including relevant aspects related to landfilling practice) were not intentionally modified with the unique aim of increasing generation of methane on site; thus artificially changing baseline emissions for the project site.</p> <p>As required by ACM0001 (version 15,0) ^{/7/}, any change in the management of the landfill after the implementation of the project activity is to be justified by referring to technical or regulatory</p>	

		<p>specifications and related impacts of such eventual changes should be addressed in the determination of baseline emissions. In summary, monitoring information for the parameter "Management of the SWDS" is used for the determination/confirmation of baseline emissions and/or confirmation of the project's implementation as per project design descriptions included in the PDD (in terms of operation and management conditions of the landfill from which LFG is combusted).</p>							
<p><i>Assessment details for the monitoring parameter "Volumetric flow of LFG stream in time interval t on a wet basis" ($V_{t,wb}$):</i></p>									
	<p>Data / Parameter: (as per the monitoring plan of the PDD):</p>	<p>Volumetric flow of LFG stream in time interval t on a wet basis ($V_{t,wb}$)</p> <p>(monitored as per Option C of the methodological tool "Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream" (version 03.0) ^{/14/}).</p>							
	<p>Measuring, recording and reporting frequencies:</p>	<p>During the considered monitoring period, continuously measurements of the monitoring parameter $V_{t,wb,j}$ were recorded/reported with an every minute frequency.</p>							
	<p>Are measuring, recording and reporting frequencies in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)</p>	<p>As per the PDD ^{/2/}, continuous measurements of $V_{t,wb,j}$ are to be recorded and reported under an every-minute frequency. Moreover, as per the applicable guidance of the methodological tool "Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream" (version 03.0) ^{/14/} (which is applied in accordance to ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/}), monitoring of $V_{t,wb,j}$ should be performed continuously if not specified in the underlying methodology.</p> <p>While ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/} does not explicitly specify any monitoring frequency for $V_{t,wb,j}$, the applied measuring, recording and reporting frequencies for this particular monitoring parameter (continuous measurements being recorded/reported under an every-minute frequency) are thus in accordance with both ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/} and the PDD ^{/2/}.</p>							
	<p>Type of monitoring equipment/instrument:</p>	<p>During the considered monitoring period, two LFG flow meters of the same model were used alternately to perform measurements of flow of collected LFG which is sent to the project's electricity generation infrastructure. Their specifications are as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="815 1915 1406 2067"> <tr> <th colspan="2">Specifications of the flow meters used for measuring the parameter $V_{t,wb}$</th></tr> <tr> <td>Manufacturer</td><td>Fluid Components International (FCI)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Model</td><td>ST98</td></tr> </table>	Specifications of the flow meters used for measuring the parameter $V_{t,wb}$		Manufacturer	Fluid Components International (FCI)	Model	ST98	
Specifications of the flow meters used for measuring the parameter $V_{t,wb}$									
Manufacturer	Fluid Components International (FCI)								
Model	ST98								

		Serial Number / period in use within the considered monitoring period	467251-A (instrument under operation during the period from 11/05/2016 to 15/06/2016) 437121-A (instrument under operation during the period from 15/06/2016 to 31/12/2016)	
		Accuracy:	$\pm 1.0\%$	
		Source: ^{152/}		
	Is the accuracy of the monitoring equipment/instrument as stated in the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment/instrument, does the utilization of the monitoring equipment/instrument represents good monitoring practice?	The PDD ^{12/} and ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{17/} do not specify any accuracy requirement for the LFG flow meters installed at the project site. The accuracy ranges for the installed LFG flow meters are $\pm 1.0\%$. It is EPIC contention that the use of the installed instruments represents good practice for monitoring of LFG flow.		
	If applicable, has the reported monitoring data been cross-checked with other available data or source?	Not applicable.		
	How were the values in the Monitoring Report (and/or supporting documents, i.e emission reduction calculation spreadsheet) verified and/or compared?	<p>Figures of LFG flow sent to the engine-generator sets of the electricity generation facility as visualized by the EPIC verification team in the screen of the project's data supervisory system (in the project activity's control room) were compared with figures displayed by the installed LFG flow meter (for the same time instant) at the time of the on-site visit. Such data checking/comparison confirmed correct data processing and recording by the project's Win CC data management platform and monitoring equipment respectively (at the time of the performed on-site visit to the project site). Further assessment details about recording of values measured at the project site are included in the end of this Section.</p> <p>Furthermore, a <i>data authenticity checking</i> was performed for all every minute basis measurement records of the following monitoring parameters in order to demonstrate and ensure that only authentic/not modified monitoring data was used as input data for the emission reduction calculations for the considered monitoring period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Volumetric flow of LFG stream in time interval t on a wet basis ($V_{t,wb,j}$) - Volumetric fraction of CH_4 in the collected LFG in time interval t on a wet basis ($v_{CH_4,t,wb}$) - Flame detection of flare in the minute m 		

		<p>(Flame_m) (sub-parameters Flame_{m,flare-1}, Flame_{m,flare-2}, Flame_{m,flare-3})</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Status of biogas destruction device (engine-generator sets of the electricity generation facility) (Operational status of biogas destruction devices) (sub-parameters Status_{genset-north}, Status_{genset-south}, Status_{genset-1}, Status_{genset-2}, Status_{genset-3}, Status_{genset-4}, Status_{genset-5}, Status_{genset-6}, Status_{genset-7}, Status_{genset-8}, Status_{genset-9}, Status_{genset-10}, Status_{genset-11}, Status_{genset-12}, Status_{genset-13}, Status_{genset-13}) - Operation of the equipment that consumes LFG (engine-generator sets of the electricity generation facility) (Op_{j,h}) (sub-parameters Op_{genset-1,h,y}, Op_{genset-2,h,y}, Op_{genset-3,h,y}, Op_{genset-4,h,y}, Op_{genset-5,h,y}, Op_{genset-6,h,y}, Op_{genset-7,h,y}, Op_{genset-8,h,y}, Op_{genset-9,h,y}, Op_{genset-10,h,y}, Op_{genset-11,h,y}, Op_{genset-12,h,y}, Op_{genset-13,h,y}, Op_{genset-14,h,y}, Op_{genset-north,h,y}, Op_{genset-south,h,y}) <p>The performed checking aimed to ensure that monitoring data were not intentionally or unintentionally edited/modified by anyone prior of being used as primary data input for the processing of emission reduction calculations. The performed checking also aimed to ensure that the emission reduction calculation spreadsheets ^{/5/} include only authentic monitoring records. Details about the performed <i>data authenticity checking</i> (which is valid for above-listed LFG and LFG flaring/utilization related monitoring data) are included in the end of this Section.</p>
	<p>Does the applied monitoring data management process (from monitoring equipment/instrument to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct recording, transfer and reporting of data to be used for the emission reductions calculations? Are necessary/applicable QA/QC processes in place?</p>	<p>Yes. Details for data transfer and reporting of emission reductions (incl. relevant QA/QC process) are further assessed in the end of this Section. Further details for monitoring management and quality assurance related aspects for the project activity are also included in the end of this Section.</p>
	<p><i>Assessment details for the monitoring parameter "Volumetric fraction of CH₄ in the collected LFG in time interval t on a wet basis" ($v_{CH_4,t,wb}$):</i></p>	
<p>Data / Parameter: (as per the monitoring plan of the PDD):</p>	<p>Volumetric fraction of CH₄ in the collected LFG in time interval t on a wet basis ($v_{CH_4,t,wb}$)</p> <p>(monitored as per Option C of the methodological tool "Tool to determine the mass flow of a</p>	

		<p>greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream" (version 3.00) ^{/14/}).</p>										
	<p>Measuring, recording and reporting frequencies:</p>	<p>During the monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016, continuous measurements for the monitoring parameter $v_{CH_4,t,wb}$ were recorded/reported with an every-minute frequency. As part of performed continuous measurements, samples of collected LFG continuously pass through the infrared cell of the installed continuous CH_4/O_2 content gas analyzer unit as a gas stream. Each every-minute reported value of $v_{CH_4,t,wb}$ corresponds to a measurement actually performed at the last time instant the minute in question. While it takes about 5 seconds for the collected gas to go through the filtering/cooling process prior of reaching the infra-red cell (according to information provided by the equipment manufacturer), each individual every-minute measurement that is recorded/reported for a specific time instant (for example, 12:03:00) actually represents the concentration of the gas stream that entered the gas analyzer pump five seconds before (e.g. 12:02:55). This is deemed reasonable and acceptable.</p>										
	<p>Are measuring, recording and reporting frequencies in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)</p>	<p>As per the PDD ^{/2/}, continuous measurements of $v_{CH_4,t,wb}$ are to be recorded and reported every minute. Moreover, as per the applicable guidance of the methodological tool "Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream" (version 03.0) ^{/14/} (which is applied in accordance to ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/}), monitoring of $v_{CH_4,t,wb,j}$ should be performed continuously if not specified in the underlying methodology. While ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/} does not specify any monitoring frequency for $v_{CH_4,t,wb}$, the applied measuring, recording and reporting frequencies for $v_{CH_4,t,wb}$ are thus in accordance with both ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/} and the PDD ^{/2/}.</p>										
	<p>Type of monitoring equipment/instrument:</p>	<p>During the monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016, continuous measurements of the monitoring parameter $v_{CH_4,t,wb}$ were performed by a continuous CH_4/O_2 content gas analyzer unit for which main specifications are summarized below:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="813 1635 1396 1859"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Specifications of installed continuous CH_4/O_2 content gas analyzer unit</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Manufacturer</td> <td>Siemens AG</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Model</td> <td>Ultramat 23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Serial Number</td> <td>N1-W2-678</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Accuracy</td> <td>±1.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Source: ^{/59/}</p> <p>It is important to note that EPIC was able to confirm during the performed on-site visit that the implemented LFG collection process ensures that LFG passing through the installed flow meter and through the installed continuous CH_4/O_2</p>	Specifications of installed continuous CH_4/O_2 content gas analyzer unit		Manufacturer	Siemens AG	Model	Ultramat 23	Serial Number	N1-W2-678	Accuracy	±1.0%
Specifications of installed continuous CH_4/O_2 content gas analyzer unit												
Manufacturer	Siemens AG											
Model	Ultramat 23											
Serial Number	N1-W2-678											
Accuracy	±1.0%											

		content gas analyzer unit are measured on the same basis/conditions.
	Is the accuracy of the monitoring equipment/instrument as stated in the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment/instrument, does the utilization of the monitoring equipment/instrument represents good monitoring practice?	The PDD ^{12/} and ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{13/} do not specify any accuracy requirement for the CH ₄ /O ₂ content gas analyzer unit installed at the project site. The accuracy range for the installed equipment is $\pm 1.0\%$. It is EPIC contention that the use of the installed equipment represents good practice for monitoring of CH ₄ content of LFG.
	If applicable, has the reported monitoring data been cross-checked with other available data or source?	Not applicable.
	How were the values in the Monitoring Report (and/or supporting documents, i.e emission reduction calculation spreadsheet) verified and/or compared?	<p>Figures of CH₄ content in the collected LFG as visualized by the EPIC verification team in the screen of the project's data supervisory system (in the project activity's control room) were compared with figures displayed in the display of the installed CH₄/O₂ content gas analyzer unit (for the same time instant) at the time of the on-site visit. Such data checking/comparison confirmed correct data processing and recording by the project's Win CC data management platform and monitoring equipment respectively (at the time of the performed on-site visit to the project site). Further assessment details about recording of values measured at the project site are included in the end of this Section.</p> <p>Furthermore, a <i>data authenticity checking</i> was performed for all every minute basis measurement records of the following LFG and LFG flaring/utilization related monitoring parameters (incl. sub-parameters) in order to demonstrate and ensure that only authentic/not modified monitoring data was used as input data for the emission reduction calculations for the considered monitoring period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Volumetric flow of LFG stream in time interval t on a wet basis ($V_{t,wb,j}$) - Volumetric fraction of CH₄ in the collected LFG in time interval t on a wet basis ($V_{CH_4,t,wb}$) - Flame detection of flare in the minute m (Flame_{m}) (sub-parameters Flame_{m,flare-1}, Flame_{m,flare-2}, Flame_{m,flare-3}) - Status of biogas destruction device (engine-generator sets of the electricity generation facility) (Operational status of biogas destruction devices) (sub-parameters Status_{genset-north}, Status_{genset-south}, Status_{genset-1}, Status_{genset-2})

		<p>Status_{genset-3}, Status_{genset-4}, Status_{genset-5}, Status_{genset-6}, Status_{genset-7}, Status_{genset-8}, Status_{genset-9}, Status_{genset-10}, Status_{genset-11}, Status_{genset-12}, Status_{genset-13}, Status_{genset-14})</p> <p>- Operation of the equipment that consumes LFG (engine-generator sets of the electricity generation facility) (Op_{j,h}) (sub-parameters Op_{genset-1,h,y}, Op_{genset-2,h,y}, Op_{genset-3,h,y}, Op_{genset-4,h,y}, Op_{genset-5,h,y}, Op_{genset-6,h,y}, Op_{genset-7,h,y}, Op_{genset-8,h,y}, Op_{genset-9,h,y}, Op_{genset-10,h,y}, Op_{genset-11,h,y}, Op_{genset-12,h,y}, Op_{genset-13,h,y}, Op_{genset-14,h,y}, Op_{genset-north,h,y}, Op_{genset-south,h,y})</p> <p>The performed checking aimed to ensure that monitoring data were not intentionally or unintentionally edited/modified by anyone prior of being used as primary data input for the processing of emission reduction calculations. The performed checking also aimed to ensure that the emission reduction calculation spreadsheets^{15/} include only authentic monitoring records. Details about the performed <i>data authenticity checking</i> (which is valid for above-listed LFG and LFG flaring/utilization related monitoring data) are included in the end of this Section.</p>	
	<p>Does the applied monitoring data management process (from monitoring equipment/instrument to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct recording, transfer and reporting of data to be used for the emission reductions calculations? Are necessary/applicable QA/QC processes in place?</p>	<p>Yes. Details for data transfer and reporting of emission reductions (incl. relevant QA/QC process) are assessed in the end of this Section. Further details for monitoring management and quality assurance related aspects for the project activity are also included in the end of this Section.</p>	
<p><i>Assessment details for the monitoring parameter “Operational status of biogas destruction devices” (Status of biogas destruction device):</i></p>			
	<p>Data / Parameter: (as per the monitoring plan of the PDD):</p>	<p>Operational status of biogas destruction devices (Status of biogas destruction device)</p>	
	<p>Measuring, recording and reporting frequencies:</p>	<p>The operational status of each one of the 16 engine-generator sets is recorded and reported every-minute on the basis of continuous measurements of the operational status of each engine-generator set (on the basis of the sub parameters Status_{genset-north}, Status_{genset-south}, Status_{genset-1}, Status_{genset-2}, Status_{genset-3}, Status_{genset-4}, Status_{genset-5}, Status_{genset-6}, Status_{genset-7}, Status_{genset-8}, Status_{genset-9}, Status_{genset-10}, Status_{genset-11}, Status_{genset-12}, Status_{genset-13}, Status_{genset-14}).</p>	

		<p>The operational status of each one of the 3 high temperature enclosed flares is also recorded and reported with an every-minute frequency on the basis of continuous monitoring of the signal of the UV flame detectors installed in each one of the flares (sub-parameters $Flame_{m,flare-1}$, $Flame_{m,flare-2}$, $Flame_{m,flare-3}$).</p>
	Are measuring, recording and reporting frequencies in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	<p>As per both the PDD ^{/2/} and ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/}, the operational status of each biogas destruction device shall be recorded once per minute. Thus, the applied measuring, recording and reporting frequencies for Status of biogas destruction device are thus in accordance with both ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/} and the PDD ^{/2/}.</p>
	Type of monitoring equipment/instrument:	<p>Not applicable. The operational status of the engine-generator sets, as automatically detected by the electronic control system for each engine-generator set based on functional parameters, is sent to the project's control system infrastructure and recorded as monitoring data.</p>
	Is the accuracy of the monitoring equipment/instrument as stated in the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment/instrument, does the utilization of the monitoring equipment/instrument represents good monitoring practice?	<p>Not applicable. There are no measurements for Operational status of biogas destruction devices (engine-generator sets of the electricity generation facility). While the detection of the operational status of the equipment is not based on performance of measurements, no monitoring equipment/instrument is utilized.</p>
	If applicable, has the reported monitoring data been cross-checked with other available data or source?	<p>Not applicable.</p>
	How were the values in the Monitoring Report (and/or supporting documents, i.e emission reduction calculation spreadsheet) verified and/or compared?	<p>A <i>data authenticity checking</i> was performed for all every minute basis measurement records of the following LFG and LFG flaring/utilization related monitoring parameters (incl. sub-parameters) in order to demonstrate and ensure that only authentic/not modified monitoring data was used as input data for the emission reduction calculations for the considered monitoring period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Volumetric flow of LFG stream in time interval t on a wet basis ($V_{t,wb,j}$) - Volumetric fraction of CH_4 in the collected LFG in time interval t on a wet basis ($v_{CH_4,t,wb}$) - Flame detection of flare in the minute m ($Flame_m$) (sub-parameters $Flame_{m,flare-1}$, $Flame_{m,flare-2}$, $Flame_{m,flare-3}$)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Status of biogas destruction device (engine-generator sets of the electricity generation facility) (Operational status of biogas destruction devices) (sub-parameters Status_{genset-north}, Status_{genset-south}, Status_{genset-1}, Status_{genset-2}, Status_{genset-3}, Status_{genset-4}, Status_{genset-5}, Status_{genset-6}, Status_{genset-7}, Status_{genset-8}, Status_{genset-9}, Status_{genset-10}, Status_{genset-11}, Status_{genset-12}, Status_{genset-13}, Status_{genset-14}) - Operation of the equipment that consumes LFG (engine-generator sets of the electricity generation facility) (Op_{j,h}) (sub-parameters Op_{genset-1,h,y}, Op_{genset-2,h,y}, Op_{genset-3,h,y}, Op_{genset-4,h,y}, Op_{genset-5,h,y}, Op_{genset-6,h,y}, Op_{genset-7,h,y}, Op_{genset-8,h,y}, Op_{genset-9,h,y}, Op_{genset-10,h,y}, Op_{genset-11,h,y}, Op_{genset-12,h,y}, Op_{genset-13,h,y}, Op_{genset-14,h,y}, Op_{genset-north,h,y}, Op_{genset-south,h,y}) <p>The performed checking aimed to ensure that monitoring data were not intentionally or unintentionally edited/modified by anyone prior of being used as primary data input for the processing of emission reduction calculations. The performed checking also aimed to ensure that the emission reduction calculation spreadsheets ^{/5/} include only authentic monitoring records. Details about the performed <i>data authenticity checking</i> (which is valid for above-listed LFG and LFG flaring/utilization related monitoring data) are included in the end of this Section.</p>						
	<p>Does the applied monitoring data management process (from monitoring equipment/instrument to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct recording, transfer and reporting of data to be used for the emission reductions calculations? Are necessary/applicable QA/QC processes in place?</p>	<p>Yes. Details for data transfer and reporting of emission reductions (incl. relevant QA/QC process) are assessed in the end of this Section. Further details for monitoring management and quality assurance related aspects for the project activity are also included in the end of this Section.</p>						
	<p><i>Assessment details for the monitoring parameter "Amount of grid electricity consumed by the project activity during the year y" (EC_{PJ,grid,y}):</i></p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="446 1854 805 1944">Data / Parameter: (as per the monitoring plan of the PDD):</td> <td data-bbox="805 1854 1417 1944">Amount of grid electricity consumed by the project activity during the year y (EC_{PJ,grid,y})</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="446 1944 805 2065">Measuring, recording and reporting frequencies:</td> <td data-bbox="805 1944 1417 2065">During the considered monitoring period, accumulated values of continuously measurements of the monitoring parameter EC_{PJ,grid,y} were aggregated and recorded/reported</td> </tr> </table>			Data / Parameter: (as per the monitoring plan of the PDD):	Amount of grid electricity consumed by the project activity during the year y (EC _{PJ,grid,y})	Measuring, recording and reporting frequencies:	During the considered monitoring period, accumulated values of continuously measurements of the monitoring parameter EC _{PJ,grid,y} were aggregated and recorded/reported	
Data / Parameter: (as per the monitoring plan of the PDD):	Amount of grid electricity consumed by the project activity during the year y (EC _{PJ,grid,y})							
Measuring, recording and reporting frequencies:	During the considered monitoring period, accumulated values of continuously measurements of the monitoring parameter EC _{PJ,grid,y} were aggregated and recorded/reported							

		every hour by KDM S.A.										
	Are measuring, recording and reporting frequencies in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	As per the PDD ^{/2/} , continuous measurements of $EC_{PJ,grid,y}$ are to be recorded and reported at least at least once a week. The “Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption” ^{/13/} , and ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/} do not clearly indicate recording and reporting frequencies for continuous measurements for the parameter $EC_{PJ,grid,y}$. Thus, the adopted measuring, recording and reporting frequencies are assumed as in accordance with the monitoring plan of the PDD ^{/2/} , the “Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption” ^{/13/} and ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/} .										
	Type of monitoring equipment/instrument:	<p>Amount of grid-sourced electricity consumed by the project activity during the considered monitoring period was continuously measured by an electricity meter for which main specifications are as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <th colspan="2">Specifications of the installed electricity meter</th></tr> <tr> <td>Manufacturer</td><td>Schneider Electric</td></tr> <tr> <td>Model</td><td>ION 8600 (bi-directional meter)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Serial Number</td><td>PT-1011A447-01</td></tr> <tr> <td>Accuracy</td><td>±0.2%</td></tr> </table> <p>Source: ^{/50/}</p>	Specifications of the installed electricity meter		Manufacturer	Schneider Electric	Model	ION 8600 (bi-directional meter)	Serial Number	PT-1011A447-01	Accuracy	±0.2%
Specifications of the installed electricity meter												
Manufacturer	Schneider Electric											
Model	ION 8600 (bi-directional meter)											
Serial Number	PT-1011A447-01											
Accuracy	±0.2%											
	Is the accuracy of the monitoring equipment/instrument as stated in the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment/instrument, does the utilization of the monitoring equipment/instrument represents good monitoring practice?	The PDD ^{/2/} , the “Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption” ^{/13/} and ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/} do not specify any accuracy requirement for the electricity meter installed at the project site. The accuracy range for the installed instrument is ±0.2%. It is EPIC contention that the use of the installed instrument represents good practice for monitoring of consumption of grid-sourced electricity by the project activity.										
	If applicable, has the reported monitoring data been cross-checked with other available data or source?	Records of grid-sourced electricity consumed by the project activity during the considered monitoring period, as reported in the summarized emission reduction calculation spreadsheet ^{/5/} and Monitoring Report ^{/3/} were cross-checked with monthly reports issued by CDEC-SIC ^{/xx/} which were made available and assessed by the EPIC verification team during the performed on-site visit. Such cross-checking confirmed correctness of reported data for $EC_{PJ,y}$ during the considered monitoring period.										
	How were the values in the Monitoring Report (and/or supporting documents, i.e emission reduction	The EPIC verification team has confirmed that values for the monitoring parameter $EC_{PJ,grid,y}$ as reported in the summarized emission reduction calculation spreadsheet ^{/5/} and Monitoring Report										

	calculation spreadsheet) verified and/or compared?	^{/3/} are as per the primary monitoring records.										
	Does the applied monitoring data management process (from monitoring equipment/instrument to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct recording, transfer and reporting of data to be used for the emission reductions calculations? Are necessary/applicable QA/QC processes in place?	Details for monitoring management and quality assurance related aspects for the project activity are also included in the end of this Section.										
	<i>Assessment details for the monitoring parameter "Amount of electricity generated using LFG by the project activity in year y" (EC_{BL,y})</i>											
	Data / Parameter: (as per the monitoring plan of the PDD):	Amount of electricity generated using LFG by the project activity in year y" (EC _{BL,y})										
	Measuring, recording and reporting frequencies:	During the considered monitoring period, accumulated values of continuously measurements of the monitoring parameter EC _{BL,y} were aggregated and recorded/reported every hour by KDM S.A.										
	Are measuring, recording and reporting frequencies in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	As per the PDD ^{/2/} , continuous measurements of EC _{BL,y} are to be recorded and reported at least once a week. The "Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption" ^{/13/} , and ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/} do not clearly indicate recording and reporting frequencies for continuous measurements for the parameter EC _{BL,y} . Thus, the adopted measuring, recording and reporting frequencies are assumed as in accordance with the monitoring plan of the PDD ^{/2/} , the "Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption" ^{/13/} and ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/} .										
	Type of monitoring equipment/instrument:	<p>Net electricity generated by the project activity during the considered monitoring period was measured by the same bi-directional electricity meter used to measure grid-sourced electricity consumed by the project activity. The main specifications of the electricity meter are as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="813 1780 1396 2004"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Specifications of the installed electricity meter</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Manufacturer</td> <td>Schneider Electric</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Model</td> <td>ION 8600 (bi-directional meter)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Serial Number</td> <td>PT-1011A447-01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Accuracy</td> <td>±0.2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Source: ^{/50/}</p>	Specifications of the installed electricity meter		Manufacturer	Schneider Electric	Model	ION 8600 (bi-directional meter)	Serial Number	PT-1011A447-01	Accuracy	±0.2%
Specifications of the installed electricity meter												
Manufacturer	Schneider Electric											
Model	ION 8600 (bi-directional meter)											
Serial Number	PT-1011A447-01											
Accuracy	±0.2%											

	Is the accuracy of the monitoring equipment/instrument as stated in the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment/instrument, does the utilization of the monitoring equipment/instrument represents good monitoring practice?	The PDD ^{/2/} , the “Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption” ^{/13/} and ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/} do not specify any accuracy requirement for the electricity meter installed. The accuracy range for the installed instruments is $\pm 0.2\%$. It is EPIC contention that the use of the installed instrument represents good practice for monitoring of consumption of grid-sourced electricity by the project activity.
	If applicable, has the reported monitoring data been cross-checked with other available data or source?	Records of net electricity generated by the project activity and exported to the CDEC-SIC grid during the considered monitoring period, as reported in the summarized emission reduction calculation spreadsheet ^{/5/} and Monitoring Report ^{/3/} were cross-checked with the monthly reports issued by CDEC-SIC ^{/xx/} which were made available and assessed by the EPIC verification team during the performed on-site visit. Such cross-checking confirmed correctness of reported data for $EC_{BL,y}$ during the considered monitoring period.
	How were the values in the Monitoring Report (and/or supporting documents, i.e emission reduction calculation spreadsheet) verified and/or compared?	The EPIC verification team has confirmed that values for the monitoring parameter $EC_{BL,y}$ as reported in the summarized emission reduction calculation spreadsheet ^{/5/} and Monitoring Report ^{/3/} are as per the primary monitoring records.
	Does the applied monitoring data management process (from monitoring equipment/instrument to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct recording, transfer and reporting of data to be used for the emission reductions calculations? Are necessary/applicable QA/QC processes in place?	Details for monitoring management and quality assurance related aspects for the project activity are also included in the end of this Section.
<i>Assessment details for the monitoring parameter “Operation of the equipment that consumes LFG (engine-generator sets of the electricity generation facility)” ($Op_{j,h}$)</i>		
	Data / Parameter: (as per the monitoring plan of the PDD):	Operation of the equipment that consumes LFG (engine-generator sets of the electricity generation facility) ($Op_{j,h}$)
	Measuring, recording and reporting frequencies:	During the considered monitoring period, the operational status of each one of the 16 engine-generator sets were recorded and reported every-minute on the basis of continuous measurements of the operational status of each engine-generator set (on the basis of the sub parameters $Op_{genset-1,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-2,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-3,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-4,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-5,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-6,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-7,h,y}$,

		<p>$Op_{\text{genset-8,h,y}}, Op_{\text{genset-9,h,y}}, Op_{\text{genset-10,h,y}}, Op_{\text{genset-11,h,y}}, Op_{\text{genset-12,h,y}}, Op_{\text{genset-13,h,y}}, Op_{\text{genset-14,h,y}}, Op_{\text{genset-north,h,y}}, Op_{\text{genset-south,h,y}}.$</p> <p>As confirmed by the EPIC verification team through assessment of the main emission reduction calculation spreadsheet ^{/5/} valid for the considered monitoring period, for every minute m that a particular engine-generator set was operational, the operational status for this particular minute is set as 1 (1 = "on") for the engine-generator set in question, otherwise the operational status is set to 0 (0 = "off").</p>	
	Are measuring, recording and reporting frequencies in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	As per both the PDD ^{/2/} and ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/} , the operational status of each engine-generator set shall be recorded once per minute. Thus, the applied measuring, recording and reporting frequencies for $Op_{j,h}$ are thus in accordance with both ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/} and the PDD ^{/2/} .	
	Type of monitoring equipment/instrument:	Not applicable. The operational status the engine-generator sets, as automatically detected by the electronic control system for each engine-generator set based on functional parameters, is sent to the project's control system infrastructure and recorded as monitoring data.	
	Is the accuracy of the monitoring equipment/instrument as stated in the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment/instrument, does the utilization of the monitoring equipment/instrument represents good monitoring practice?	Not applicable. There are no measurements for operation status of the equipment that consumes LFG (engine-generator sets of the electricity generation facility). While the detection of the operational status of the equipment is not based on performance of measurements, no monitoring equipment/instrument is utilized.	
	If applicable, has the reported monitoring data been cross-checked with other available data or source?	Not applicable.	
	How were the values in the Monitoring Report (and/or supporting documents, i.e emission reduction calculation spreadsheet) verified and/or compared?	<p>A <i>data authenticity checking</i> was performed for all every minute basis measurement records of the following LFG and LFG flaring/utilization related monitoring parameters (incl. sub-parameters) in order to demonstrate and ensure that only authentic/not modified monitoring data was used as input data for the emission reduction calculations for the considered monitoring period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Volumetric flow of LFG stream in time interval t on a wet basis ($V_{t,wb,i}$) - Volumetric fraction of CH_4 in the collected LFG in time interval t on a wet 	

		<p>basis ($v_{CH_4,t,wb}$)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Flame detection of flare in the minute m ($Flame_m$) (sub-parameters $Flame_{m,flare-1}$, $Flame_{m,flare-2}$, $Flame_{m,flare-3}$) - Status of biogas destruction device (engine-generator sets of the electricity generation facility) (Operational status of biogas destruction devices) (sub-parameters $Status_{genset-north}$, $Status_{genset-south}$, $Status_{genset-1}$, $Status_{genset-2}$, $Status_{genset-3}$, $Status_{genset-4}$, $Status_{genset-5}$, $Status_{genset-6}$, $Status_{genset-7}$, $Status_{genset-8}$, $Status_{genset-9}$, $Status_{genset-10}$, $Status_{genset-11}$, $Status_{genset-12}$, $Status_{genset-13}$, $Status_{genset-14}$) - Operation of the equipment that consumes LFG (engine-generator sets of the electricity generation facility) ($Op_{i,h}$) (sub-parameters $Op_{genset-1,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-2,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-3,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-4,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-5,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-6,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-7,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-8,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-9,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-10,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-11,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-12,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-13,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-14,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-north,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-south,h,y}$) <p>The performed checking aimed to ensure that monitoring data were not intentionally or unintentionally edited/modified by anyone prior of being used as primary data input for the processing of emission reduction calculations. The performed checking also aimed to ensure that the emission reduction calculation spreadsheets ^{/5/} include only authentic monitoring records. Details about the performed <i>data authenticity checking</i> (which is valid for above-listed LFG and LFG flaring/utilization related monitoring data) are included in the end of this Section.</p>
	<p>Does the applied monitoring data management process (from monitoring equipment/instrument to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct recording, transfer and reporting of data to be used for the emission reductions calculations? Are necessary/applicable QA/QC processes in place?</p>	<p>Yes. Details for data transfer and reporting of emission reductions (incl. relevant QA/QC process) are assessed in the end of this Section. Further details for monitoring management and quality assurance related aspects for the project activity are also included in the end of this Section.</p>
	<p><i>Assessment details for the monitoring parameter "Flame detection of flare in the minute m" ($Flame_m$):</i></p>	
<p>Data / Parameter:</p>	<p>Flame detection of flare in the minute m</p>	

	(as per the monitoring plan of the PDD):	(Flame _m)																				
	Measuring, recording and reporting frequencies:	<p>During the considered monitoring period, the operational status of the flares was recorded and reported every-minute on the basis of continuous measurements of the status of flame in the flares.</p> <p>As confirmed by the EPIC verification team through assessment of the main emission reduction calculation spreadsheets ^{/5/}, for every minute <i>m</i> during which flame was detected in a given flare, the flame status of the flare in question for each minute is set as 1 (1 = Flame “on”), otherwise the flame status of the flare for the given minute is set to 0 (0 = Flame “off”). As further explained in Section E.3., while no collected LFG was directed to the enclosed flares during the considered monitoring period, the flame status for the 3 flares was set as “off” during the entire monitoring period.</p>																				
	Are measuring, recording and reporting frequencies in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	As per both the PDD ^{/2/} and the methodological tool “Project emissions from flaring” (version 02.0.0) ^{/12/} , (which is applied in accordance to ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/}), the operational status of the flares is to be recorded once per minute. Thus, the applied measuring, recording and reporting frequencies for Flame _m are thus in accordance with both ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/} and the PDD ^{/2/} .																				
Type of monitoring equipment/instrument:	<p>Monitoring of the operational status of each flare (calculation sub-parameters Flame_{m,flare-1}, Flame_{m,flare-2} and Flame_{m,flare-3}) is performed by 3 installed UV flame detectors (one for each installed high temperature enclosed flare).</p> <p><i>UV Flame detector used for monitoring Flame_{m,flare-1}:</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="821 1370 1407 1559"> <tr> <th colspan="2">Specifications of the UV Flame detector installed on Flare 1</th></tr> <tr> <td>Manufacturer</td><td>Honeywell Analytics Ltd.</td></tr> <tr> <td>Model</td><td>C7035A 1031</td></tr> <tr> <td>Serial Number</td><td>No Serial Number is indicated in the monitoring instrument</td></tr> </table> <p>Source: ^{/41/}</p> <p><i>UV Flame detector used for monitoring Flame_{m,flare-2}:</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="821 1680 1407 1868"> <tr> <th colspan="2">Specifications of the UV Flame detector installed on Flare 2</th></tr> <tr> <td>Manufacturer</td><td>Honeywell Analytics Ltd.</td></tr> <tr> <td>Model</td><td>C7035A 1031</td></tr> <tr> <td>Serial Number</td><td>No Serial Number is indicated in the monitoring instrument</td></tr> </table> <p>Source: ^{/41/}</p> <p><i>UV Flame detector used for monitoring Flame_{m,flare-3}:</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="821 1989 1407 2085"> <tr> <th colspan="2">Specifications of the UV Flame detector installed on Flare 3</th></tr> <tr> <td>Manufacturer</td><td>Honeywell Analytics Ltd.</td></tr> </table>		Specifications of the UV Flame detector installed on Flare 1		Manufacturer	Honeywell Analytics Ltd.	Model	C7035A 1031	Serial Number	No Serial Number is indicated in the monitoring instrument	Specifications of the UV Flame detector installed on Flare 2		Manufacturer	Honeywell Analytics Ltd.	Model	C7035A 1031	Serial Number	No Serial Number is indicated in the monitoring instrument	Specifications of the UV Flame detector installed on Flare 3		Manufacturer	Honeywell Analytics Ltd.
Specifications of the UV Flame detector installed on Flare 1																						
Manufacturer	Honeywell Analytics Ltd.																					
Model	C7035A 1031																					
Serial Number	No Serial Number is indicated in the monitoring instrument																					
Specifications of the UV Flame detector installed on Flare 2																						
Manufacturer	Honeywell Analytics Ltd.																					
Model	C7035A 1031																					
Serial Number	No Serial Number is indicated in the monitoring instrument																					
Specifications of the UV Flame detector installed on Flare 3																						
Manufacturer	Honeywell Analytics Ltd.																					

		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Model</td><td>C7035A 1031</td></tr> <tr> <td>Serial Number</td><td>No Serial Number is indicated in the monitoring instrument</td></tr> </table> <p>Source: ^{741/}</p>	Model	C7035A 1031	Serial Number	No Serial Number is indicated in the monitoring instrument	
Model	C7035A 1031						
Serial Number	No Serial Number is indicated in the monitoring instrument						
Is the accuracy of the monitoring equipment/instrument as stated in the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment/instrument, does the utilization of the monitoring equipment/instrument represents good monitoring practice?	Not applicable. There are no measured values for Flame detection of flare in the minute m .						
If applicable, has the reported monitoring data been cross-checked with other available data or source?	Not applicable.						
How were the values in the Monitoring Report (and/or supporting documents, i.e emission reduction calculation spreadsheet) verified and/or compared?	<p>A <i>data authenticity checking</i> was performed for all every minute basis measurement records of the following LFG and LFG flaring/utilization related monitoring parameters (incl. sub-parameters) in order to demonstrate and ensure that only authentic/not modified monitoring data was used as input data for the emission reduction calculations for the considered monitoring period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Volumetric flow of LFG stream in time interval t on a wet basis ($V_{t,wb,i}$) - Volumetric fraction of CH_4 in the collected LFG in time interval t on a wet basis ($V_{CH_4,t,wb}$) - Flame detection of flare in the minute m ($Flame_m$) (sub-parameters $Flame_{m,flare-1}$, $Flame_{m,flare-2}$, $Flame_{m,flare-3}$) - Status of biogas destruction device (engine-generator sets of the electricity generation facility) (Operational status of biogas destruction devices) (sub-parameters $Status_{genset-north}$, $Status_{genset-south}$, $Status_{genset-1}$, $Status_{genset-2}$, $Status_{genset-3}$, $Status_{genset-4}$, $Status_{genset-5}$, $Status_{genset-6}$, $Status_{genset-7}$, $Status_{genset-8}$, $Status_{genset-9}$, $Status_{genset-10}$, $Status_{genset-11}$, $Status_{genset-12}$, $Status_{genset-13}$, $Status_{genset-14}$) - Operation of the equipment that consumes LFG (engine-generator sets of the electricity generation facility) ($Op_{j,h}$) (sub-parameters $Op_{genset-1,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-2,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-3,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-4,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-5,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-6,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-7,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-8,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-9,h,y}$, $Op_{genset-10,h,y}$) 						

		<p>Op_{genset-11,h,y}, Op_{genset-12,h,y}, Op_{genset-13,h,y}, Op_{genset-14,h,y}, Op_{genset-north,h,y}, Op_{genset-south,h,y})</p> <p>The performed checking aimed to ensure that monitoring data were not intentionally or unintentionally edited/modified by anyone prior of being used as primary data input for the processing of emission reduction calculations. The performed checking also aimed to ensure that the emission reduction calculation spreadsheets ^{/5/} include only authentic monitoring records. Details about the performed <i>data authenticity checking</i> (which is valid for above-listed LFG and LFG flaring/utilization related monitoring data) are included in the end of this Section.</p>	
	<p>Does the applied monitoring data management process (from monitoring equipment/instrument to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct recording, transfer and reporting of data to be used for the emission reductions calculations? Are necessary/applicable QA/QC processes in place?</p>	<p>Yes. Details for data transfer and reporting of emission reductions (incl. relevant QA/QC process) are assessed in the end of this Section. Further details for monitoring management and quality assurance related aspects for the project activity are also included in the end of this Section.</p>	
		<p><i>Assessment details for the monitoring parameter “Quantity of electricity generated in captive diesel backup generator during the year y” (EC_{PJ,captive,y}):</i></p>	
	<p>Data / Parameter: (as per the monitoring plan of the PDD):</p>	<p>Quantity of electricity generated in captive diesel backup generator during the year y (EC_{PJ,captive,y})</p>	
	<p>Measuring, recording and reporting frequencies:</p>	<p>Measurements of electricity generated by the backup off-grid electricity generators (fuelled by Diesel) have been continuously measured by an electricity meter, with continuous measurements recorded and reported with an hourly frequency.</p> <p>It is important to note that the following is correctly stated in the latest version of the Monitoring Report:</p> <p><i>“(...) while there are 3 captive diesel backup generators installed as part of the project activity (“Diesel Backup Generator I”, “Diesel Backup Generator II” and “Diesel Backup Generator III”), the electricity meter installed for measuring electricity generated by the “Diesel Backup Generator II” did not function properly during the considered monitoring period. Thus, as further described in Section E.2, for the particular case of the “Diesel Backup Generator II”, a conservative approach is adopted for the determination of project emissions due to the consumption of electricity generated by this diesel backup generator.”</i></p>	

		<p>As confirmed by the EPIC verification team, the applied determination approach (Option B.4 of the “Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption”) is very conservative since, besides of utilizing a conservative default CO₂ emissions factor for each MWh of consumed electricity, this approach assumes the installed captive electricity generator II operated full time during the considered monitoring period. It is conservatively assumed that this backup diesel generator operated at its maximum capacity interruptedly during the whole monitoring period encompassing 234 days (which accounts for 5 616 hours).</p> <p>The EPIC assessment team has confirmed that the adoption of two different determination approaches for the amount of electricity generated by the diesel backup generators and consumed by the project activity during the considered monitoring period is in accordance with the provisions of the PDD ^{/2/}.</p>															
	<p>Are measuring, recording and reporting frequencies in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)</p>	<p>As per the PDD ^{/2/}, continuous measurements of EC_{PJ,captive,y} are to be recorded and reported at least with an every month frequency. The “Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption” ^{/13/}, and ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/} do not clearly indicate recording and reporting frequencies for continuous measurements for the parameter EC_{PJ,captive,y}. Thus, the adopted measuring, recording and reporting frequencies are assumed as in accordance with the monitoring plan of the PDD ^{/2/}, the “Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption” ^{/13/} and ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/}.</p>															
	<p>Type of monitoring equipment/instrument:</p>	<p><i>Specifications of the electricity meter utilized for measuring electricity generated by the Diesel Backup Generator I (EC_{PJ,captive,y,1}):</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="821 1518 1401 1758"> <tr> <td colspan="2">Specifications of the installed electricity meter utilized for measuring electricity generated by the Diesel Backup Generator I (EC_{PJ,captive,y,1})</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Manufacturer</td> <td>Schneider Electric</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Model</td> <td>PM820MG</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Serial Number</td> <td>26207716</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Accuracy:</td> <td>±0.5%</td> </tr> </table> <p>Source: ^{/38/}</p> <p><i>Specifications of the electricity meter utilized for measuring electricity generated by the Diesel Backup Generator III (EC_{PJ,captive,y,3}):</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="821 1937 1401 2060"> <tr> <td colspan="2">Specifications of the installed electricity meter utilized for measuring electricity generated by the Diesel Backup Generator I (EC_{PJ,captive,y,3})</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Manufacturer</td> <td>Schneider Electric</td> </tr> </table>	Specifications of the installed electricity meter utilized for measuring electricity generated by the Diesel Backup Generator I (EC _{PJ,captive,y,1})		Manufacturer	Schneider Electric	Model	PM820MG	Serial Number	26207716	Accuracy:	±0.5%	Specifications of the installed electricity meter utilized for measuring electricity generated by the Diesel Backup Generator I (EC _{PJ,captive,y,3})		Manufacturer	Schneider Electric	
Specifications of the installed electricity meter utilized for measuring electricity generated by the Diesel Backup Generator I (EC _{PJ,captive,y,1})																	
Manufacturer	Schneider Electric																
Model	PM820MG																
Serial Number	26207716																
Accuracy:	±0.5%																
Specifications of the installed electricity meter utilized for measuring electricity generated by the Diesel Backup Generator I (EC _{PJ,captive,y,3})																	
Manufacturer	Schneider Electric																

		Model	PM820MG		
		Serial Number	26205401		
		Accuracy:	±0.5%		
		Source: ^{/38/}			
	Is the accuracy of the monitoring equipment/instrument as stated in the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment/instrument, does the utilization of the monitoring equipment/instrument represents good monitoring practice?	The PDD ^{/2/} and ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/} do not specify any accuracy requirement for the electricity meters installed at the project site. The accuracy range for the installed instruments is ±0.5%. It is EPIC contention that the use of the installed instruments represents good practice for monitoring of temperature in the exhaust gas of the flare.			
	If applicable, has the reported monitoring data been cross-checked with other available data or source?	Not applicable.			
	How were the values in the Monitoring Report (and/or supporting documents, i.e emission reduction calculation spreadsheet) verified and/or compared?	The EPIC verification team has confirmed that values for the monitoring parameter $EC_{PJ,captive,y}$ as reported in the summarized emission reduction calculation spreadsheet ^{/5/} and Monitoring Report ^{/3/} are as per the primary monitoring records.			
	Does the applied monitoring data management process (from monitoring equipment/instrument to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct recording, transfer and reporting of data to be used for the emission reductions calculations? Are necessary/applicable QA/QC processes in place?	Details for monitoring management and quality assurance related aspects for the project activity are also included in the end of this Section.			
	It is important to note that the monitoring plan of the PDD ^{/2/} also includes the following monitoring parameters of which monitoring was not required during the considered monitoring period since the methodological options for which they are applicable were not selected during the considered monitoring period.				
	Parameter not monitored during the considered monitoring period				
	Volumetric flow of LFG stream in time interval t on a dry basis on a dry basis $(V_{t,db})^8$				

⁸ While Option C of the methodological tool “Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream” (version 03.0) was selected for the determination of $F_{CH4,flared,y}$ during the considered monitoring period, it is important to note the following:

- $V_{t,db}$ was not monitored as Option A of the methodological tool “Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream” (version 03.0) was not selected.

	Volumetric fraction of CH ₄ in the collected LFG in time interval t on a dry basis ($V_{CH_4,t,db}$)	
	Mass flow of the LFG stream in time interval t on dry basis ($M_{t,db}$)	
	Quantity of fuel Diesel combusted by the captive off-grid electricity generator ($FC_{Diesel,y}$)	
	Net calorific value of the fuel Diesel in year y ($NCV_{Diesel,y}$)	
	CO ₂ emission factor of fuel Diesel in year y ($EF_{CO_2,Diesel,y}$)	
	Quantity of electricity generated in captive diesel backup generator during the year y ($EG_{Diesel-Generator,y}$)	
	The following monitoring parameters were not monitored either (as no collected LFG was sent for combustion in the flares during the considered monitoring period):	
	Parameters not monitored during the considered monitoring period	
	Mass flow of methane in the exhaust gas of the flare on a dry basis at reference conditions in the time period t ($F_{CH_4,EG,t}$)	
	Temperature in the exhaust gas of the enclosed flare in minute m ($T_{EG,m}$)	
	Maintenance events completed in year y as monitored by the project participants ($Maintenance_v$)	
	Quantity of LPG consumed by the project activity in year y ($FC_{LPG,y}$)	
	Net calorific value of the fuel LPG ($NCV_{LPG,y}$)	
	CO ₂ emission factor of fuel LPG in year y ($EF_{CO_2,LPG,y}$)	
	Saturation pressure of H ₂ O at temperature T_t in time interval t ($p_{H_2O,t,Sat}$)	
<p><u>Handling of records for both parameters monitored ex-post and ex-ante determined parameters in the context of determination of achieved emission reductions:</u></p> <p>As part of the applied monitoring procedure, measurement signals for the following monitoring parameters have been automatically processed by the project's Win CC data management platform and with related measurement values being recorded (with data recording/reporting frequency of every minute) in an encrypted binary data format in the project's data supervisory/controlling system (supervisory control and data acquisition system (Win CC platform) with embedded database. (with reporting frequency of 1 minute):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Volumetric flow of LFG stream in time interval t on a wet basis ($V_{t,wb}$) - Volumetric fraction of CH₄ in the collected LFG in time interval t on a wet basis ($V_{CH_4,t,wb}$), - Flame detection of flare in the minute m ($Flame_m$) - Operation of the equipment that consumes LFG (engine-generator sets of the electricity generation facility) ($Op_{j,h}$) - Operational status of biogas destruction devices (Status of biogas destruction device) <p>Data records for measurements of the amount of electricity generated and exported by the project's electricity generation infrastructure as well as consumption of grid</p>		

- $V_{CH_4,t,db}$ was not monitored as Options A and D of the methodological tool "Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream" (version 03.0) was not selected.
- $M_{t,db}$ was not monitored as Option D of the methodological tool "Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream" (version 03.0) was not selected.

electricity by the project activity are also regularly archived by the project's Win CC data management platform.

Win CC data management platform (installed data supervisory control and data acquisition system):

The Win CC data management platform is the SCADA platform installed as part of the project activity. The installed Win CC data management platform is used for control and monitoring the operation of the whole project activity. Win CC data is a SCADA derived platform solution developed and supplied by Siemens AG. The installed Win CC platform is deemed customized for the project activity and includes an embedded database for all gathered monitoring data. As per the design of this data supervisory control and data management system, all handled/supported data is archived in the database in encrypted and un-editable format. Thus, all recorded monitoring data handled by the Win CC platform is effectively protected from data loss and/or data tampering. As confirmed by the EPIC assessment team, the installed Win CC platform includes reliable data logging and archiving strategies/solutions that protect monitoring data and ensure all required data integrity. All monitoring data recorded in the project's Win CC platform can be assessed (visualized) and be retrieved through any PC client connected to the local area network (LAN) of KDM S.A. and with access to the installed Win CC platform.

It is EPIC opinion that the use of the available PLC infrastructure and Win CC platform for recording and archiving monitoring details for the project activity represents good practice in terms of data acquisition, data recording and data archiving. EPIC was also able to verify that reliable and robust monitoring procedures were established, implemented and have been effectively and systematically followed by appointed staff of KDM S.A.

Data transmission, data export/conversion and creation of "raw data" input files for the emission reduction calculations:

While all monitoring data recorded in the project's Win CC platform can be visualized but cannot be edited/modified, as part of the application of the project's monitoring system, related data is retrieved and exported/converted into MS-Excel spreadsheet format (data saved in "xlms" file format)⁹. As confirmed by the EPIC verification team, as part of the data reporting and emission reduction calculation procedure adopted by the project's monitoring team at KDM S.A., monitoring data recorded at project's Win CC platform is regularly retrieved and exported/converted in order to be appropriately used for the determination of emission reductions achieved by the project activity.

For the considered monitoring period, the EPIC verification team was able to confirm that all monitoring data recorded at the project's Win CC data management platform which are applicable for the considered monitoring were retrieved and converted/exported in order to be used for the determination/calculation of emission reductions. As a result of the performed data export/conversion process, a MS-Excel format spreadsheet file with all records for the parameters indicated above in this Section was generated. This spreadsheet file is termed as "raw-data" file and it was used as the major primary monitoring input data for the elaboration of the main emission reduction calculation spreadsheet.

The generated "MS-Excel-format "raw data" file was made available and assessed by the EPIC verification team. This raw data file contains a date and time stamp for every minute, and the related monitoring records for LFG flow, flame detection of the flare, operational status of the engine-generator sets and CH₄ content of LFG, which are used for the calculation of GHG emission reductions. It is crucial to note that when generating such file in MS-Excel format, data could be eventually intentionally or unintentionally edited/modified. Thus, in order to ensure that only

⁹ The XLSM file type is primarily associated with the software application 'Excel version 2007 (and more recent versions) from Microsoft Corporation.

authentic (not edited /not modified) “raw data” were used as a basis for the emission reduction calculations, a systematic *data authenticity checking* was performed by the EPIC verification team for all the monitored data as described and assessed below in the sub-section “*Data authenticity checking*”.

As per the applied monitoring procedure and in accordance with the requirements of ACM0001 (version 15.0) ⁷⁷ and related provisions of the PDD, GHG emission reductions are calculated based on measurement records and selected default values of the *ex-post* monitored parameters (of which monitoring details are presented in the tables above) and also using the values for the *ex-ante* determined parameter as presented below:

Parameter	Applied value		
Fraction of methane that would be oxidized in the top layer of the SWDS in the baseline (OX_{top_layer})	0.1		
Historical amount of methane in the LFG which is captured and destroyed in the year prior to the implementation of the project activity (2006).($F_{CH4,BL,x-1}$)	516.16		
Global Warming Potential of CH_4 (GWP_{CH4})	25 tCO ₂ e/tCH ₄		
Universal ideal gases constant (R_u)	8,314 Pa.m ³ /kmol.K		
Molecular mass of gas k (MM_k) (For the particular case of the project activity, $k = N_2$)	28.01 kg/kmol		
Molecular mass of greenhouse gas i (MM_i) (For the particular case of the project activity, $i = CH_4$)	16.04 kg/kmol		
Total pressure at normal conditions (P_n)	101,325 Pa		
Temperature at normal conditions (T_n)	273.15 K		
Molecular mass of water (MM_{H_2O})	18.0152 kg/kmol		
Average technical transmission and distribution losses for providing electricity to the grid and/or for grid sourced electricity consumed by the project activity ($TDL_{grid,y}$)	20% (for grid-sourced electricity consumed by the project activity) and 3% (for electricity generated by the project activity and provided to the grid)		
Weighting of build margin emissions factor (w_{BM})	75%		
Weighting of operating margin emissions factor (w_{OM})	25%		
Build margin CO ₂ emission factor in year y ($EF_{grid,BM,y}$)	0.7046 tCO ₂ /MWh		
Operating margin CO2 emission factor in year y	0.7479 tCO ₂ /MWh		
Manufacturer's flare specifications for temperature, flow rate and maintenance schedule interval ($SPEC_{flare}$)	$SPEC_{flare,flare-1}$ $SPEC_{flare,flare-2}$	Min.	Max.

			Operational LFG flow for each flare (for continuous operation):	850 Nm ³ /h	5,097 Nm ³ /h
			Required temperature of the exhaust gas of the flare (to ensure LFG destruction (combustion) under high CH ₄ destruction efficiency):	760 °C	1,093 °C
			Required minimum frequency for inspection and maintenance service in each flare (incl. inspection in the conditions of the flare isolation ceramics revetment material):	Min. every year	
			Required/ recommended minimum frequency for replacement of the flare isolation ceramics revetment material in each flare:	After 10 years of regular and appropriate operation	
			SPEC _{flare,flare-3}		
				Min.	Max.
			Operational LFG flow for each flare (for continuous operation):	510 Nm ³ /h	5,097 Nm ³ /h

		Required temperature of the exhaust gas of the flare (to ensure LFG destruction (combustion) under high CH ₄ destruction efficiency):	760 °C	1,093 °C	
		Required minimum frequency for inspection and maintenance service in each flare (incl. inspection in the conditions of the flare isolation ceramics revetment material):	Min. every year		
		Required/ recommended minimum frequency for replacement of the flare isolation ceramics revetment material in each flare:	After 10 years of regular and appropriate operation		
	Rated capacity of the installed captive backup electricity generators fuelled by diesel ($PP_{CP, Diesel-generator}$)	Equipment id/tag		Power (MW)	
		Diesel Backup Generator I		0.276	
Diesel Backup Generator II		0.352			
Diesel Backup Generator III		0.080			
Average technical transmission and distribution losses for electricity sourced by the captive electricity generator ($TDL_{captive,y}$)	0				
CO ₂ emission factor for electricity sourced by the captive off-grid electricity generators ($EF_{EL,captive,y}$)	1.3 tCO ₂ /MWh				
<p>It is noteworthy that values of the fixed parameters indicated in the table above were selected ex-ante in the PDD ^{/2/}.</p> <p>Baseline emissions for the whole monitoring period were partially calculated through application of the <i>blank</i> version of the spreadsheet template that is developed by the project participant KDM S.A. and termed "main emission reduction calculation</p>					

spreadsheet template”^{/23/}. This calculation spreadsheet template uses the following data/information as input data for the determination of every-minute and accumulated annual values for the calculation parameters “Amount of methane in the LFG which is flared and/or used in the project activity” ($F_{CH_4,PJ,y}$) and “Amount of methane in the LFG that would be flared in the baseline scenario (absence of project activity)” ($F_{CH_4,BL,y}$):

- Monitoring records included in the MS-Excel format “raw-data” spreadsheet file^{/6/} valid for the monitoring period
- the *ex-ante* determined parameters presented in the table above

The elaborated main emission reduction calculation spreadsheet file^{/5/} aggregates (reports) the following recorded monitoring data on an every-minute recording/reporting frequency (folder “Output”):

- Volumetric flow of collected LFG sent to combustion/utilization (monitoring parameter “Volumetric flow of LFG stream in time interval t on a wet basis” ($V_{t,wb}$))
- Methane fraction in the LFG (monitoring parameter “Volumetric fraction of CH_4 in the collected LFG in time interval t on a wet basis” ($v_{CH_4,t,wb}$))
- “Operational status of biogas destruction devices” (Status of biogas destruction device)
- Flame status of the flare (monitoring parameter “Flame detection of flare in the minute m ” ($Flame_m$))
- Operation of the equipment that consumes LFG (engine-generator sets of the electricity generation facility) ($Op_{i,h}$)

An additional calculation spreadsheet (termed “Summarized emission reduction calculation spreadsheet”) (file name “*MR12 summarized - LLC - V.4.xls*”)^{/5/} correctly summarizes the achieved baseline emissions due to destruction of methane by the project activity during the considered monitoring period. Moreover, such summarized spreadsheet^{/5/} also calculates baseline emissions from the displacement of the equivalent amount of electricity generated by the project activity which would otherwise be generated by existing grid-connected power plants, including fossil-fuel fired power plants (and addition of new power generation units) within the CDEC-SIC electricity grid of Chile). Further assessment details about the calculation of baseline emissions are included in Section E.8.1.

Project emissions due to consumption of grid-sourced electricity and electricity generated by the installed backup off-grid electricity generators (fuelled by diesel) by the project activity are also calculated in the summarized emission reduction calculation spreadsheet^{/5/} on the basis of monitoring records (input data) for (i) monitoring parameters that are not automatically recorded/reported by the project’s Win CC data management platform and (ii) related *ex-ante* determined parameters. Further assessment details about the calculation of project emissions are included in Section E.8.2.

The MS-Excel-format main emission reduction calculation spreadsheet file^{/5/} and the summarized emission reduction calculation spreadsheet^{/5/} were made available and assessed by the EPIC verification team.

While the EPIC verification team was able to confirm that such main emission reduction spreadsheet^{/5/} correctly calculates and reports the accumulated value of the calculation parameters “Amount of methane in the LFG which is flared and/or used in the project activity” ($F_{CH_4,PJ,y}$) and “Amount of methane in the LFG that would be flared in the baseline scenario (absence of project activity)” ($F_{CH_4,BL,y}$) for the entire considered monitoring period, the summarized emission reduction calculation spreadsheet^{/5/} correctly summarizes the emission reductions for the whole

monitoring period (by correctly considering accumulated values of $F_{CH_4,PJ,y}$ and $F_{CH_4,BL,y}$ from the main emission reduction spreadsheets ^{/5/} + *ex-ante* determined parameters as input data + monitoring records for the monitoring parameters which are not automatically recorded/reported by the project's PLC unit).

In summary, the EPIC verification team was able to confirm that calculations of baseline emissions and project emissions were correctly performed as per the formulae and methods stated in the PDD ^{/2/}, monitoring methodology and applicable tools ^{/12/ /13/ /14/ /15/} as described and assessed in Section E.8.

All calculations are thus confirmed by the EPIC verification team to be under conformance with applicable requirements from:

- CDM baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0001 – “Flaring or use of landfill gas” (version 15.0) ^{/7/},
- “Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion” (version 02) ^{/15/},
- “Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption” (version 01) ^{/13/},
- “Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system” (version 04.0) ^{/17/},
- “Project emissions from flaring” (version 02.0.0) ^{/12/},
- “Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream” (version 03.0) ^{/14/},
- Monitoring plan of the PDD ^{/2/}.

The table below presents the reported results of the generated main emission reduction spreadsheet and the summarized emission reduction calculation spreadsheet:

File name	Period
“MR 12 main – LLC – V.4.xls”	From 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016
“MR 12 summarized - LLC - V.4.xls” (Summarized emission reduction calculation spreadsheet for the whole monitoring period)	From 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016

It is crucial to note that, as earlier highlighted in this section, when generating the “raw-data” spreadsheet file (which is used as primary input data for the main emission reduction spreadsheet ^{/5/}), data could be eventually intentionally or unintentionally edited/modified (by using MS-Excel application). Thus, in order to ensure that only authentic (not edited /not modified) data were used as a basis for the emission reduction calculations, a systematic *data authenticity checking* was performed by the EPIC verification team for all the monitored data as detailed below under the sub-section “*Data authenticity checking*”.

Monitoring Management and Quality Assurance:

The EPIC verification team was able to confirm that quality control and quality assurance (QA/QC) procedures are implemented by the project participant and project operator KDM S.A. for preventing or identifying and correct eventual errors or omissions in the reported monitoring parameters.

As verified by the EPIC verification team, competent and sufficiently trained staff are

recruited for operating the project activity and handling related monitoring data. Such employees are found with knowledge not only about the operation of the project activity, but also with sufficient knowledge and competence to ensure the application of all related QA/QC procedures for data recording and storage.

Furthermore, for the 12th periodic verification, the host-country project participant and project operator KDM S.A. was also supported with consultancy and advisory services in CDM and LFG management related issues by the consultancy service company named UniCarbo Energia e Biogás Ltda. As confirmed by the EPIC verification team, the technical team from UniCarbo Energia e Biogás Ltda. has contributed for the development of related documentation (e.g. Monitoring Report ^{/3/} and emission reduction calculation spreadsheets ^{/5/}) and also supported KDM S.A. for addressing all raised outstanding issues (raised CARs).

As also assessed by the EPIC verification team, the project activity has been operated by sufficiently trained staff by correctly following guidance and instructions of internal documented working procedures and with high quality technical support from external CDM and LFG management consultants.

As confirmed by the EPIC verification team, the applied procedures for data collection, data reporting, performance of calibration events and other aspects related to the applied procedures for determining the emission reductions are systematically implemented and have been appropriately followed by the host-country project participant and project operator KDM S.A. During the conducted on-site visit to the project site, the EPIC verification team was also able to verify that the operational structure of the project activity is also in line with the information made available in the PDD ^{/2/} and in the Monitoring Report ^{/3/}. In summary, EPIC was also able to verify that detailed management and operational work procedures are in place and confirmed that an operational structure for the project activity is established with responsibilities clearly identified. Moreover trained staff is employed to ensure data quality.

Data authenticity checking:

As part of the performed verification assessment, the EPIC verification team was able to confirm that the main emission reduction calculation spreadsheet ^{/5/} completed by KDM S.A. is basically an MS-Excel spreadsheet that, in theory, could have recorded data being easily edited/modified (intentionally or unintentionally). Thus, this spreadsheet, if inappropriately edited, could potentially tamper reported monitoring records, thus resulting in unreal and incorrect calculation and reporting of emission reductions achieved by the project activity during the considered monitoring period. In order to ensure that all emission reductions calculations are entirely and correctly based on authentic and real monitoring records valid for the considered monitoring period, a *data authentic check* was performed as part of the verification assessment.

Such checking aimed to ensure that only authentic and unmodified monitoring data records were used by the host-country project participant KDM S.A. for performing the emission reduction calculation for the considered monitoring period (thus ensuring that measurement records made available in the MS-Excel format "raw data" input file ^{/6/} and measurement records reported in the main emission reduction spreadsheet were not intentionally or unintentionally edited/modified during the generation or handling of these files).

The performed *data authenticity check* involved the following steps:

STEP 1: Reproduction of the procedure of retrieving/exporting measurement data records from the project's Win CC SCADA platform to MS-Excel format: A new round of data retrieval/exports for historical monitoring records stored in the project's Win CC SCADA platform to MS-Excel format ("raw data" input file) was performed for all data records valid for the whole considered monitoring period. Such data retrieval/exporting was performed by the EPIC verification team during the performed on-site visit to the project site by reproducing the procedure normally applied by

	<p>the project's monitoring team as part of the application of the monitoring system. This procedure is summarized above. As an outcome of STEP 1, a new comparative file with primary data inputs from the project's Win CC SCADA system valid for the whole monitoring period was generated. This comparative file is MS-Excel format named by the EPIC verification team as "<i>raw-data for checking</i>" file ^{/22/}.</p> <p><i>STEP 2: Re-calculation of emission reductions:</i> By using the MS-Excel format "<i>raw-data for checking</i>" comparative file ^{/22/} (that was generated under STEP 1) as input data, the procedure for emission reductions calculation for the whole monitoring period was reproduced by the EPIC verification team for the entire considered monitoring period. The content of the "<i>raw-data for checking</i>" comparative file ^{/22/} was used as input data for the compilation of the comparative main emission reduction calculation spreadsheet ^{/21/} by applying a <i>blank</i> version of the main emission reduction calculation spreadsheet ^{/5/} that was made available by the project participant and was assessed by the EPIC verification team. Moreover, correct values for the applicable <i>ex-ante</i> determined parameters were also inserted in the <i>blank</i> version of the main emission reduction calculation spreadsheet ^{/5/} as input data. As a result of this step, a comparative main emission reduction spreadsheet ^{/21/} was thus created.</p> <p><i>STEP 3 – Comparison of the main emission reduction calculation spreadsheet developed by the project participant KDM S.A. against the created comparative main emission reduction spreadsheet and analysis of the results:</i> The calculated accumulated values of the parameter $F_{CH_4,PJ,y}$ in the comparative main emission reduction spreadsheet ^{/21/} (files generated under STEP 2) was compared against the corresponding accumulated value for the parameter $F_{CH_4,PJ,y}$ in the main emission reduction spreadsheet ^{/5/} previously created by the project participants as part of the project's monitoring/reporting process.</p> <p>As a result of STEP 3, by comparing the file previously generated by the project participants against the files generated under STEP 2, the EPIC verification team was able to confirm that the generated comparative checking spreadsheet ^{/21/} is identical to the emission reduction calculation spreadsheet ^{/5/} previously created by the project participants. While no quantitative deviations or differences were identified when comparing the accumulated values for the calculation parameters presented in these files, and by assuming that all encrypted data stored in the project's Win CC data management platform represent credible and authentic monitoring data, the performed <i>data authenticity check</i> thus successfully and sufficiently confirmed that only authentic and not-modified monitored measurement data were previously used by the project participants for the calculation of emission reductions as reported in the Monitoring Report ^{/3/}.</p>
Findings	<p>A CAR was raised regarding the compliance of monitoring activities valid for the considered monitoring period with monitoring requirements as per the monitoring plan from the PDD:</p> <p>CAR 6: Details presented in Section D.2. of the initial version of the Monitoring Report about the UV flame detectors installed and utilized during the considered monitoring are incomplete.</p> <p>The representatives of the project participant KDM S.A. were requested to address the above-summarized raised CAR by providing to the EPIC verification team sufficient evidences to determine that the applicable CDM requirements have been met and/or through performance sufficient modification (corrections/improvements) in the initial version of the Monitoring Report and/or enclosed calculation spreadsheets if applicable.</p>

Conclusion	<p>In summary, upon closure of the raised related CAR, the EPIC verification team was able to confirm that monitoring plan has been implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan. The monitoring mechanism is effective and reliable. The EPIC verification team sufficiently confirmed that:</p> <p>The monitoring plan and the applied methodology had been properly implemented and related monitoring activities have been correctly performed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The responsibilities and authorities for monitoring and reporting were in accordance with the general responsibilities and authorities for the monitoring plan as outlined in the latest version of the Monitoring Report ^{/3/}. - QA/QC procedures are implemented for preventing or identifying and correct eventual errors or omissions in the reported monitoring parameters. - All parameters for which monitoring were required (by taking into account the monitoring approaches and calculation options selected for the considered monitoring period) were sufficiently and appropriately monitored during the considered monitoring period. For each monitored parameter, sufficient details about data generation, aggregation, recording and reporting are included in the latest version of the Monitoring Report ^{/3/}.
-------------------	---

E.6.3. Implementation of sampling plan

Means of verification	Not applicable ¹⁰ .
Findings	Not applicable.
Conclusion	Not applicable.

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

Means of verification	<p>The EPIC verification team has assessed that all monitoring instruments/equipment installed at the project site have operated during the monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016 under full compliance with calibration requirements as per both related provisions from the PDD ^{/2/} and recommendations/guidance from the instrument/equipment manufacturers. The following tables include assessment details for calibration events performed on the monitoring instruments/equipment used for performance of measurements monitoring the ex-post determined parameters during the considered monitoring period:</p> <p><i>Assessment of performed calibration events for equipment/instruments used for monitoring the parameter “Management of the SWDS”:</i></p>	
	Data / Parameter: (as per the monitoring plan of the PDD):	Management of the SWDS (Management of SWDS)
	Calibration frequency /interval for the monitoring equipment/instrument:	Not applicable. While monitoring of the parameter “Management of the SWDS” is not performed based on measurements, there are no monitoring equipment/instruments utilized. Thus, there are no compliance with applicable calibration frequency/intervals of monitoring equipment/instruments to be assessed.
	Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the	Not applicable. While monitoring of the parameter Management of the SWDS is not performed based on measurements, there are no monitoring equipment/instruments utilized.

¹⁰ As per the monitoring and GHG calculation approaches that are valid for the project activity (as established in the PDD and applied CDM baseline and monitoring methodology + applicable methodological tools) no sampling procedure and no sampling-based monitoring are valid/required for the determination of achieved emission reductions. Moreover, as further assessed in Section E.6.2, under *Data authenticity checking*, cross-checking/reproducing all reported LFG and LFG flaring/utilization measurement records valid for the considered monitoring period against the related primary data sources were performed (with all reported related monitoring data being cross-checked/reproduced instead of having selected samples of data being cross-checked/reproduced).

	frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practice?	Thus, there are no compliance with applicable calibration frequency/intervals of monitoring equipment/instruments to be assessed.
	Did the performed calibration(s) confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment/instrument? (Yes / No):	Not applicable. While monitoring of the parameter Management of the SWDS is not performed based on measurements, there are no monitoring equipment/instruments utilized. Thus, there are no compliance with applicable calibration frequency/intervals of monitoring equipment/instruments to be assessed.
	Is(are) the performed calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	Not applicable. While monitoring of the parameter Management of the SWDS is not performed based on measurements, there are no monitoring equipment/instruments utilized. Thus, there are no compliance with applicable calibration frequency/intervals of monitoring equipment/instruments to be assessed.
<p><i>Assessment of performed calibration events for equipment/instruments used for monitoring the parameter "Volumetric flow of LFG stream in time interval t on a wet basis" ($V_{t,wb}$):</i></p>		
	Data / Parameter: (as per the monitoring plan of the PDD):	<p>Volumetric flow of LFG stream in time interval t on a wet basis ($V_{t,wb}$)</p> <p>(monitored as per Option C of the methodological tool "Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream" (version 03.0) ^{/14/}).</p>
	Calibration frequency /interval for the monitoring equipment/instrument:	<p>As per the implemented monitoring procedure at KDM S.A. and recommendations from the equipment's manufacturer, the installed LFG flow meter used for measuring LFG flow sent to the project's biogas destruction/utilization devices under operational status is calibrated at least once every 18 months by a third party independent accredited calibration laboratory.</p> <p><i>Calibration details for the LFG flow meters used for measuring $V_{t,wb}$:</i></p> <p>For the flow meter with S/N 467251-A (instrument under operation during the period from 11/05/2016 to 15/06/2016 within the considered monitoring period), a valid calibration event was performed on 20/05/2015, as indicated in the Certificate of Calibration No. RA377047 ^{/34/} issued by FCI Fluid Components International LLC.</p> <p>For the flow meter with S/N 437121-A (instrument under operation during the period from 15/06/2016 to 31/12/2016 within the considered monitoring period), a valid calibration event was performed on 12/02/2016, as indicated in the Certificate of Calibration No. RA378038 ^{/35/} issued by FCI Fluid Components International LLC.</p>

	<p>Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practice?</p>	<p>As per both the PDD ^{/2/} and ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/}, the installed LFG flow meters are to be calibrated in a frequency as per the instrument's specifications and/or instrument manufacturer's recommendations.</p> <p>Thus, the applied calibration frequencies (every 18 months as per recommendations from the equipment's manufacturer) are under full conformance with both the monitoring plan of the PDD ^{/2/} and ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/}.</p>
	<p>Did the performed calibration(s) confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment/instrument? (Yes / No):</p>	<p>Yes. The performed calibration events for the installed LFG flow meters confirm proper functioning of these measurement instruments.</p>
	<p>Is(are) the performed calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?</p>	<p>Yes. The performed calibration events for the installed LFG flow meters are valid for the whole considered monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016.</p> <p>EPIC was able to confirm the validity of the performed calibration events for the installed LFG flow meters as follows:</p> <p>LFG flow meter with S/N 467251-A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Calibration event performed on 20/05/2015, valid until 19/11/2016 (18 months) <p>LFG flow meter with S/N 437121-A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Calibration event performed on 12/02/2016, valid until 11/08/2017 (18 months)
	<p><i>Assessment of performed calibration events for equipment/instruments used for monitoring the parameter "Volumetric fraction of CH₄ in the collected LFG in time interval t on a wet basis" ($v_{CH_4,t,wb}$):</i></p>	
	<p>Data / Parameter: (as per the monitoring plan of the PDD):</p>	<p>Volumetric fraction of CH₄ in the collected LFG in time interval t on a wet basis ($v_{CH_4,t,wb}$)</p>
	<p>Calibration frequency /interval for the monitoring equipment/instrument:</p>	<p>As per the implemented monitoring procedure at KDM S.A., the installed CH₄/O₂ content gas analyzer unit is to be calibrated every year by a third party independent accredited calibration laboratory.</p> <p>For the gas analyser unit with S/N N1-W2-678, the following calibration events valid for the considered monitoring period were performed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Calibration event performed on 04/09/2015, as indicated in the Certificate of Calibration No. 1043-15 ^{/43/}. - Calibration event performed on 19/08/2016, as indicated in the Certificate of Calibration

		<p>No. 1102-16^{/42/}.</p> <p>Both calibration events were performed by TAG Instrumentación y Automatización de Processos Industriales, a SIEMENS Solution Partner in Chile.</p> <p>The Calibration Certificates were made available and were assessed by the EPIC verification team.</p>		
	<p>Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practice?</p>	<p>As per the PDD^{/2/}, ACM0001 (version 15.0)^{/7/} and the "Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream" (version 03.0)^{/14/}, the installed continuous CH₄/O₂ content gas analyzer unit is to be calibrated in a frequency to be established under conformance with instrument's specifications and/or instrument manufacturer's recommendations. Thus, the adopted calibration frequency (every year, as per recommendations from the equipment's manufacturer) is in line with the monitoring plan of the PDD^{/2/}, ACM0001 (version 15.0)^{/7/} and the "Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream" (version 03.0)^{/14/}.</p>		
	<p>Did the performed calibration(s) confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment/instrument? (Yes / No):</p>	<p>Yes. The performed calibration events for the CH₄/O₂ content gas analyzer units confirmed proper functioning of these measurement instruments.</p>		
	<p>Is(are) the performed calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?</p>	<p>Yes. The performed calibration events for the installed CH₄/O₂ content gas analyzer unit that are referred in the Monitoring Report^{/3/} are valid for the whole monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016</p> <p>EPIC was able to confirm the validity of the performed calibration events for the installed CH₄ gas analyzer units as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Calibration event performed on 04/09/2015, valid until 03/09/2016 (1 year) - Calibration event performed on 19/08/2016, valid until 18/08/2017 (1 year) - 		
	<p><i>Assessment of performed calibration events for equipment/instruments used for monitoring the parameter "Operational status of biogas destruction devices" (Status of biogas destruction device):</i></p>			
	<p>Data / Parameter: (as per the monitoring plan of the PDD):</p>	<p>Operational status of biogas destruction devices (Status of biogas destruction device)</p>		
<p>Calibration frequency /interval for the monitoring equipment/instrument:</p>	<p>Not applicable. There are no measurements or measurement instruments/equipment involved for the definition of Status of biogas destruction device.</p>			
<p>Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the</p>	<p>Not applicable. There are no measurements or measurement instruments/equipment involved for the definition of Status of biogas destruction device.</p>			

	frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practice?	
	Company which has performed the applicable calibration events:	Not applicable. There are no measurements or measurement instruments/equipment involved for the definition of Status of biogas destruction device.
	Did the performed calibration(s) confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment/instrument? (Yes / No):	Not applicable. There are no measurements or measurement instruments/equipment involved for the definition of Status of biogas destruction device.
	Is(are) the performed calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	Not applicable. There are no measurements or measurement instruments/equipment involved for the definition of Status of biogas destruction device.

Assessment of performed calibration events for equipment/instruments used for monitoring the parameter "Amount of grid electricity consumed by the project activity during the year y" ($EC_{PJ,y}$):

Data / Parameter: (as per the monitoring plan of the PDD):	Amount of grid electricity consumed by the project activity during the year y ($EC_{PJ,y}$)
Calibration frequency /interval for the monitoring equipment/instrument:	<p>As per the implemented monitoring procedure at KDM S.A. and recommendations from the equipment's manufacturer, the installed electricity meter is to be calibrated every 2 years.</p> <p>For the electricity meter with S/N PT-1011A447-01, an initial calibration event was performed on 05/03/2014 (Calibration Certificate KD201403000001 ^{/45/}, issued by CAM Chile S.A.). A second calibration event was performed on 12/05/2015 (Calibration Certificate KD201505000002 ^{/46/}, also issued by CAM Chile S.A.),</p>
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practice?	<p>Both the monitoring plan of the PDD ^{/2/} and ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/} do not specify any calibration frequency requirements for the electricity meters. The PDD ^{/2/} states the following:</p> <p><i>"Instrument will be subject to a regular maintenance and testing regime in accordance to appropriate national / international standards/requirements and/or best practice."</i></p> <p>As per the "Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption" ^{/13/}, the following requirement is established regarding maintenance and calibration for electricity meters:</p> <p><i>"(...) Instrument will be subject to a regular maintenance and testing regime"</i></p>

		<p><i>in accordance to appropriate national / international standards/requirements and/or best practice.”.</i></p> <p>The calibration frequency adopted for the electricity meter is as per recommendations from the instrument manufacturer. It is the opinion of the EPIC assessment team that the adopted calibration frequency for the installed electricity meter represent good practice.</p>
	Did the performed calibration(s) confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment/instrument? (Yes / No):	Yes. The performed calibration events confirm proper functioning of the electricity meters (at the time the calibration events were performed).
	Is(are) the performed calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	<p>Yes. The performed calibration events as correctly outlined in the Monitoring Report ^{/3/} are valid for the whole considered monitoring period.</p> <p>EPIC was able to confirm the validity of the performed calibration events for the installed electricity meter as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - calibration event performed on 05/03/2014, valid until 04/03/2016 (2 years) - calibration event performed on 12/05/2015, valid until 11/05/2017 (2 years)
	<p><i>Assessment of performed calibration events for equipment/instruments used for monitoring the parameter “Amount of electricity generated using LFG by the project activity in year y” ($EC_{BL,y}$):</i></p>	
	Data / Parameter: (as per the monitoring plan of the PDD):	Amount of electricity generated using LFG by the project activity in year y ($EC_{BL,y}$)
	Calibration frequency /interval for the monitoring equipment/instrument:	While monitoring for the parameter $EC_{BL,y}$ is performed on the basis of electricity export measurements performed by the same instrument for which measurements of imports of grid-sourced electricity are made as part of monitoring of the parameter “Amount of grid electricity consumed by the project activity during the year y” ($EC_{PJ,grid,y}$), details about calibration events performed on the installed electricity meter are presented above in the table with details for the monitoring parameter $EC_{PJ,grid,y}$.
	Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practice?	<p>Both the monitoring plan of the PDD ^{/2/} and ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/} do not specify any calibration frequency requirements for the electricity meters. The PDD ^{/2/} states the following:</p> <p><i>“Instrument will be subject to a regular maintenance and testing regime in</i></p>

		<p><i>accordance to appropriate national / international standards/requirements and/or best practice.”</i></p> <p>As per the “Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption” ^{13/}, the following requirement is established regarding maintenance and calibration for electricity meters:</p> <p><i>“(…) Instrument will be subject to a regular maintenance and testing regime in accordance to appropriate national / international standards/requirements and/or best practice.”.</i></p> <p>The calibration frequency adopted for the electricity meter is as per recommendations from the instrument manufacturer. It is the opinion of the EPIC assessment team that the adopted calibration frequency for the installed electricity meter represent good practice.</p>								
	<p>Did the performed calibration(s) confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment/instrument? (Yes / No):</p>	<p>Yes. The performed calibration events confirm proper functioning of the electricity meters (at the time the calibration events were performed).</p>								
	<p>Is(are) the performed calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?</p>	<p>Yes. The performed calibration events as correctly outlined in the Monitoring Report ^{13/} are valid for the whole considered monitoring period.</p> <p>EPIC was able to confirm the validity of the performed calibration events for the installed electricity meter as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - calibration event performed on 05/03/2014, valid until 04/03/2016 (2 years) - calibration event performed on 12/05/2015, valid until 11/05/2017 (2 years) 								
	<p><i>Assessment of performed calibration events for equipment/instruments used for monitoring the parameter “Operation of the equipment that consumes LFG (engine-generator sets of the electricity generation facility)” (Op_{j,h}):</i></p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="446 1702 805 1825"> <p>Data / Parameter: (as per the monitoring plan of the PDD):</p> </td> <td data-bbox="805 1702 1412 1825"> <p>Operation of the equipment that consumes LFG (engine-generator sets of the electricity generation facility) (Op_{j,h})</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="446 1825 805 2004"> <p>Calibration frequency /interval for the monitoring equipment/instrument:</p> </td> <td data-bbox="805 1825 1412 2004"> <p>Not applicable. The operational status of the engine-generator sets is automatically registered by the electronic control system for each engine-generator set of the project’s electricity generation component.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="446 2004 805 2069"> <p>Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring</p> </td> <td data-bbox="805 2004 1412 2069"> <p>Not applicable.</p> </td> </tr> </table>			<p>Data / Parameter: (as per the monitoring plan of the PDD):</p>	<p>Operation of the equipment that consumes LFG (engine-generator sets of the electricity generation facility) (Op_{j,h})</p>	<p>Calibration frequency /interval for the monitoring equipment/instrument:</p>	<p>Not applicable. The operational status of the engine-generator sets is automatically registered by the electronic control system for each engine-generator set of the project’s electricity generation component.</p>	<p>Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	
<p>Data / Parameter: (as per the monitoring plan of the PDD):</p>	<p>Operation of the equipment that consumes LFG (engine-generator sets of the electricity generation facility) (Op_{j,h})</p>									
<p>Calibration frequency /interval for the monitoring equipment/instrument:</p>	<p>Not applicable. The operational status of the engine-generator sets is automatically registered by the electronic control system for each engine-generator set of the project’s electricity generation component.</p>									
<p>Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>									

	plan of the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practice?	
	Did the performed calibration(s) confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment/instrument? (Yes / No):	Not applicable.
	Is(are) the performed calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	Not applicable.
	<p><i>Assessment of performed calibration events for equipment/instruments used for monitoring the parameter "Flame detection of flare in the minute m" ($Flame_m$):</i></p>	
	Data / Parameter: (as per the monitoring plan of the PDD):	Flame detection of flare in the minute m ($Flame_m$)
	Calibration frequency /interval for the monitoring equipment/instrument:	Not applicable. As confirmed by the EPIC verification team through assessment of the specification sheet for the UV Flame detectors installed at the project site ^{/41/} , the installed UV Flame detectors have a self-checking function and thus do not require any calibration.
	Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practice?	Not applicable.
	Did the performed calibration(s) confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment/instrument? (Yes / No):	Not applicable.
	Is(are) the performed calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	Not applicable.
	<p><i>Assessment of performed calibration events for equipment/instruments used for monitoring the parameter "Quantity of electricity generated in captive diesel backup generator during the year y" ($EC_{PJ,captive,y}$):</i></p>	
Data / Parameter: (as per the monitoring plan of the PDD):	Quantity of electricity generated in captive diesel backup generator during the year y ($EC_{PJ,captive,y}$)	
Calibration frequency /interval for the monitoring equipment/instrument:	As per the implemented monitoring procedure at KDM S.A. and recommendations from the equipment's manufacturer, the installed electricity meters are to be calibrated at least every 2 years. As confirmed by the EPIC	

		<p>verification team through assessment of the service and operation manual for the installed electricity meters, the applied calibration frequency is as per the recommendations of the instrument manufacturer.</p> <p>For the electricity meter with S/N 26207716, a valid calibration event was performed on 13/05/2015 (Calibration Certificate KD201505000002 ^{/39/}, issued by CAM Chile S.A.).</p> <p>For the electricity meter with S/N 26205401, a valid calibration event was performed on 11/05/2015 (Calibration Certificate KD201505000001 ^{/40/}, issued by CAM Chile S.A.).</p>	
	<p>Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practice?</p>	<p>Both the monitoring plan of the PDD ^{/2/} and ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/} do not specify any calibration frequency requirements for the electricity meters. The PDD ^{/2/} states the following:</p> <p><i>“Periodic calibration events will be performed in a frequency as per instrument specifications and/or instrument manufacturer’s recommendations. Instrument will be subject to a regular maintenance and testing regime in accordance to appropriate national / international standards/requirements and/or best practice.”</i></p> <p>As per the “Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption” ^{/13/}, the following requirement is established regarding maintenance and calibration for electricity meters:</p> <p><i>“(…) meters should be installed, maintained and calibrated according to equipment manufacturer instructions and be in line with national standards, or, if these are not available, international standards (e.g. IEC, ISO)”.</i></p> <p>Therefore, the calibration frequency considered for these electricity meters was as per recommendations from the instrument manufacturer. It is the opinion of the EPIC verification team that the adopted calibration frequency for electricity meter represents good monitoring practice.</p>	
	<p>Did the performed calibration(s) confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment/instrument? (Yes / No):</p>	<p>Yes. The performed calibration events confirm proper functioning of the electricity meters (at the time the calibration events were performed).</p>	
	<p>Is(are) the performed calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?</p>	<p>Yes. The performed calibration events as correctly outlined in the Monitoring Report ^{/3/} are valid for the whole considered monitoring period.</p>	

		<p>EPIC was able to confirm the validity of the performed calibration events for the installed electricity meter as follows:</p> <p>Electricity meter with Serial Number 26207716:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- calibration event performed on 13/05/2015, valid until 12/05/2017 (2 years) <p>Electricity meter with Serial Number 26205401::</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- calibration event performed on 11/05/2015, valid until 10/05/2017 (2 years)															
	<p>It is important to note that, as further assessed in Section E.6.2., the monitoring plan of the PDD ^{/2/} also includes the following monitoring parameters of which monitoring was not required during the considered monitoring period:</p>																
	<table><tr><th>Parameter not monitored during the considered monitoring period</th></tr><tr><td>Volumetric flow of LFG stream in time interval t on a dry basis on a dry basis ($V_{t,db}$)</td></tr><tr><td>Volumetric fraction of CH₄ in the collected LFG in time interval t on a dry basis ($v_{CH4,t,db}$)</td></tr><tr><td>Mass flow of the LFG stream in time interval t on dry basis ($M_{t,db,i}$)</td></tr><tr><td>Quantity of fuel Diesel combusted by the captive off-grid electricity generator ($FC_{Diesel,y}$)</td></tr><tr><td>Net calorific value of the fuel Diesel in year y ($NCV_{Diesel,y}$)</td></tr><tr><td>CO₂ emission factor of fuel Diesel in year y ($EF_{CO2,Diesel,y}$)</td></tr><tr><td>Quantity of electricity generated in captive diesel backup generator during the year y ($EG_{Diesel-Generator,y}$)</td></tr><tr><td>Mass flow of methane in the exhaust gas of the flare on a dry basis at reference conditions in the time period t ($F_{CH4,EG,t}$)</td></tr><tr><td>Temperature in the exhaust gas of the enclosed flare in minute m ($T_{EG,m}$)</td></tr><tr><td>Maintenance events completed in year y as monitored by the project participants ($Maintenance_v$)</td></tr><tr><td>Quantity of LPG consumed by the project activity in year y ($FC_{LPG,y}$)</td></tr><tr><td>Net calorific value of the fuel LPG ($NCV_{LPG,y}$)</td></tr><tr><td>CO₂ emission factor of fuel LPG in year y ($EF_{CO2,LPG,y}$)</td></tr><tr><td>Saturation pressure of H₂O at temperature T_t in time interval t ($p_{H2O,t,Sat}$)</td></tr></table>		Parameter not monitored during the considered monitoring period	Volumetric flow of LFG stream in time interval t on a dry basis on a dry basis ($V_{t,db}$)	Volumetric fraction of CH ₄ in the collected LFG in time interval t on a dry basis ($v_{CH4,t,db}$)	Mass flow of the LFG stream in time interval t on dry basis ($M_{t,db,i}$)	Quantity of fuel Diesel combusted by the captive off-grid electricity generator ($FC_{Diesel,y}$)	Net calorific value of the fuel Diesel in year y ($NCV_{Diesel,y}$)	CO ₂ emission factor of fuel Diesel in year y ($EF_{CO2,Diesel,y}$)	Quantity of electricity generated in captive diesel backup generator during the year y ($EG_{Diesel-Generator,y}$)	Mass flow of methane in the exhaust gas of the flare on a dry basis at reference conditions in the time period t ($F_{CH4,EG,t}$)	Temperature in the exhaust gas of the enclosed flare in minute m ($T_{EG,m}$)	Maintenance events completed in year y as monitored by the project participants ($Maintenance_v$)	Quantity of LPG consumed by the project activity in year y ($FC_{LPG,y}$)	Net calorific value of the fuel LPG ($NCV_{LPG,y}$)	CO ₂ emission factor of fuel LPG in year y ($EF_{CO2,LPG,y}$)	Saturation pressure of H ₂ O at temperature T_t in time interval t ($p_{H2O,t,Sat}$)
Parameter not monitored during the considered monitoring period																	
Volumetric flow of LFG stream in time interval t on a dry basis on a dry basis ($V_{t,db}$)																	
Volumetric fraction of CH ₄ in the collected LFG in time interval t on a dry basis ($v_{CH4,t,db}$)																	
Mass flow of the LFG stream in time interval t on dry basis ($M_{t,db,i}$)																	
Quantity of fuel Diesel combusted by the captive off-grid electricity generator ($FC_{Diesel,y}$)																	
Net calorific value of the fuel Diesel in year y ($NCV_{Diesel,y}$)																	
CO ₂ emission factor of fuel Diesel in year y ($EF_{CO2,Diesel,y}$)																	
Quantity of electricity generated in captive diesel backup generator during the year y ($EG_{Diesel-Generator,y}$)																	
Mass flow of methane in the exhaust gas of the flare on a dry basis at reference conditions in the time period t ($F_{CH4,EG,t}$)																	
Temperature in the exhaust gas of the enclosed flare in minute m ($T_{EG,m}$)																	
Maintenance events completed in year y as monitored by the project participants ($Maintenance_v$)																	
Quantity of LPG consumed by the project activity in year y ($FC_{LPG,y}$)																	
Net calorific value of the fuel LPG ($NCV_{LPG,y}$)																	
CO ₂ emission factor of fuel LPG in year y ($EF_{CO2,LPG,y}$)																	
Saturation pressure of H ₂ O at temperature T_t in time interval t ($p_{H2O,t,Sat}$)																	
	<p>No assessment details are thus included for the parameters listed above.</p>																
Findings	<p>No CARs and CLs were raised regarding compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments/equipment:</p>																
Conclusion	<p>As a conclusion, the EPIC verification team was able to confirm that the calibration events performed for all monitoring instruments of the project activity were conducted in accordance with the monitoring plan of the PDD ^{/2/}, ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/} and applicable tools during the monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016. Documented evidences for performed calibration events allowed the EPIC verification team to confirm that applied monitoring instruments/equipped operated under appropriate manner during the considered monitoring period.</p>																

	<p>Moreover, the EPIC verification team has also confirmed that no calibration event valid for the monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016 has identified an error beyond the maximum permissible error of the respective measuring instrument.</p> <p>In summary, compliance with applicable calibration frequency requirements was confirmed for all monitoring instruments/equipment.</p>
--	--

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>The EPIC verification team assessed whether the methods and formulae used to determine baseline emissions for the considered monitoring period are correct and appropriate. The performed assessment encompassed checking whether applied methods and formulae as described in the registered monitoring plan and applicable methodology + methodological tools were correctly applied, including confirmation whether the Monitoring Report includes all parameters and monitored data at the intervals required by the applied methodology + methodological tools as per the PDD ^{/2/}. The correctness of application of emission factors and default values (ex-ante determined/fixed parameters as per the PDD) ^{/2/} was also verified.</p> <p>Through assessment of the Monitoring Report, the EPIC verification team was able to verify that as correctly indicated in the Monitoring Report ^{/3/} and also as established by ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/}, applied methodological tools and the PDD ^{/2/}, baseline emissions (BE_y) for the considered monitoring period are correctly calculated as follows:</p> $BE_y = BE_{CH_4,y} + BE_{EC,y}$ <p>Where:</p> <p>BE_{EC,y} Baseline emissions associated with electricity generation in year y. As correctly outlined in the Monitoring Report ^{/3/}, BE_{EC,y} is determined as follows:</p> $BE_{EC,y} = EC_{BL,y} * EF_{EL,grid,y} * (1 + TDL_{grid,y})$ <p>Where:</p> <p>EC_{BL,y} Net amount of electricity generated using LFG in year y (in MWh). Total net electricity generated by the project activity during the considered monitoring period is reported as 84,726.514 MWh.</p> <p>TDL_{grid,y} Average technical transmission and distribution losses for providing electricity to the grid and/or for grid sourced electricity consumed by the project activity. As indicated in the PDD ^{/2/}, in the particular case of the determination of BE_{EC,y}, TDL_{grid,y} is <i>ex-ante</i> determined as 3% (TDL_{grid,export,y}).</p> <p>EF_{EL,grid,y} Emission factor for grid-sourced electricity in year y. For the considered monitoring period, EF_{EL,grid} is determined as the Combined margin CO₂ emission factor (EF_{grid,CM,y}) that is calculated as the weighted average of the ex-ante determined value for the monitoring parameters "Operating margin CO₂ emission factor in year y" (EF_{grid,OM,y}) and "Build margin CO₂ emission factors" (EF_{grid,BM,y}). In order to appropriately weight these two factors, the also previously determined and validated default values for the <i>ex-ante</i> determined parameters "Weighting of operating margin emission factor" (w_{OM}) and "Weighting of build margin emission factor" (w_{BM}) are applied.</p>
------------------------------	--

For the considered monitoring period, $EF_{grid,CM,y}$ is thus determined as follows:

$$EF_{grid,CM,y} = w_{OM} * EF_{grid,OM,y} + w_{BM} * EF_{grid,BM,y}$$

Where:

w_{OM} Weighting of operating margin emissions factor. As established in the PDD ^{/2/}, w_{OM} is *ex-ante* determined as 0.5 (50%).

w_{BM} Weighting of operating margin emissions factor. As established in the PDD ^{/2/}, w_{BM} is *ex-ante* determined as 0.5 (50%).

$EF_{grid,OM,y}$ Operating margin CO₂ emission factor in year y . As indicated in the PDD ^{/2/}, $EF_{grid,OM,y}$ is *ex-ante* determined as 0.7479 tCO₂/MWh.

$EF_{grid,BM,y}$ Build margin CO₂ emission factor in year y . As indicated in the PDD ^{/2/}, $EF_{grid,BM,y}$ is *ex-ante* determined as 0.7046 tCO₂/MWh.

$EF_{EL,grid,y}$ is thus calculated as 0.7154 tCO₂/MWh.

As confirmed by the EPIC verification team, the calculated accumulated value for $BE_{EC,y}$ for the considered monitoring period is correctly determined as 62,432 tCO₂e.

$BE_{CH4,y}$ Baseline emissions of methane from the SWDS. $BE_{CH4,y}$ is determined as follows:

$$BE_{CH4,y} = ((1 - OX_{top_layer}) * F_{CH4,PJ,y} - F_{CH4,BL,y}) * GWP_{CH4}$$

Where:

OX_{top_layer} Fraction of methane in the LFG that would be oxidized in the top layer of the SWDS in the baseline scenario. As indicated in the PDD ^{/2/}, OX_{top_layer} is *ex-ante* determined as 10%.

$GWP_{CH4,y}$ Global warming potential of CH₄. As indicated in the PDD ^{/2/}, $GWP_{CH4,y}$ is *ex-ante* determined as 25.

$F_{CH4,BL,y}$ Amount of methane in the LFG that would be flared in the baseline scenario (absence of project activity). $F_{CH4,BL,y}$ is calculated as follows:

$$F_{CH4,BL,y} = F_{CH4,hist,y} = F_{CH4,BL,x-1} / F_{CH4,x-1} * F_{CH4,PJ,y}$$

Where:

$F_{CH4,hist,y}$ Historical amount of methane in the LFG which is captured and destroyed (in t CH₄/yr).

$F_{CH4,BL,x-1}$ Historical amount of methane in the LFG which is captured and destroyed in the year prior to the implementation of the project activity. $F_{CH4,BL,x-1}$ is *ex-ante* determined as 516.16 t CH₄/yr.

$F_{CH,x-1}$ Amount of methane in the LFG generated in the SWDS in the year prior to the implementation of the project activity. $F_{CH4,BL,x-1}$ is *ex-ante* determined as 41,292.46 t CH₄/yr (year 2006).

$F_{CH_4,PJ,capt,y}$ Amount of methane collected by the project activity. $F_{CH_4,PJ,capt,y}$ is determined as follows:

$$F_{CH_4,PJ,capt,y} = F_{CH_4,sent,flare,y} + F_{CH_4,EL,y}$$

Where:

$F_{CH_4,EL,y}$ Amount of methane in the LFG which is used for electricity generation in year y (in tCH_4/yr). Assessment details for the determination of every-minute values for $F_{CH_4,EL,y}$ during the considered monitoring period are presented below (under “*Determination of every-minute values for the calculation parameter $F_{CH_4,EL,y}$* ”).

$F_{CH_4,sent,flare,y}$ Amount of methane in the LFG which is sent to the flare (in tCH_4) during the whole monitoring period. While no collected LFG was sent to the flares during the considered monitoring period, $F_{CH_4,sent,flare,y}$ is thus considered as null.

As confirmed by the EPIC verification team, the calculated accumulated value for $F_{CH_4,BL,y}$ for the considered monitoring period is correctly determined as 226 tCH_4 .

$F_{CH_4,PJ,y}$ Amount of methane in the LFG which is flared and/or used in the project activity. As outlined in the latest version of the Monitoring Report ^{/3/} and in accordance with the PDD ^{/2/}, $F_{CH_4,PJ,y}$ is correctly determined as follows:

$$F_{CH_4,PJ,y} = F_{CH_4,flared,y} + F_{CH_4,EL,y}$$

Where:

$F_{CH_4,EL,y}$ Amount of methane in the LFG which is used for electricity generation in year y (in tCH_4/yr). Assessment details for the determination of every-minute values for $F_{CH_4,EL,y}$ are presented below (under “*Determination of every-minute values for the calculation parameter $F_{CH_4,EL,y}$* ”).

$F_{CH_4,flared,y}$ Amount of methane in the LFG flared by the project activity (in tCH_4). While no collected LFG was sent to the flares during the considered monitoring period, $F_{CH_4,flared,y}$ is thus considered as null.

Assessment details for the determination of every-minute values for the calculation parameter $F_{CH_4,EL,y}$:

In accordance with ACM0001 version 15.0) ^{/7/}, the amount of methane in the LFG which is sent to the project’s electricity generation component is determined by following the applicable guidance of the methodological tool “Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream” ^{/14/}. For the considered monitoring period, Option C (volume flow of LFG and volumetric fraction of CH_4 in collected LFG being measured in wet basis) of this methodological tool is selected. As per Option C of this methodological tool, the amount of methane in the LFG which is sent to the engine-generator sets is determined as follows:

$$F_{CH_4,EL,y} = V_{t,wb,n} * v_{CH_4,t,wb} * \rho_{CH_4,n}$$

Where:

$V_{t,wb,n}$ Volumetric flow of the gaseous stream (LFG) sent to the electricity generation infrastructure in time interval t on a wet basis at normal conditions. While measurements of volumetric flow of LFG sent to the electricity generation infrastructure are automatically processed and recorded in Nm^3 of wet gas/h (normal conditions), the following assumption is valid:

$$V_{t,wb,n} = V_{t,wb}$$

Where:

$V_{t,wb}$ Volumetric flow of the gaseous stream (LFG) in time interval t on a wet basis at actual conditions.

$V_{CH_4,t,wb}$ Volumetric fraction of CH_4 in the gaseous stream in time interval t on a wet basis.

$\rho_{CH_4,n}$ Density of CH_4 in the gaseous stream (LFG) at normal conditions. As per the selected determination procedure of the "Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream"^{/14/}, $\rho_{CH_4,n}$ is calculated as follows:

$$\rho_{CH_4,n} = (P_n * MM_i) / (R_u * T_n)$$

Where:

P_n Absolute pressure at normal conditions. *Ex-ante* determined as 101,325 Pa.

T_n Temperature at normal conditions. *Ex-ante* determined as 273.15 Kelvin.

MM_i Molecular mass of greenhouse gas i ($i = CH_4$). *Ex-ante* determined as 16.04 kg/mol.

R_u Universal ideal gases constant. *Ex-ante* determined as 8,314 Pa.m³/kmol.K.

The EPIC verification team was able to verify that the value of the parameter $\rho_{CH_4,n}$ was correctly calculated and reported as 0.7156650 kgCH₄/m³CH₄.

Assessment details for the additional monitoring requirements applicable for the simplified monitoring approach of the latest version of the PDD "Use of a single flow meter for multi-use of recovered biogas":

During the performed on-site visit, the EPIC assessment team has confirmed that, as appropriately outlined in Box 1 of the latest version of the Monitoring Report^{/3/}, during the considered monitoring period collected LFG sent to the project's electricity generation infrastructure was measured by a single LFG flow meter (with no collected LFG being sent to the project's high temperature enclosed flares for combustion). While the determination of baseline emissions for the considered monitoring period is performed by applying the simplified monitoring approach of the latest version of the PDD termed "Use of a single flow meter for multi-use of recovered biogas", all additional requirements for the use of such simplified monitoring approach were assessed by the EPIC verification team.

During the performed on-site visit, the EPIC assessment team has also confirmed that there is an individual safety shut-off valve installed/located within each section of the project's LFG supply pipeline that directs LFG towards each operational individual flare (and prior to each one of these biogas destruction devices) that automatically closes whenever the underlying biogas utilization device becomes under non-operational status. Through assessment of historical additional monitoring data (every-minute records of the status of each one of the 3 installed valves) and operational records of the project activity ^{/6/}, the EPIC verification team confirmed that such 3 valves (one valve for each installed flare) have been kept under "closed" status since 10/03/2014 (incl. the whole considered monitoring period). The non-operational status of the 3 flares during the whole considered monitoring period was also confirmed through assessment of records of the monitoring parameter "Flame detection of flare in the minute m " (Flame_m) valid for the considered monitoring period.

The EPIC assessment team has also confirmed that the design of the installed engine-generator sets of the project's electricity generation infrastructure and the whole construction of the project's electricity generation infrastructure ensure that no collected LFG is vented (directly emitted into the atmosphere) through any one of the installed engine-generators when they are not under operational status.

Whenever installed engine-generators are under operational status, for all time instants all collected LFG sent to such biogas utilization devices is utilized (combusted) as gaseous fuel for electricity generation.

As also confirmed by the EPIC verification team, all installed engine-generator sets are of design and constructions where there is an individual safety/control valve (located in the air/fuel mix intake manifold of each set) that is automatically kept under "closed" status/position whenever the underlying engine-generator set is not under operation.

Through assessment of the main emission reductions calculation spreadsheet valid for the considered monitoring, the EPIC assessment team has also confirmed that the following checking requirements (as described in the Monitoring Report) were fulfilled during the considered monitoring period:

"(...)

- *Records of electricity generated by the engine generator sets and records from the status of the both the flare(s) (by means of a flame detector(s) and the valves located prior to the flares within the project's LFG pipeline). In the particular case of the engine-generator sets, it is demonstrated that electricity generation (as the output from operation of such devices) corresponds to the flow of LFG actually consumed by the devices (in energy basis).*
- *For any time instants minute m where one or more biogas destruction/utilization devices connected downstream to the utilized single LFG flow meter (i.e. engine-generator set(s) and/or flare(s)) were under non-operational status, it is demonstrated that the set of remaining devices under operational status (i.e. engine-generator sets utilizing LFG as fuel for electricity generation in the particular case of the considered monitoring period) have the quantitative capacity to combust the amount of LFG flow that was sent to the underlying devices during the underlying minute m .*

	<p>As assessed by the EPIC verification team, the main emission reductions calculation spreadsheet valid for the considered monitoring includes a Section termed "<i>Checking of meeting of the condition "that the output corresponds to the flow of gas (e.g., through mass and/or energy balance)"</i>". Under such section of the main emission reductions calculation spreadsheet, for every minute of the considered monitoring period, by appropriately taking into account the conversion efficiency range of installed equipment (specific fuel consumption for the engine generator sets) and additional energy losses (e.g. heat and noise) energy content of supplied LFG (input) is compared against energy content of generated electricity (output). As verified by the EPIC verification team, whenever the ratio between output energy (power generated in the minute m (in MWh) and input energy (energy content of LFG consumed in the minute m (in MWh)) is between 0.35 and 0.40 (LFG to electricity conversion efficiency within the range from 35% to 40%), it is correctly assumed that the condition "<i>output corresponds to the flow of gas</i>" is met. It is the opinion of the EPIC verification team that the applied approach for checking meeting of the underlying condition (as reported in the main emission reductions calculation spreadsheet) is deemed reasonable and correct. The EPIC verification team has assessed fact sheets with specifications of the installed engine generator sets ^{/31/} ^{/32/} and technical literature issued by the US Environmental Agency (US-EPA) ^{/36/} that confirms that assuming the project's electricity generation infrastructure as operating with LFG to electricity energy conversion efficiency within the range from 35% to 40% is deemed realistic and correct.</p> <p>Furthermore, the EPIC assessment team also confirmed that installed CH₄ content gas analyzer used for measuring methane content in collected LFG during the considered monitoring period is indeed located immediately downstream of the utilized unique LFG flow meter as required in the PDD.</p> <p>The calculated accumulated value for $F_{CH_4,PJ,y} = F_{CH_4,EL,y}$ for the considered monitoring period is correctly determined as 18,051 tCH₄.</p> <p>The calculated value for $BE_{CH_4,y}$ for the monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016 is correctly determined as 400,498 tCO₂e.</p> <p>The calculated total value for baseline emissions (BE_y) for the monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016 is correctly determined as 462,930 tCO₂e.</p>
Findings	<p>A CAR was raised concerning the calculations of baseline emissions:</p> <p>CAR 7: Accumulated values of $F_{CH_4,PJ,y}$, $F_{CH_4,BL,y}$, $BE_{CH_4,y}$, $EC_{BL,y}$, $BE_{EC,y}$ and BE_y as reported in the initial version of the Monitoring Report are not in accordance with emission reductions calculation spreadsheets.</p> <p>The representatives of the project participant KDM S.A. were requested to address the above-summarized raised CAR by providing to the EPIC verification team sufficient evidences to determine that the applicable CDM requirements have been met and/or through performance sufficient modification (corrections/improvements) in the initial version of the Monitoring Report and/or enclosed calculation spreadsheets if applicable.</p>
Conclusion	<p>The EPIC verification team was able to confirm, upon closure of the raised CAR, that all related calculations for the determination of baseline emissions are provided in the main emission reduction calculation spreadsheets files ^{/5/} and the summarized emission reduction calculation spreadsheet ^{/5/} in a deemed correct and transparent manner. All performed calculations for baseline emissions, as reported in the latest version of the Monitoring Report ^{/3/} and emission reduction calculation spreadsheets ^{/5/}, were verified to be performed under full conformance with</p>

	<p>applicable requirements of the PDD ^{/2/}, ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/11/} and applicable methodological tools ^{/12/ /13/ /14/ /15/}. Applied methods and formulae, as described in the monitoring plan from the PDD ^{/2/} and applicable methodology + methodological tools, were correctly applied.</p> <p>The calculated value for BE_y for the monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016 is correctly determined as 462,930 tCO₂e.</p> <p>It is noteworthy that, as a result of the applied correction approach for addressing the raised related CAR, the calculated value of BE_y as per the latest version of the Monitoring Report is slightly lower than the value as per the previous and initial version of the Monitoring Report.</p>
--	--

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

Means of verification	<p>The EPIC verification team assessed whether the methods and formulae used to determine project emissions for the considered monitoring period are appropriate. The performed assessment encompassed checking whether applied methods and formulae as described in the registered monitoring plan and applicable methodology + methodological tools were correctly applied, including confirmation whether the Monitoring Report includes all parameters and monitored data at the intervals required by the applied methodology + methodological tools as per the PDD ^{/2/}. The correct application of emission factor and default values (ex-ante determined/fixed parameters as per the PDD ^{/2/}) was also verified.</p> <p>The EPIC verification team was able to verify that as correctly indicated in the Monitoring Report ^{/3/}, project emissions for the whole monitoring period due to the operation of the project activity are determined as follows:</p> $PE_y = PE_{EC,grid,y} + PE_{EC,captive,y}$ <p>Where:</p> <p>$PE_{EC,grid,y}$ Project emissions due to the consumption of grid-sourced electricity by the project activity in year y</p> <p>$PE_{EC,captive,y}$ Project emissions from consumption of electricity generated by a captive off-grid electricity generator fuelled by fossil fuel (diesel) in year y</p> <p><i>Project emissions due to the consumption of grid-sourced electricity by the project activity ($PE_{EC,grid,y}$):</i></p> <p>As correctly outlined in the latest version of the Monitoring Report ^{/3/}, for the whole considered monitoring period, emissions due to the consumption of grid-sourced electricity by the project activity ($PE_{EC,grid,y}$) are correctly determined by following applicable guidance of the methodological tool "Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption" (version 01) ^{/13/} as follows:</p> $PE_{EC,grid,y} = EC_{PJ,grid,y} * EF_{EL,grid,y} * (1 + TDL_{grid,y})$ <p>Where:</p> <p>$EC_{PJ,grid,y}$ Quantity of grid-sourced electricity consumed by the project activity in year y. Total accumulated amount of grid-sourced electricity consumption during the considered monitoring period is reported as 20.17 MWh. Assessment details for the monitoring parameter $EC_{PJ,grid,y}$ valid for the considered monitoring period are included in Section E.6.2.</p> <p>$TDL_{grid,y}$ Average technical transmission and distribution losses for providing electricity to the grid and/or for grid sourced electricity consumed by the project activity. As indicated in the PDD ^{/2/}, in the particular case of</p>
------------------------------	--

the determination of $PE_{EC,grid,y}$, $TDL_{grid,y}$ is *ex-ante* determined as 20% ($TDL_{grid,import,y}$).

$EF_{EL,grid,y}$ Emission factor for grid-sourced electricity in year y . For the considered monitoring period, $EF_{EL,grid}$ is determined as the Combined margin CO_2 emission factor ($EF_{grid,CM,y}$) that is calculated as the weighted average of the *ex-ante* determined values for the monitoring parameters "Operating margin CO_2 emission factor in year y " ($EF_{grid,OM,y}$) and "Build margin CO_2 emission factors" ($EF_{grid,BM,y}$). In order to appropriately weight these two factors, the also previously determined and validated default values for the *ex-ante* determined parameters "Weighting of operating margin emission factor" (w_{OM}) and "Weighting of build margin emission factor" (w_{BM}) are applied. For the considered monitoring period, $EF_{grid,CM,y}$ is thus determined as follows:

$$EF_{grid,CM,y} = w_{OM} * EF_{grid,OM,y} + w_{BM} * EF_{grid,BM,y}$$

Where:

w_{OM} Weighting of operating margin emissions factor. As established in the PDD ^{/2/}, w_{OM} is *ex-ante* determined as 0.5 (50%).

w_{BM} Weighting of operating margin emissions factor. As established in the PDD ^{/2/}, w_{BM} is *ex-ante* determined as 0.5 (50%).

$EF_{grid,OM,y}$ Operating margin CO_2 emission factor in year y . As indicated in the PDD ^{/2/}, $EF_{grid,OM,y}$ is *ex-ante* determined as 0.7479 tCO₂/MWh.

$EF_{grid,BM,y}$ Build margin CO_2 emission factor in year y . As indicated in the PDD ^{/2/}, $EF_{grid,BM,y}$ is *ex-ante* determined as 0.7046 tCO₂/MWh.

The calculated value for $PE_{EC,grid,y}$ for the considered monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016 is correctly determined as 17 tCO₂ (rounded value).

Project emissions from consumption of electricity generated by a captive off-grid electricity generator fuelled by fossil fuel (diesel) in year y ($PE_{EC,captive,y}$):

As correctly outlined in the latest version of the Monitoring Report ^{/3/}, for the considered monitoring period, emissions due to the consumption of electricity sourced by the captive diesel off-grid electricity generators I and III by the project activity ($PE_{EC,captive,y,1}$ and $PE_{EC,captive,y,3}$) are correctly determined by following applicable guidance of the methodological tool "Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption" (version 01) ^{/13/} as follows:

$$PE_{EC,captive,y,n} = EC_{PJ,captive,y,n} * EF_{EL,captive,y} * (1 + TDL_{captive,y})$$

Where:

n Diesel Backup Generator number (for the considered monitoring period, $n = 1$ and 3).

$EC_{PJ,captive,y,n}$ Amount of electricity sourced by the captive electricity generator (fuelled by Diesel) in question and consumed by the project activity. For the considered monitoring period, total accumulated amount of electricity sourced by the captive backup diesel generators 1 and 3 are reported as 22.687 MWh ($EC_{captive,y,1}$) and 0.257 MWh ($EC_{captive,y,2}$) respectively. Assessment details for the monitoring parameter $EC_{PJ,captive,y}$ valid for the considered monitoring period are included in

	<p>Section E.6.2.</p> <p>$TDL_{captive,y}$ Average technical transmission and distribution losses for electricity sourced by the captive electricity generator. As indicated in the PDD ^{12/}, $TDL_{captive,y}$ is <i>ex-ante</i> determined as zero.</p> <p>$EF_{EL,captive,y}$ CO₂ emission factor for electricity sourced by the captive off-grid electricity generators. As indicated in the PDD ^{12/}, $EF_{EL,captive,y}$ is <i>ex-ante</i> determined as 1.3 tCO₂/MWh.</p> <p>The calculated values for $PE_{EC,captive,y,1}$ and $PE_{EC,captive,y,3}$ for the considered monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016 are correctly determined as 30 tCO₂ (rounded value) and 1 tCO₂ (rounded value), respectively.</p> <p>As indicated in the Monitoring Report, while no measurements of electricity sourced by the Backup Diesel Generator II (sub-parameter $EC_{PJ,captive,y,2}$) were performed during the considered monitoring period, $PE_{EC,captive,y,2}$ is thus determined by applying the conservative approach of option B4 of the “Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption” as follows:</p> $PE_{EC,captive,y,2} = 11,400^{11} * PP_{CP,Diesel-generator,2}$ <p>Where:</p> <p>$PP_{CP,Diesel-generator,2}$ Rated capacity of the installed captive off-grid electricity generator fuelled by diesel ($PP_{CP,Diesel-generator,2}$) (in MW). $PP_{CP,Diesel-generator,2}$ is <i>ex-ante</i> determined as 0.352 MW. This value represents the nameplate power of the installed captive off-grid electricity generator II.</p> <p>By applying the value of $PP_{CP,Diesel-generator,2}$ as well as the period this captive off-grid electricity generator was under operation:</p> $PE_{EC,captive,y,2} = 1.3 * 5,616 * 0.352 = 2,570 \text{ tCO}_2 \text{ (rounded value)}$ <p>The EPIC assessment team has confirmed that both applied approaches for determining project emissions due to the consumption of electricity sourced by the backup captive off-grid electricity generators (fuelled by Diesel) are in accordance with the PDD.</p> <p>Total project emissions due to the consumption of electricity sourced by the backup captive off-grid electricity generators (fuelled by Diesel) are thus calculated as 2,601 tCO₂.</p> <p>Total project emissions (PE_y) are correctly calculated and reported as 2,618 tCO₂ (rounded value) and are correctly considered in the context of the emission reduction calculations.</p>
Findings	<p>A CAR was raised concerning the calculations of project emissions:</p> <p>CAR 8: Accumulated values of $EC_{PJ,grid,y}$, $PE_{EC,grid,y}$ and PE_y as reported in the initial version of the Monitoring Report are not in accordance with emission reductions calculation spreadsheets.</p>
Conclusion	<p>Upon closure of the raised CAR, the EPIC verification team was able to confirm that all related calculations for the determination of project emissions are provided in the</p>

¹¹ 11,400 = 8,760 * 1.3 (i.e., the number of hours encompassed by one year multiplied by the conservative emission factor 1.3 tCO₂/MWh). For the determination of $PE_{EC,captive,y}$ for the considered monitoring period "5,616" is used instead of "8,760" figure, thus correctly taking into account the quantity of hours encompassed by the considered monitoring period of 234 day length (i.e 234 * 24 hours = 5,616 hours).

	<p>summarized emission reduction calculation spreadsheet ^{/5/} in a deemed correct and transparent manner. All performed calculations for project emissions, as reported in the latest version of the Monitoring Report ^{/3/} and summarized emission reduction calculation spreadsheet ^{/5/}, were verified to be performed under full conformance with applicable requirements of the PDD ^{/2/}, ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/} and applicable methodological tools ^{/13/ /15/ /17/}. Applied methods and formulae, as described in the monitoring plan from the PDD ^{/2/} and applicable methodology + methodological tools, were correctly applied.</p> <p>The calculated value for PE_y for the monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016 is correctly determined as 2,618 tCO₂ (rounded value).</p>
--	---

E.8.3. Calculation of leakage GHG emissions

Means of verification	Not applicable. In accordance with the applied CDM baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0001 (version 15.0) ^{/7/} , the PDD ^{/2/} indicates that no leakage emissions are to be considered in the context of emission reduction calculations.
Findings	Not applicable.
Conclusion	Not applicable.

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

Means of verification	<p>The EPIC verification team assessed whether calculation and reporting of achieved GHG emission reductions for the considered monitoring period are correct.</p> <p>As a result of the performed verification assessment, the EPIC verification team was able to confirm that the determination of achieved GHG emission reductions for the considered monitoring period are performed and reported in a correct, objective and transparent manner. As confirmed by the EPIC verification team, determination of baseline and project emissions are in accordance with the applicable requirements from the following reference and methodological documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monitoring plan and other related provisions of the PDD ^{/2/}. - CDM baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0001 - 'Flaring or use of landfill gas' (version 15.0) ^{/7/}, - Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption (version 01) ^{/13/}. - Tool to calculate project or leakage CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion" (version 02) ^{/15/} - "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system" (version 04.0 ^{/17/}) - "Project emissions from flaring" (version 02.0.0) ^{/12/} - "Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream" (version 03.0.0) ^{/14/} <p>All figures and input data as well as all performed calculations were checked by the EPIC verification team and were found to be reported in a deemed correct, appropriate and transparent manner in the latest versions of the Monitoring Report ^{/3/} and emission reduction calculation spreadsheets ^{/5/}. EPIC was thus able to confirm that the emission reductions reported for the monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016 are based on authentic measurements of related monitoring data and are also based on the application of a semi-automatic and systematic data monitoring procedure for automatically recorded monitoring data as well as data related to the consumption of LPG, electricity sourced by the installed captive off-grid electricity generator (fuelled by Diesel), grid-sourced electricity by the project activity and electricity generated by the project activity. Moreover, as also</p>
------------------------------	--

	assessed by the EPIC verification team, 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016 monitoring data records were correctly retrieved and utilized in the emission reduction calculation spreadsheets ^{/5/} for performing related calculation and reporting of achieved emission reductions for the considered monitoring period. EPIC was thus able to verify that, in general, all calculation and reporting procedures were adopted in a deemed transparent, correct and reliable manner.
Findings	No findings (CARs, CLs) were raised regarding reporting and calculations of summary of calculation of GHG emission reductions.
Conclusion	The EPIC verification team was able to confirm that reported achieved emission reductions for monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016 are correctly calculated and reported as the difference between determined accumulated values for baseline emissions and project emissions for the period. Reported achieved emission reductions are in accordance with all applicable measurement, reporting and calculation requirements as per the monitoring plan of the PDD ^{/2/} , monitoring and baseline methodology ACM0001 - "Flaring or use of landfill gas" (version 15.0) ^{/17/} and applicable methodological tools ^{/13/ /14/ /15/ /17/} .

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

Means of verification	The EPIC verification team assessed the comparison of achieved GHG emission reductions with related estimates as per the PDD ^{/2/} .							
	As part of the performed verification assessment, reported and verified emission reductions achieved by the project activity during the monitoring period encompassing 234 days within year of 2016 were compared against the equivalent related <i>ex-ante</i> estimation of emission reductions for year 2016 for such period as per the PDD ^{/2/} . The results of such comparisons are summarized and assessed below:							
	<table><thead><tr><th>Period</th><th>Ex-ante estimation of emission reductions as per the PDD (in tCO₂e)</th><th>Achieved emission reductions (in tCO₂e)</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016 (considered monitoring period)</td><td>809,032</td><td>460,312</td></tr></tbody></table>	Period	Ex-ante estimation of emission reductions as per the PDD (in tCO ₂ e)	Achieved emission reductions (in tCO ₂ e)	Period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016 (considered monitoring period)	809,032	460,312	
Period	Ex-ante estimation of emission reductions as per the PDD (in tCO ₂ e)	Achieved emission reductions (in tCO ₂ e)						
Period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016 (considered monitoring period)	809,032	460,312						
Findings	No findings (CARs, CLs) were raised regarding the comparison of achieved emission reductions against related <i>ex-ante</i> estimation of emission reductions as per the PDD.							
Conclusion	As confirmed by the EPIC verification team, for the 234-day length monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016, achieved emission reductions are correctly indicated as about ~43% lower than the comparable value of <i>ex-ante</i> estimation of emission reductions as per the PDD ^{/2/} valid for such period. As further assessed in Section E.8.6., the Monitoring Report presents a set of factors and aspects that sufficiently explains the occurred differences between achieved/verified emission							

	reductions during the considered monitoring period and the comparable value for <i>ex-ante</i> estimation of emission reductions as per the PDD ^{/2/} for the same time period. This is deemed correct and in accordance with applicable verification requirements.
--	--

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

Means of verification	<p>The EPIC verification team assessed the remarks on the difference between achieved GHG emission reductions and applicable estimated value in the PDD ^{/2/}.</p> <p>As appropriately indicated in Section E.6 of the latest version of the Monitoring Report ^{/3/}, there are a set of factors and aspects that sufficiently explain the occurred slightly difference between verified emission reductions achieved during the considered monitoring period and the comparable value for <i>ex-ante</i> estimation of emission reductions as per the PDD ^{/2/} for the same time period. Assessment for such factors and aspects are summarized below:</p> <p><i>Aspects/conditions that represent a decrease factor of reported emission reductions for the considered monitoring period when compared against the ex-ante estimation of emission reduction for the same period in the PDD:</i></p> <p><u>1. Uncertainties associated with the application of First Order Decay (FOD) multi-phased model for estimating the emission reductions in the PDD:</u></p> <p>Like any other CDM project activity encompassing LFG collection and destruction/utilization, all potential uncertainties associated with the application of the First Order Decay (FOD) multi-phased model in the context of the <i>ex-ante</i> estimation of emission reductions in the PDD ^{/2/} are applicable for the <i>ex-ante</i> estimation of emission reductions for the “Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project”. The EPIC verification team has confirmed that it is reasonable to assume that the uncertainties associated with the application of such decay model have somehow underestimated the amount of LFG to be generated and collected by the project activity during the considered monitoring period.</p> <p><u>2. Reduced performance of the project’s LFG collection infrastructure and no improvement of existing infrastructure (with no collected LFG being sent to the project’s flares for destruction):</u></p> <p>The EPIC verification team was also able to verify that, as correctly indicated in the Monitoring Report ^{/3/}, during the considered monitoring period, the project’s LFG destruction (flaring) facility was out of operation due to operational difficulties/challenges faced in the latest years by KDM S.A. where incremental and required investment on improvement of LFG collection infrastructure at the Loma Los Colorados landfill (e.g. increase of the number and/or quality of LFG collection wells beyond the number/specifications previously considered as part of the project design conceptualization) in order to allow excess of LFG to be combusted in the flares were not made.. As confirmed by the EPIC verification team, this negatively affected the amount of emission reductions achieved by the project activity during the considered monitoring period.</p>
Findings	<p>A CAR was raised concerning the difference from estimated GHG emission reductions as per the PDD and actual emission reductions achieved by the project activity during the considered monitoring period.</p> <p>CAR 9:</p> <p>While achieved emission reductions were acknowledged as been negatively affected by the lack of investments on improvement of the LFG collection infrastructure, this aspect is not considered under the “<i>Aspects/conditions which represent a decrease factor of reported emission reductions for the considered monitoring period when compared against the ex-ante estimation of emission</i></p>

	<i>reduction for the same period in the PDD</i> ” in Section E.6 of the Monitoring Report.
Conclusion	As a conclusion, by taking into account the factor/aspect listed above, upon closure of the raised CAR, it is the opinion of the EPIC verification team that the occurred relative difference between achieved emission reductions during the considered monitoring period and calculated comparable PDD's ex-ante estimation of emission reductions for the same period is deemed acceptable, plausible and reasonable.

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	As the monitoring period covered by this Verification Report (12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016) started after 01/01/2013, this verification does not include assessment of GHG emission reductions occurred during the first commitment period. Achieved emission GHG emission reductions as reported in the Monitoring Report ^{/3/} occurred after 01/01/2013.
Findings	No findings (CARs, CLs) were raised regarding reporting and calculations of GHG emission reductions during the first commitment period and the period from 01/01/2013 onwards.
Conclusion	As a conclusion, EPIC thus confirms that the reported achieved emission reductions for monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016 are in accordance with all measurement, reporting and calculation requirements of the monitoring plan of the PDD ^{/2/} , monitoring and baseline methodology ACM0001 - ‘Flaring or use of landfill gas’ (version 15.0) ^{/7/} and applicable methodological tools ^{/13/ /14/ /15/ /17/} . No emission reductions occurred prior 01/01/2013 were considered in the current verification.

SECTION F. Internal quality control

>>

As part of EPIC internal quality control system, after the completion of assessment by the verification team, all the relevant documentation is submitted to a qualified, independent technical review team. The technical review team (with at least one member) is appointed to review the draft final verification report (Draft FVR). The technical review team assesses whether all the reporting requirements have been fulfilled and whether all the issues raised were satisfactorily addressed. The technical reviewer team either accepts or rejects element of the Draft FVR included by the verification team. The comments made by the technical review team are taken into consideration and incorporated in the final FVR. The final report (after resolutions of all findings) is then submitted to the head of operations for review and approval.

SECTION G. Verification opinion

>>

It is the opinion of EPIC that reported GHG emission reductions for the CDM project activity “Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Projects” for the monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016, as reported in the latest version of the Monitoring Report issued on 26/06/2017 (version 4.0), are calculated and reported without material misstatements and in a correct manner.

Moreover, EPIC has confirmed that all information presented in the latest version of the Monitoring Report ^{/3/} and all applied calculations for the determination of emission reductions achieved during the considered monitoring period are under full conformance with provisions and requirements of the PDD ^{/2/}, monitoring and baseline methodology ACM0001 - ‘Flaring or use of landfill gas’ (version 15.0) ^{/7/} and applicable methodological tools ^{/13/ /14/ /15/ /17/}.

EPIC thus confirms the following regarding verified emission reductions:

Project title:	Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project
----------------	---

UNFCCC ref no:	0822
PDD	Version 1.6, dated 24/06/2017.
Monitoring Report	Version 4.0, dated 26/06/2017
Methodology used for verification:	ACM0001 (version 15.0)
Applicable monitoring period:	12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016 (first and last day included)
Achieved emission reductions:	460,312 tCO ₂ e

SECTION H. Certification statement

>>

EPIC Sustainability Services Pvt. Ltd. (EPIC) has performed the 12th periodic verification assessment of the registered CDM project activity titled “Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project”. The project activity was registered by the UNFCCC on 17/03/2007 as CDM project activity with registration no. 0822 and it is currently under its 2nd 7-year renewable crediting period (period from 17/03/2014 to 16/03/2021).

The performed CDM verification assessment covered the monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016 (including both days) and represents the 12th periodic verification for the project activity.

It is EPIC responsibility to express an independent verification statement and opinion on the reported GHG emission reductions from the project activity during the covered monitoring period.

The project activity is implemented and has operated at the Loma los Colorados landfill. In accordance with related project design information made available in the latest version of the Project Design Document (PDD) valid for the 2nd 7-year crediting period, the operation of the project activity resulted in permanent and real mitigation of methane (CH₄) emissions during the considered monitoring period through collection and destruction of landfill gas (LFG) by its utilization for electricity generation in the project's electricity generation facility. While LFG is rich in CH₄, as established in the PDD for the project activity, in the absence of the project activity (baseline scenario) it is assumed that the largest share of LFG collected and destroyed by the project activity would be directly emitted into the atmosphere. Moreover, the project also promoted emission reductions resulting from the displacement of an equivalent amount of electricity generated by the project activity which would otherwise be generated by existing grid-connected power plants, including fossil-fuel fired power plants (and addition of new power generation units) within the National Electricity Grid of Chile).

The host-country project participant and project operator KDM S.A. has been responsible for gathering of monitoring data in accordance with the monitoring plan of the PDD. While supported by hired external CDM consultants, KDM S.A. has been responsible for calculating and reporting GHG emissions reductions achieved by the project activity during the considered monitoring period.

The EPIC verification team performed the verification assessment and provided its verification opinion on the basis of the provisions and requirements of the CDM baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0001 - “Flaring or use of landfill gas” (version 15.0), the monitoring plan included in the revised version of the PDD for the 2nd 7-year crediting period of the project activity (version 1.6, dated 24/06/2017) and also as per the latest version of Monitoring Report for the considered monitoring period (version 4.0, dated 26/06/2017). The verification assessment performed by EPIC included:

- i) checking whether the project activity was implemented and has operated in accordance with related project design details as described in the latest version of the Project Design Document (PDD) for the project activity;

- ii) checking whether the provisions of both the applied CDM baseline and monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan (as per the PDD) were consistently and appropriately applied;
- iii) assessment of all documented evidences which supports the reported data and claimed emission reductions during the considered monitoring period;
- iv) checking whether the installed monitoring equipment/instrument required for measuring *ex-post* determined parameters required for calculating emission reductions were calibrated and have operated appropriately.

The EPIC verification approach draws on an understanding of the risks associated with reporting of GHG emission data and the controls in place to mitigate these. EPIC planned and performed the verification assessment by obtaining evidence, information and explanations that were considered necessary for providing reasonable assurance that reported GHG emission reductions are fairly stated. All Corrective Action Requests (CARs) and/or Clarification Actions (CL) raised by EPIC as part of the performed verification assessment were confirmed to be adequately resolved.

It is the opinion of EPIC that reported GHG emission reductions for the CDM project activity “Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project” for the monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016, as reported in the latest version of the Monitoring Report issued on 26/06/2017 (version 4.0), are calculated and reported without material misstatements and in a correct manner. Moreover, EPIC has confirmed that all information presented in the latest version of the Monitoring Report and all applied calculations for the determination of emission reductions achieved during the considered monitoring period are under full conformance with provisions and requirements of the revised version of the PDD, monitoring and baseline methodology ACM0001 - ‘Flaring or use of landfill gas’ (version 15.0) and applicable methodological tools.

EPIC Sustainability Services Pvt. Ltd. (EPIC) herewith confirms that GHG emission reductions were achieved by the CDM project activity “Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project” during the monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016 as follows:

Emission reductions for the monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016:	460,312 tCO ₂ e
--	----------------------------

Appendix 1. Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Full texts
ACM	Approved Consolidated Methodology (CDM baseline and monitoring methodology)
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDEC-SIC	Centro de Despacho Económico de Carga Del Sistema Interconectado Central (Grid operation / dispatch coordinating entity for the Chilean SIC (Interconnected Central System) grid)
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CDM-EB	Clean Development Mechanism Executive Board
CDM-M&P	Modalities and Procedures for Clean Development Mechanism
CDM-PCP	Clean Development Mechanism Project Cycle Procedures
CDM-PS	Clean Development Mechanism Project Standard
CDM-VVS	Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Standard
CER	Certified Emission Reduction
CH ₄	Methane
CL	Clarification Request
CMP	Meeting of Parties to the Kyoto Protocol
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
CO ₂ e	Carbon dioxide equivalent
COP/MOP	The Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol
DNA	Designated National Authority
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
ER	Emission Reduction
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
HDPE	High Density Polyethylene
LFG	Landfill gas
LPG	Liquefied petroleum gas
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
MP	Monitoring Plan
MR	Monitoring Report
MSW	Municipals solid waste
PDD	Project Design Document
PLC	Programmable logic controller
PP	Project Participant
PPA	Power purchase agreement
QA/QC	Quality Assurance / Quality Control
SCADA	Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change
US-EPA	Environmental Protection Agency of the U.S.A.
UV	Ultra violet

Appendix 2. Competence of team members and technical reviewers

All personnel being engaged in CDM verification assessments performed by EPIC are qualified based on the established procedures of EPIC to assure the resource requirements that satisfy all the requirements of competence criteria of the CDM Accreditation Standard for operational entities. EPIC is accredited as a DOE and holds the full responsibility on decision-making regarding the verification in accordance with the accreditation requirements of the CDM-EB.

The following verification team has been assigned to carry out the verification of the project.

Name	Mr Marco A. Ratton	Dr G. Vishnu	Mr. R. Vijayaraghavan
Role	Lead Auditor	Auditor	Technical Reviewer
Competence in relevant sectoral scope(s):	Sectors 1 and 13	N/A	Sectors 1 and 13
Responsibility	Performance of document review, performance of on-site visit, preparation of initial list of findings, assessment of responses from the project participants for all list of findings and assessment of updated/corrected documents, preparation of the and draft Verification Report, addressing comments from the performed technical review and preparation of final Verification Report.	Review of documents, assistance in report preparation	Performance of Technical review

Mr. Marco A. Ratton is based in Brazil and has acted as a CDM auditor since 2007. He holds vast experience with independent assessments of CDM project activities within the area of solid waste management and effluent treatment implemented in Latin America and other regions. He also has previous working experience with planning of municipal waste management as well as educational background in mechanical fabrication & manufacturing technologies, economics and environmental management & policy. He has undergone extensive training on CDM validation and verification and is a qualified Lead Auditor for Sectoral Scope 13 under Technical Area “Waste handling and disposal” and Sector Scope 1 in accordance with procedures of EPIC sustainability services Pvt. Ltd. He also has previous experience on conducting ISO 9001/14001 assessments.

Dr. G. Vishnu holds a Masters and Doctorate in Environmental Science. He has around 8 years of experience in the field of research and consultancy related to water, wastewater, solid waste management systems, implementation of new, Cleaner Production technologies and biomass assessment studies. He has more than four years’ experience in validation verification of more than thirty CDM, projects and has undergone extensive training on GHG validation and verification. He is a Lead Auditor for various technical areas. He is also an ISO 26000 lead auditor and ISO 50001 auditor certified by Professional Evaluation and Certification Board (PECB). He is

a Certified Sustainability Assurance Practitioner (CSAP) from AccountAbility, UK. He is qualified as Lead Auditor based on EPICs CDM accreditation procedures.

Mr. R. Vijayaraghavan holds BE in Mechanical Engineering, M.Tech in Energy Conservation and Management and MBA in Technology Management. He is certified as Energy Auditor by Bureau of Energy Efficiency (BEE), Government of India. He has 10 years of working experience in energy sector including validation / verification of fifty CDM and VCS/GS projects and has undergone extensive training on CDM validation and verification and has been qualified as Lead Auditor with Sectoral Scope 1 and 13. He is also an ISO 26000 lead auditor certified by Professional Evaluation and Certification Board (PECB).

Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced

No.	Author	Title	References to the document	Provider
/1/	UNFCCC/CDM-EB	Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Standard (CDM-VVS), version 09.0 as per EB 82	Dated 20/02/2015. Available online: http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Standards/index.html	Others
/2/	KDM S.A.	Revised version of the Project Design Document (PDD) for the 2 nd 7-year renewable crediting period for the CDM project activity: "Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project", version 1.6.	Dated 24/06/2017.	Project Participants ¹²
/3/	KDM S.A.	Monitoring Report for the CDM project activity "Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project" - monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016, version 4.0.	Dated 26/06/2017.	Project Participants
/4/	KDM S.A.	Monitoring Report for the CDM project activity "Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project" - monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016, version 1.0.	Dated 16/03/2017. Available online: https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/DNV-CUK1166695034.41/view	Project Participants
/5/	KDM S.A.	Main emission reduction calculation spreadsheet \+ summarized emission reduction spreadsheet for the CDM project activity "Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project" - monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016. File names: "MR12 main - LLC - V.4.xls" "MR12 summarized - LLC - V.4.xls"	Dated 26/06/2017.	Project Participants
/6/	KDM S.A.	Input data for the emission reduction calculation spreadsheets for the project activity "Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project" - monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016. File name: "12 may to 31 dec 2017.xls"	Dated 15/03/2017.	Project Participants
/7/	UNFCCC/CDM-EB	Consolidated baseline and monitoring methodology	Dated 08/11/2013. Available online:	Others

¹² All document with provider indicated as "Project Participants" were sourced by the host-country project participant and project owner KDM S.A.

		ACM0001 - "Flaring or use of landfill gas", version 15.0 as per EB 67.	https://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/DB/LZK7FFF1UVA2II/LFNAQ0I0CUCW3RJJ	
/8/	UNFCCC	Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change	Dated 1998. Available online: http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/convkp/kpeng.pdf	Others
/9/	UNFCCC	Decision 3/CMP. 1 (Marrakesh – Accords)	Dated 30/03/2006. Available online: https://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/COPMOP/08a01.pdf	Others
/10/	TUV SÜD South Asia Pvt. Ltd.	"Validation of the renewal of crediting period of an existing CDM-project" for the project activity Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project, Version 03.	Dated 31/03/2015. Available online: https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/DNV-CUK1166695034.41/view	Others
/11/	IPCC	1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: work book; 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: work book.	Available online: http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/gl/invs5.html http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/vol5.html	Others
/12/	UNFCCC/CDM-EB	"Project emissions from flaring", version 02.0.0 as per EB 68.	Dated 20/07/2012. Available online: https://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/tools/am-tool-06-v2.0.pdf/history_view	Others
/13/	UNFCCC/CDM-EB	"Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption", version 01 as per EB 39.	Dated 16/05/2008. Available online: https://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/tools/am-tool-05-v1.pdf/history_view	Others
/14/	UNFCCC/CDM-EB	"Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream", version 03.0 as per EB 61.	Dated 27/11/2015. Available online: https://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/tools/am-tool-08-v2.0.0.pdf/history_view	Others
/15/	UNFCCC/CDM-EB	"Tool to calculate project or leakage CO ₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion", version 02 as per EB 41.	Dated 02/08/2008. Available online: https://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/tools/am-tool-03-v2.pdf/history_view	Others
/16/	EPIC	CDM Verification and Certification Report for the CDM project activity "Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project". 11 th verification (monitoring	-	Others

		period from 15/09/2014 to 11/05/2016, draft version.		
/17/	UNFCCC/CDM-EB	"Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system", version 04.0 as per EB 75.	Dated 04/10/2013. Available online: https://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/tools/am-tool-07-v1.1.pdf/history_view	Others
/18/	UNFCCC/CDM-EB	Clean Development Mechanism Project Standard (CDM-PS), version 09.0 as per EB 82	Dated 20/02/2015. Available online: http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Standards/index.html	Others
/19/	UNFCCC/CDM-EB	Clean Development Mechanism Project Cycle Procedure (CDM-PCP), version 09.0 as per EB 82	Dated 20/02/2015. Available online: http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Procedures/index.html#project_cycle	Others
/20/	KDM S.A.	Main emission reduction calculation spreadsheet + summarized emission reduction spreadsheet for the CDM project activity "Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project" - monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016. File names: "MR12 main - LLC - V.1.xls" "MR12 summarized - LLC - V.1.xls"	Dated 16/03/2017.	Project Participants
/21/	EPIC / KDM S.A.	Comparative emission reduction calculation spreadsheets for the project activity "Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project" - monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016. Created as part of the <i>Data authenticity checking</i> procedure performed during the verification. File names: "MR12 main - LLC - V.1 – for checking.xls" "MR12 summarized - LLC - V.1 for checking.xls"	Dated 20/04/2017.	Project Participants
/22/	EPIC / KDM S.A.	Comparative spreadsheet with monitoring records for the project activity "Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project" – monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016. Created as part of the <i>Data authenticity checking</i> procedure performed during the on-site visit.	Dated 20/04/2017.	Project Participants

		File name: "12 may to 31 dec 2017 – for checking.xls"		
/23/	KDM S.A.	Blank version of the main emission reduction calculation spreadsheet applied for the project activity "Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project" - monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016. File names: "MR12 main - LLC - V.1 – blank.xls" "MR12 summarized - LLC - V.1 blank.xls"	Dated 16/03/2017.	Project Participants
/24/	KDM S.A.	Internal service and maintenance log book (with details about historical of interventions, service and instrument/equipment calibration and replacement in the project activity "Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project").	Available at the project's data control room.	Project Participants
/25/	KDM S.A.	Completed Modalities of Communication (MoC) form for the CDM project activity "Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project".	Latest version dated 28/04/2017. Available online: https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/DNV-CUK1166695034.41/view?cp=1	Project Participants
/26/	EPIC	EPIC: Working procedures for performance of CDM verification assessments, Issue No. 2, Rev No. 1.	Dated 01/08/2014.	Others
/27/	EPIC	List of Findings for the 12th verification of the CDM project activity "Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project".	Dated 20/04/2017	Others
/28/	EPIC	CDM Verification and Certification Report for the CDM project activity "Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project". 9 th verification (monitoring period from 01/01/2013 to 16/03/2014, draft/working version.	-	Others
/29/	Germanischer Lloyd Certification GmbH	CDM Verification and Certification Report for the CDM project activity "Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project". 4 th periodic verifications (monitoring period from 01/09/2009 to 31/08/2010). GLC Report No. 115, Rev 07.	Dated 05/11/2012. Available online: https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/DNV-CUK1166695034.41/iProcesses/Germanischer1307274708.81/view	Others

/30/	EPIC	CDM Verification and Certification Report for the CDM project activity "Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project". 10 th verification (monitoring period from 17/03/2014 to 14/09/2014, draft/working version.	-	Others
/31/	GE Jenbacher	Specifications for the Jenbacher Type 4 Gas Engines (Jenbacher Type 4 Gas Engines / Product specifications / J 420 model/ "Bio Gas" fuel / "60 Hz" AC frequency)	Available online: https://powergen.gepower.com/products/reciprocating-engines/jenbacher-type-4.html	Others
/32/	GE Energy	Specification sheet for Waukesha gas engines APG1000	Available online: http://sl-energie.com/fileadmin/templates/makeit/cms/cms_upload/documents/APG1000_BG_Form%204171_0811.pdf	Others
/33/	TÜV Industrie Service GmbH	CDM Verification and Certification Report for the CDM project activity "Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project". 1 st verification (verification period from 17/03/2007 to 17/06/2007. Report No. 1066682, version 02.	Dated 11/02/2008. Available online: https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/DNV-CUK1166695034.41/iProcesses/TUEV-SUED1190733289.61/view	Others
/34/	FCI Fluid Components International LLC.	Certificate of Calibration for the installed LFG flow meter with S/N 467251-A - calibration event performed on 20/05/2015. Certificate No. RA377047.	-	Others
/35/	FCI Fluid Components International LLC.	Certificate of Calibration for the installed LFG flow meter with S/N 437121-A - calibration event performed on 12/02/2016. Certificate No. RA378038.	-	Others
/36/	US-EPA	LFG Energy Project Development Handbook. / Landfill Methane Outreach Program	Dated September 2016 Available online: https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-11/documents/pdh_full.pdf	Others
/37/	EPIC	Validation Opinion Report for Post-Registration Changes for the CDM project activity Loma los Colorados Landfill Gas Project. Version 01.0	Dated 25/06/2017.	Others
/38/	Schneider Electric	Technical Specification sheet for the electricity meter PM820MG.	Available online: http://www.opsecat.schneider-electric.com/cut.CatalogueRetrieverServlet/CatalogueRetrieverServlet?fct=get_element&env=publish&scp_id=Z008&lc=pt&el_type=product&cat_id	Others

			=BU_POW_918_L1_Z008&maj_v=1&min_v=2&nod_id=000000002&prd_id=PM820MG&frm=pdf&pdf_frm=A4	
/39/	CAM Chile S.A.	Calibration certificate for electricity meter Serial No. 26207716. Certificate No. KD201505000002. Calibration event date: 13/05/2015.	-	Others
/40/	CAM Chile S.A.	Calibration certificate for electricity meter Serial No. 2620541. Certificate No. KD201505000001. Calibration event date: 11/05/2015.	-	Others
/41/	Honeywell Analytics Ltd.	Specification sheet for the C7035A 1031 Ultra-Violet Flame Detector.	Available online: https://customer.honeywell.com/en-US/Pages/Category.aspx?cat=HonECC+Catalog&category=C7035&catpath=1.3.5.2.4	Others
/42/	TAG Instrumentación y Automatización de Processos Industriales	Calibration certificate for the installed CH ₄ /O ₂ content gas analyzer unit with S/N N1-W2-678. Calibration Certificate No. 1102-16. Calibration event date: 19/08/2016.	-	Others
/43/	TAG Instrumentación y Automatización de Processos Industriales	Calibration certificate for the installed CH ₄ /O ₂ content gas analyzer unit with S/N N1-W2-678. Calibration Certificate No. 1043-15. Calibration event date: 04/09/2015.	-	Others
/44/	UNFCCC/CDM-EB	"Guideline – Application of materiality in verifications", version 02.0, as per EB82.	Dated 20/02/2015.	Others
/45/	CAM Chile S.A.	Calibration certificate for electricity meter Serial No. PT-1011A447-01. Certificate No. KD201403000001. Calibration event date: 05/03/2014.	-	Others
/46/	CAM Chile S.A.	Calibration certificate for electricity meter Serial No. PT-1011A447-01. Certificate No. KD201505000002. Calibration event date: 12/05/2015.	-	Others
/47/	Germanischer Lloyd Certification GmbH	CDM Verification and Certification Report for the CDM project activity "Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project". 7 th periodic verification (monitoring period from 01/06/2012 to 31/08/2012). GLC Report No. 273 Rev 05.	Dated 23/11/2012. Available online: https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/DNV-CUK1166695034.41/iProcesses/Germanischer1347886109.23/view	Others
/48/	Germanischer Lloyd Certification	CDM Verification and Certification Report for the CDM	Dated 09/11/2012. Available online:	Others

	GmbH	project activity "Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project". 6 th periodic verification (monitoring period from 01/05/2011 to 31/05/2012). GLC Report No. 272 Rev 05.	https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/DNV-CUK1166695034.41/iProcesses/Germanischer1341240392.68/view	
/49/	Germanischer Lloyd Certification GmbH	CDM Verification and Certification Report for the CDM project activity "Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project". 5 th periodic verification (monitoring period from 01/09/2010 to 30/04/2011). GLC Report No. 149, Rev 05.	Dated 08/11/2012. Available online: https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/DNV-CUK1166695034.41/iProcesses/Germanischer1307547070.73/view	Others
/50/	Schneider Electric	Technical Specification sheet for the electricity meter ION 8600.	Available online: http://www.schneider-electric.com/products/br/bz/4100-sistema-de-monitoramento-de-energia-potencia/4105-medidores-de-consumo-powerlogic/1462-ion8600/	Others
/51/	TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH	CDM Verification and Certification Report for the CDM project activity "Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project". 3 rd periodic verification (monitoring period from 13/03/2008 to 31/08/2009). Report No. 600500381.	Dated 02/02/2011. Available online: https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/DNV-CUK1166695034.41/iProcesses/TUEV-SUED1253544672.79/view	Others
/52/	Fluid Components International (FCI)	Technical Specification sheet for the ST98 flow meter.	Available online: http://www.fluidcomponents.com/Industrial/Products/MassFlowMeters/ProdST98.asp	Others
/53/	TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH	CDM Verification and Certification Report for the CDM project activity "Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project". 2 nd periodic verification (monitoring period from 18/06/2007 to 12/03/2008). Report No. 1156950, Version 04.	Dated 14/10/2009. Available online: https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/DNV-CUK1166695034.41/iProcesses/TUEV-SUED1207302127.33/view	Others
/54/	Intermountain CHP Application Center	Designing a Landfill Gas to Energy Project: Rules of Thumb and Questions to Ask. Intermountain Workshop. CHP Bioenergy for Landfills and for Wastewater Treatment Plants. SCS Engineers.	Dated 11/08/2005.	Others
/55/	Solid Waste Association of North America (SWANA)	Landfill Gas Collection System Efficiencies (2007).	Report dated 2007.	Others
/56/	California Environmental	Evaluation of Landfill Gas Collection Efficiency. Appendix	Dated year 2009. Available online:	Others

	Protection Agency	D.	http://www.arb.ca.gov/regact/2009/landfills09/appd.pdf	
/57/	UNFCCC / CDM-EB	Monitoring Report Form (CDM-MR-FORM). Version 05.1.	Dated 04/05/2015. Available online: https://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/PDDs_Forms/index.html#proj_cycle	Others
/58/	Gordon J. Van Wylen, Richard E. Sonntag and Borgnakke:	Fundamentals of Classical Thermodynamics; 3 rd Edition, John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Table A-4: Saturated Water-Temperature.	Dated 1996. Available online: http://fireflylabs.com/disted/courses/m275-data(all%20years)/SaturatedWaterTables-T&P.pdf	Others
/59/	Siemens AG	Technical Catalogue for the installed CH ₄ /O ₂ content gas analyser unit Ultramat 23.	Available online: http://w3.siemens.com/mcms/sensor-systems/en/process-analytics/gas-analyzer-gas-analysis/extractive/ir-active-components/pages/ultrammat-23.aspx	Others
/60/	Emerge Ingenieria Ltda.	Declaration documents reporting the outcome of the technical evaluations performed at the Loma los Colorados landfill comparing the management practices at the Loma los Colorados landfill vis-a-vis the previously conceived design of the landfill.	Documents dated 12/10/2015 (first evaluation), 05/10/2016 (second evaluation) and 21/02/2017 (third evaluation).	Others
/61/	CDEC-SIC	Monthly reports of electricity exported and grid-sourced electricity imported by KDM S.A. (months: May 2016, June 2016, July 2016, August 2016, September 2016, October 2016, November 2016 and December 2016).	-	
/62/	EPIC	Validation Opinion Report for Post-Registration Changes for the CDM project activity Loma los Colorados Landfill Gas Project. Version 02.1	Dated 14/03/2017. https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/DNV-CUK1166695034.41/view	Others
/63/	KDM S.A.	Project Design Document (PDD) for the 2 nd 7-year renewable crediting period for the CDM project activity: "Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project", version 1.5.1.	Dated 14/03/2017. Available online: https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/DNV-CUK1166695034.41/view	Project Participants
/64/	KDM S.A.	Monitoring Report for the CDM project activity "Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project" - monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016, version 3.0.	Dated 06/05/2017.	Project Participants
/65/	KDM S.A.	Main emission reduction	Dated 06/05/2017.	Project

		calculation spreadsheet \+ summarized emission reduction spreadsheet for the CDM project activity "Loma Los Colorados Landfill Gas Project" - monitoring period from 12/05/2016 to 31/12/2016. File names: <i>"MR12 main - LLC - V.3.xls"</i> <i>"MR12 summarized - LLC - V.3.xls"</i>		Participants
--	--	---	--	--------------

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

Table 1. Remaining FAR from validation and/or previous verification

FAR ID	Section no.	Date:
Description of FAR		
No FARs were identified from the validation phase nor from previous verifications for the project activity.		
Project participant response		Date:
Documentation provided by project participant		
DOE assessment		Date:

Table 2. CL from this verification

CL ID	Section no.	Date:
1	E.1.	20/04/2017
Description of CL		
The monitoring Report does not clearly specify whether version 1.5.1 of the PDD is the latest registered version of the document.		
Project participant response		Date: 25/04/2017
As a response to the raised CL, a disclaimer was included in footnote 1 of the Monitoring Report regarding the performed revisions of the latest version of the PDD and its approval by the CDM-EB.		
Documentation provided by project participant		
No additional documentation was provided.		
DOE assessment		Date: 25/04/2017
It is the opinion of the EPIC verification team performed related corrections in the Monitoring Report are deemed reasonable, correct and sufficiently address the raised CL. This CL is thus successfully closed.		

Table 3. CAR from this verification

CAR ID	Section no.	Date:
1	E.1.	20/04/2017
Description of CAR		
Name and details of all project participants are not fully in accordance with the latest version of the Modalities of Communication (MoC) form and its annexes.		
Project participant response		Date: 25/04/2017

As a response to the raised CAR, information details about all project participants were included in Sections A.3, Appendix 1 and cover in the revised version of the Monitoring Report.	
Documentation provided by project participant	
No additional documentation was provided.	
DOE assessment	Date: 25/04/2017
The EPIC verification team confirmed that performed related amendments in the Monitoring Report are deemed reasonable, correct and sufficiently address the raised CAR. This CAR is thus successfully closed.	

Table 4. CAR from this verification

CAR ID	2	Section no.	E.1.	Date: 20/04/2017
Description of CAR				
The schematic diagram of the project's monitoring system as presented in Section C of the Monitoring Report does not completely reflect the project's monitoring system during the considered monitoring period.				
Project participant response				Date: 25/04/2017
As a response to the raised CAR, an updated version of the schematic diagram of the project's monitoring system and updated version of the organizational chart for the project activity were included in the revised version of the Monitoring Report.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
No additional documentation was provided.				
DOE assessment				Date: 25/04/2017
The EPIC verification team confirmed that performed related amendments in the Monitoring Report are deemed reasonable, correct and sufficiently address the raised CAR. This CAR is thus successfully closed.				

Table 5. CAR from this verification

CAR ID	3	Section no.	E.1.	Date: 06/05/2017
Description of CAR				
Different sections of the Monitoring Report wrongly indicate the considered monitoring period as starting on 16/05/2016.				
Project participant response				Date: 06/05/2017
As a response to the raised CAR, references to the monitoring period encompassed by the present verification were corrected in the revised version of the Monitoring Report.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
No additional documentation was provided.				
DOE assessment				Date: 06/05/2017
The EPIC verification team confirmed that performed related amendments in the Monitoring Report are deemed reasonable, correct and sufficiently address the raised CAR. This CAR is thus successfully closed.				

Table 6. CAR from this verification

CAR ID	4	Section no.	E.1.	Date: 06/05/2017
Description of CAR				
Specifications of the installed flares are not correctly indicated in Section B.1. of the Monitoring Report.				
Project participant response				Date: 06/05/2017
As a response to the raised CAR, the specifications of the installed high temperature enclosed flares were corrected in Section B.1. of the Monitoring Report.				

Documentation provided by project participant	
No additional documentation was provided.	
DOE assessment	Date: 06/05/2017
The EPIC verification team confirmed that performed related amendments in the Monitoring Report are deemed reasonable, correct and sufficiently address the raised CAR. This CAR is thus successfully closed.	

Table 7. CAR from this verification

CAR ID	5	Section no.	E.1.	Date: 06/05/2017
Description of CAR				
While the project activity encompasses generation of electricity using collected LFG as gaseous fuel, the Monitoring Report does not refer to sectoral scope 1 - Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources).				
Project participant response				Date: 06/05/2017
As a response to the raised CAR, sectoral scope 1 was also included in the cover of the revised version of the Monitoring Report.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
No additional documentation was provided.				
DOE assessment				Date: 06/05/2017
The EPIC verification team confirmed that performed related amendments in the Monitoring Report are deemed reasonable, correct and sufficiently address the raised CAR. This CAR is thus successfully closed.				

Table 8. CAR from this verification

CAR ID	6	Section no.	E.6.2.	Date: 20/04/2017
Description of CAR				
Details presented in Section D.2. of the initial version of the Monitoring Report about the UV flame detectors installed and utilized during the considered monitoring are incomplete.				
Project participant response				Date: 25/04/2017
As a response to the raised CAR, further details about the UV flame detectors installed in the project's high temperature enclosed flares were included in the revised version of the Monitoring Report.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
No additional documentation was provided.				
DOE assessment				Date: 25/04/2017
The EPIC verification team confirmed that performed related amendments in the Monitoring Report are deemed reasonable, correct and sufficiently address the raised CAR. This CAR is thus successfully closed.				

Table 9. CAR from this verification

CAR ID	7	Section no.	E.8.1.	Date: 20/04/2017
Description of CAR				
Accumulated values of $F_{CH_4,PJ,y}$, $F_{CH_4,BL,y}$, $BE_{CH_4,y}$, $EC_{BL,y}$, $BE_{EC,y}$ and BE_y as reported in the initial version of the Monitoring Report are not in accordance with emission reductions calculation spreadsheets.				
Project participant response				Date: 25/04/2017
As a response to the raised CAR, the reported values for the parameters $F_{CH_4,PJ,y}$, $F_{CH_4,BL,y}$, $BE_{CH_4,y}$, $EC_{BL,y}$, $BE_{EC,y}$ and BE_y were corrected in the revised version of the Monitoring Report in accordance with the emission reductions calculation spreadsheets.				
Documentation provided by project participant				

No additional documentation was provided.	
DOE assessment	Date: 25/04/2017
The EPIC verification team confirmed that performed related amendments in the Monitoring Report are deemed reasonable, correct and sufficiently address the raised CAR. This CAR is thus successfully closed.	

Table 10. CAR from this verification

CAR ID	8	Section no.	E.8.2.	Date: 20/04/2017
Description of CAR				
Accumulated values of $EC_{PJ,grid,y}$, $PE_{EC,grid,y}$ and PE_y as reported in the initial version of the Monitoring Report are not in accordance with emission reductions calculation spreadsheets.				
Project participant response				Date: 25/04/2017
As a response to the raised CAR, the reported values of the parameters $EC_{PJ,grid,y}$, $PE_{EC,grid,y}$ and PE_y were corrected in the revised version of the Monitoring Report in accordance with the emission reductions calculation spreadsheets.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
No additional documentation was provided.				
DOE assessment				Date: 25/04/2017
The EPIC verification team confirmed that performed related amendments in the Monitoring Report are deemed reasonable, correct and sufficiently address the raised CAR. This CAR is thus successfully closed.				

Table 11. CAR from this verification

CAR ID	9	Section no.	E.8.6.	Date: 20/04/2017
Description of CAR				
While achieved emission reductions were acknowledged as been negatively affected by the lack of investments on improvement of the LFG collection infrastructure, this aspect is not considered under the <i>"Aspects/conditions which represent a decrease factor of reported emission reductions for the considered monitoring period when compared against the ex-ante estimation of emission reduction for the same period in the PDD"</i> in Section E.6 of the Monitoring Report.				
Project participant response				Date: 25/04/2017
As a response to the raised CAR, details about the lack of investments on improvements of the LFG collection infrastructure and its impact over achieved emission reduction by the project activity were included in the revised version of the Monitoring Report as an aspect which represents a decrease factor of achieved emission reductions by the project activity.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
No additional documentation was provided.				
DOE assessment				Date: 25/04/2017
The EPIC verification team confirmed that performed related amendments in the Monitoring Report are deemed reasonable, correct and sufficiently address the raised CAR. This CAR is thus successfully closed.				

Table 12. CAR from this verification

CAR ID	10	Section no.	E.6.1.	Date: 22/06/2017
Description of CAR				
The determination of applicable value for the parameter $TDL_{grid,y}$ in the context of determination of $BE_{EC,y}$ is not in accordance with applicable guidance of ACM0001 (version 15.0) and the methodological tool "Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption" (version 01).				
Project participant response				Date: 26/06/2017

<p>As a response to the raised CAR, correct value for the ex-ante determined parameter $TDL_{grid,y}$ is applied in the context of the determination of Baseline emissions associated with electricity generation in year $y.(BE_{EC,y})$. The applied 3% value represents the default value applicable for generated electricity exported through the electricity grid the project activity is connected to and it is termed as $TDL_{grid,export,y}$. It is also relevant to note that the previously selected 20% default value became applicable only for grid-sourced electricity imported by the project activity and is termed as $TDL_{grid,import,y}$.</p>	
Documentation provided by project participant	
No additional documentation was provided.	
DOE assessment	Date: 27/06/2017
<p>The EPIC verification team confirmed that performed related amendments in the Monitoring Report and emission reduction calculations spreadsheets are deemed reasonable, correct and sufficiently address the raised CAR. This CAR is thus successfully closed.</p>	

Table 13. FAR from this verification

FAR ID		Section No.		Date:
Description of FAR				
No FARs were raised during this verification.				
Project participant response				Date:
Documentation provided by project participant				
DOE assessment				Date:

Document information

Version	Date	Description
01.0	23 March 2015	Initial publication.
Decision Class: Regulatory Document Type: Form Business Function: Issuance Keywords: project activities, verifying and certifying		