
 <p style="text-align: center;">Verification and certification report form for CDM project activities (Version 02.1)</p>	
Complete this form in accordance with the instructions attached at the end of this form.	
BASIC INFORMATION	
Title and UNFCCC reference number of the project activity	Catalytic N ₂ O destruction project at the new nitric acid plant PANNA 4 of Enaex S.A. 5393
Version number of the verification and certification report	02.0
Completion date of the verification and certification report	28/03/2018
Monitoring period number and duration of this monitoring period	Monitoring period: 9 th 01/01/2017 – 30/11/2017
Version number of the monitoring report to which this report applies	02.1
Crediting period of the project activity corresponding to this monitoring period	Type: fixed Start date: 19/12/2011 Length: 10 years
Project participants	Enaex S.A, Carbon Climate Protection GmbH, Mitsubishi Corporation (withdrawn as of 27/03/2017) and Nordic Environment Finance Corporation
Host Party	Republic of Chile
Applied methodologies and standardized baselines	ACM0019 v2 (N ₂ O Abatement from Nitric Acid Production) No standardized baseline(s) applicable
Mandatory sectoral scopes linked to the applied methodologies	5: Chemical industries
Conditional sectoral scope(s) linked to the applied methodologies	Not Applicable
Estimated amount of GHG emission reductions or GHG removals for this monitoring duration in the registered PDD	223,928 tCO ₂ e (for 334 days)
Certified amount of GHG emission reductions or GHG removals for this monitoring period	104,020 tCO ₂ e
Name and UNFCCC reference number of the DOE	ERM Certification and Verification Services E-0016

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



Melanie Eddis, Partner

SECTION A. Executive summary

ERM Certification and Verification Services (ERMCVS) was commissioned by Enaex S.A. (Enaex), to verify and certify the ER reported for the period 01/01/2017 – 30/11/2017 as set out in the monitoring report of the CDM project activity *Catalytic N₂O destruction project at the new nitric acid plant PANNA 4 of Enaex S.A.*, UNFCCC Reference 5393.

Description of CDM project activity:

The project activity consists in the installation and operations of N₂O catalyst inserted below the primary catalyst (NH₃ catalyst) in the ammonia oxidation reactor (secondary N₂O abatement) of PANNA 4 of Enaex located at the Prillex®America Plant at the municipality of Mejillones, Province of Antofagasta, Chile.

Panna 4 was erected in 2010. It produces ammonium nitrate (NH₄NO₃), which is used as a raw material for mining and civil explosives used in the mining and construction industries. The nitric acid is also used as raw material for other explosives (PETN and Nitro-glycerine), also used in the same industries previously mentioned. The operation of the CDM project activity started in December 2011.

Project emissions are monitored continuously to determine the ER for each monitoring period. No leakage is expected to occur in projects under this methodology. Requirements regarding the calibration of specific instruments (measuring N₂O flow and concentration in the gaseous stream) follow the European Standard EN14181. During this monitoring period several operational events (planned or forced shutdowns, safety trips, etc.) occurred. All have been verified and as applicable are discussed in this report (please refer to Appendix 5). PP has demonstrated to have a robust system to manage the CDM project.

ERM CVS was responsible to provide an independent verification conclusion on the reported greenhouse gas (GHG) ER for the project during the relevant monitoring period. The verification activities included desk review, site visit, close out of open issues, preparation of reports and technical review. This report sets out the methodology and conclusions of the verification process and the ERM CVS Certification Statement. ERM CVS assessed and verified whether the implementation of the project activity and the steps taken to report ER comply with the CDM criteria and relevant guidance provided by the CMP and the CDM Executive Board.

As set out in the CDM modalities and procedures, verification is the periodic independent review and ex post determination by the Designated Operational Entity (DOE) of the monitored reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases (GHGs) that have occurred as a result of a registered CDM project activity during the verification period. Certification is the written assurance by the DOE that, during a specified time period, a project activity achieved the reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs as verified. The objective of the verification is to establish whether sufficient evidence exists to confirm, to reasonable assurance:

- Whether the project activity has been implemented and is being operated as per the PDD /03/ and that all physical features (technology, project equipment, and monitoring and metering equipment) of the project activity are in place;
- Whether the applied monitoring plan /04/ is in compliance with the relevant approved CDM monitoring methodology;
- Whether the monitoring report /01/ and other supporting documents provided are complete and verifiable and in accordance with the monitoring plan and applicable CDM requirement;
- Whether the ER as set out in the monitoring report /1/ have been measured, calculated and reported in accordance with the requirements of the monitoring plan /04/, and

- Whether the reported data meet the key principles of data quality and are complete, reliable, consistent, accurate, valid, transparent and conservative.

ERM CVS also assessed whether the monitoring report and other supporting documents provided are complete in accordance with the latest applicable UNFCCC checklists and guidance for documentation required to be submitted with the Request for Issuance.

Scope and basis of verification work:

The verification is an independent and objective review and ex-post determination of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions by the DOE. Based on the key project information the verification addresses the implementation and operation of the project activity as set out in the PDD /03/, and the information and reported ER set out in the monitoring report prepared by the project participant (PP) for this monitoring period.

Only verification activities undertaken after the publication of the monitoring report on the UNFCCC CDM website are used as a basis for ERM CVS to conclude the verification and submit a request for issuance of CERs to the CDM EB.

The verification considers both quantitative and qualitative information on ER. The monitoring report is assessed, using a rule based approach, against the principles of accuracy, relevance, credibility, reliability, completeness, consistency, and transparency. Conservativeness is applied throughout the process to ensure that ER are not overstated.

ERM CVS conducts all its work under strict rules to safeguard impartiality and ensure the independence of the verification team. The verification does not provide any consulting or recommendations for the client. However, stated requests for clarifications and/or corrective actions may provide input for improvement of the monitoring activities.

Conclusions:

In conclusion, based on the verification activities undertaken, ERM CVS concludes that the project activity is implemented and operated as described in the registered PDD.

The GHG ER set out in the monitoring report were found to be appropriately measured and calculated in accordance with the applied monitoring methodology and the monitoring plan. ERM CVS concluded that the reported ER for the monitoring period are fairly stated. Please see section G for the verification opinion and certification statement.

SECTION B. Verification team, technical reviewer and approver**B.1. Verification team member**

No.	Role	Type of resource	Last name	First name	Affiliation (e.g. name of central or other office of DOE or outsourced entity)	Involvement in			
						Desk/document review	On-site inspection	Interviews	Verification findings
1.	Team Leader	EI	Correa	Alice	ERM Brasil	Y	Y	Y	Y
2.	Verifier	EI	Braulio	Pikman	ERM Brasil	Y	Y	Y	Y

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	OR	Li	Huoyun	External
2.	Approver	IR	Eddis	Melanie	ERM CVS London

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

>>

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.	Not applicable as consideration of materiality was not considered in the planning of this verification in accordance with the "Guideline: Application of materiality in verifications".		Because this project uses automatic metering/measuring, ERM CVS checked 100% of the calibration information, all data collection and calculation in order to verify the ER number.	Not applicable

C.2. Consideration of materiality in conducting the verification

>>In the case of the project activity, an omission, misstatement, or erroneous reporting of information is considered material if it might lead, at an aggregated level, to an overestimation of the total ER or removals achieved by a registered CDM project activity equal to or higher than 0.5 per cent of the ER (project activities achieving a total ER equal to or more than 500,000 tCO₂e per year). The project uses automatic metering/measuring devices with automatic data extraction and automated calculations. ERM CVS checked 100% of the data associated to calibration, metering systems, all data collection procedures and formulas used in calculations in order to verify the ER number.

SECTION D. Means of verification**D.1. Desk/document review**

>> A detailed desk review was undertaken prior to the site visit. This included the PDD /3/, the monitoring plan /4/, the validation report /5/, the applied monitoring methodology, previous verifications reports /6/, relevant external data and reports, on-site documents, and relevant decisions, clarifications and guidance from the CMP and the CDM Executive Board.

The desk review included:

- A review of the data and information presented to verify completeness and consistency in accordance with relevant CDM requirements;
- A review of the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology, including applicable tools, paying particular attention to the frequency of measurements, quality of metering equipment (including calibration requirements) and the quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) procedures;
- An evaluation of data management and the QA/QC system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of ER, and
- Review of the monitoring report to ensure it is completed as per the standardised format.

D.2. On-site inspection

Duration of on-site inspection: 01/ – 02/02/2018				
No.	Activity performed on-site	Site location	Date	Team member
1.	An assessment of the project implementation and operation as per the registered PDD /03/ (including site walk through to confirm physical existence and operation of project components) or any approved revised PDD;	Prillex America Plant, Mejillones	01/ – 02/02/2018	Braulio Pikman Alice Correa
2.	Review of information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters;	Prillex America Plant, Mejillones	01/ – 02/02/2018	Braulio Pikman Alice Correa
3.	Interviews with relevant personnel to determine whether the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan /04/. A list of all interviewees is included in Section D3;	Prillex America Plant, Mejillones	01/ – 02/02/2018	Braulio Pikman Alice Correa
4.	A cross-check between information provided in the monitoring report /1/ and data from other sources such as log books, inventories, purchase records or similar data sources to establish the existence of a clear audit trail and records that validate or invalidate the stated data;	Prillex America Plant, Mejillones	01/ – 02/02/2018	Braulio Pikman Alice Correa
5.	A check of monitoring equipment including calibration performance and observations of the monitoring practices against the requirements of the PDD /03/ and the selected methodology(is) and corresponding tool(s), where applicable;	Prillex America Plant, Mejillones	01/ – 02/02/2018	Braulio Pikman Alice Correa
6.	A review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and ER;	Prillex America Plant, Mejillones	01/ – 02/02/2018	Braulio Pikman Alice Correa
7.	Identification of quality control procedures in place to prevent or identify and correct any errors or omissions in the reported monitoring parameters.	Prillex America Plant, Mejillones	01/ – 02/02/2018	Braulio Pikman Alice Correa

D.3. Interviews

No.	Interviewee			Date	Subject	Team member
	Last name	First name	Affiliation			
1.	Diaz	Josefina	ENAEEX	01/ – 02/02/2018	Data extraction/ER calculation/ events occurring during the monitoring period/calibration	Braulio Pikman Alice Correa
2.	Bichler	Sonja	Carbon Austria	01/ – 02/02/2018	Data extraction/ER calculation/ events occurring during the monitoring period/calibration	Braulio Pikman Alice Correa
3.	Peña	Wuinder	ENAEEX	01/ – 02/02/2018	Calibration/ site walk over/production	Braulio Pikman Alice Correa

D.4. Sampling approach

>> Not applicable

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

Areas of verification findings	No. of CL	No. of CAR	No. of FAR
Compliance of the monitoring report with the monitoring report form	-	-	-
Compliance of the project implementation and operation with the registered PDD	-	-	-
Post-registration changes	-	-	-
Compliance of the registered monitoring plan with the methodologies including applicable tools and standardized baselines	-	-	-
Compliance of monitoring activities with the registered monitoring plan	1		-
Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments	1	1	-
Assessment of data and calculation of ER or net removals			-
Assessment of reported sustainable development co-benefits			-
Global stakeholder consultation			-
Others (please specify)			-
Total	2	1	-

SECTION E. Verification findings**E.1. Compliance of the monitoring report with the monitoring report form**

Means of verification	ERM CVS evaluated whether the monitoring report has been prepared in accordance with the latest valid and applicable Monitoring Report Form and correctly presents the status of post registration changes that are relevant to the project activity.
Findings	The monitoring report was found to be correctly completed according to the latest valid form. The monitoring report was found, through document review, to correctly state the implementation and operational status of the project activity, in accordance with the Guidelines.
Conclusion	ERM CVS confirms that the monitoring report has been appropriately prepared using the applicable monitoring report form, that all sections are completed and it

	<p>complies with the latest valid monitoring report form and the instructions therein for filling out the form.</p> <p>ERM CVS confirms that the monitoring report correctly presents the status of post registration changes.</p> <p>For this project activity there have been no Post Registration Changes during this monitoring period.</p>
--	---

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

>> *Not applicable*

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

Means of verification	<p>Based on the review of documentation provided, and the site visit, ERM CVS assessed whether all physical features of the project as described in the PDD are in place and that the PP have operated the project in accordance with operational criteria set out in the PDD /03/, and whether any deviation or the proposed or actual changes in the implementation or operation of the project activity comply with the requirements of the Project Standard.</p> <p>During the ERM CVS site visit, the verification team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walked through the project site and inspected the project facility and its operations; • Checked the installed equipment, including the monitoring instruments, their name plates, and cross-checked them against the PDD and monitoring plan /03/04/ and the monitoring report/01/; • Interviewed the staff responsible for the monitoring and implementation of the project, and • Reviewed the relevant training materials and training records.
Findings	<p>The verification team confirms, through visual inspection and review of documentation, that all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity including data collection systems and storage systems have been implemented in accordance with the PDD /03/. ERM CVS confirms during the site visit that the CDM project is fully operational. The project has been implemented and all physical features installed as described in the PDD /03/.</p> <p>The operation of the project during the monitoring period is confirmed to be in line with the operational assumptions made in the PDD /03/. During this monitoring period, there were no special events or situations that may impact the applicability of the methodology.</p> <p>ERM CVS confirms that the project activity operates as per the PDD /03/ and consists of a secondary N₂O abatement, composed of a N₂O catalyst inserted below the primary catalyst (NH₃ catalyst) in the ammonia oxidation reactor. ERM CVS therefore concluded that the project was implemented and equipment installed as described in the PDD and its monitoring plan /03/04/.</p>
Conclusion	<p>ERM CVS confirms, through the visual inspection that all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity have been implemented in accordance with the PDD /03/.</p> <p>The project activity is also confirmed to be fully operational in accordance with the PDD /03/.</p> <p>The information provided in the latest version of the monitoring report sections A and B correctly states the implementation and operational status of the project activity.</p> <p>ERM CVS confirmed during the site visit that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the installed capacity and number of units have not changed; ▪ no component has been added nor the technology has been extended; ▪ the project is still a single site activity;

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the scale of the project has not changed. |
|--|---|

E.4. Post-registration changes**E.4.1. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies or applied standardized baselines**

>> Not applicable.

E.4.2. Corrections

>> Not applicable.

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

>> Not applicable.

E.4.4. Inclusion of a monitoring plan

>> Not applicable.

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

>> Not applicable.

E.4.6. Changes to the project design

>> Not applicable.

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

>> Not applicable.

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

Means of verification	The verification team reviewed the monitoring plan /04/ and compared it against the requirements of the applied methodology and the applicable tools.
Findings	<p>ERM CVS confirms that the monitoring plan /04/ includes appropriate provisions for the organisation and management structure, monitoring and reporting procedures, measuring instruments, staff training, QA/QC procedures, and data management to comply with the monitoring methodology. QA/QC procedures include systematic calibration and equipment maintenance, inspections and third party "health checks" by equipment supplier/28/.</p> <p>ERM CVS confirms that monitoring processes for the data and parameters, which are required to be monitored by the methodology, are included in the monitoring plan. The application of the monitoring methodology was found to be appropriate and ERM CVS confirms that the monitoring plan is consistent with the requirements of the approved methodology /8/.</p> <p>The methodology refers to the "Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream" and to the "Tool to calculate project or leakage CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion" both in its latest version. ERM CVS has confirmed that the referred Tools were duly applied in this project activity and no standardized baselines are used according to the applied methodology.</p>

	<p>If data for either the N₂O concentration or the volume or mass flow of the tail gas are not available for more than 1/3 of any hour while the plant was in operation, the value for that hour shall be replaced with the maximum value of N₂O concentration or volume or mass flow of the tail gas observed during the monitoring period. If data for neither the N₂O concentration nor the volume or mass flow of the tail gas are available for more than 1/3 of any hour while the plant was in operation, the maximum value of mass flow of N₂O calculated during the monitoring period shall be applied to any such hour. Values observed during five operating hours before and after a plant start-up and shutdown shall not be used for the determination of the maximum values, in line with the applied methodology and the "Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream".</p> <p>ERM CVS did not note any relevant monitoring aspects that are not specified in the methodology, which may enhance the level of accuracy and completeness of the revised monitoring plan.</p>
Conclusion	ERM CVS confirms that the monitoring plan /04/ is in accordance with the approved methodology /08/ applied by the CDM project activity. No standardized baselines are used in the project activity according to the applied methodology.

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	Data and parameters fixed ex-ante or at the renewal of the crediting period as listed in the monitoring report have been crosschecked and reviewed – as applicable – against the monitoring plan in the PDD as well as against the applied methodology and other relevant CDM related documentation. Therefore, the verification team evaluated the status of data and parameters that were determined at registration and not monitored during the monitoring period, including default values and factors, and confirmed whether they were correctly presented in Section D.1 of the monitoring report /01/ and applied correctly in the ER calculations spreadsheet /02/.
Findings	<p>The values of the parameters fixed ex-ante valid for this monitoring period as listed in chapter B.6.2 of the PDD are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline N₂O emission factor for nitric acid production in year 2017 (related to 100 per cent pure acid): 3.00 kg N₂O/t HNO₃ • Global warming potential of N₂O valid for the commitment period: 298 • Universal ideal gases constant: 8,314 Pa.m³/kmol.K • Molecular mass of greenhouse gas i: 44.02 kg/kmol (N₂O) <p>The parameters were correctly presented in the monitoring report /01/ in line with the PDD. They have been applied appropriately in the ER calculation spreadsheet /02/.</p>
Conclusion	ERM CVS confirms that the parameters were correctly presented in the monitoring report /01/ and applied appropriately in the ER calculation spreadsheet /02/. All values are in compliance with relevant documentation such as the PDD and monitoring plan as well as the applied methodology, applied tools and other CDM related documentation, where applicable. Furthermore, ERM CVS confirms that the monitoring activities comply with the registered monitoring plan.

E.6.2. Data and parameters monitored

Means of verification	<p>ERM CVS assessed the information flow and data collection system by means of physical inspection of all major components of the information flow and data collection system as well as related documentation and interviews with relevant staff were held. During the ERM CVS site visit, the verification team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walked through the project site and inspected the project facility and its operations; • Checked the installed equipment, including the monitoring instruments, their name plates, and cross-checked them against the PDD and monitoring plan /03/04/ and the monitoring report /01/;
------------------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviewed the staff responsible for the monitoring and implementation of the project, and Reviewed the relevant training materials and training records. <p>Reviewed metering equipment specifications and calibration records, where relevant.</p>
Findings	<p>ERM CVS's detailed findings for each monitored parameter are presented in Appendix 5.</p> <p>The parameter <i>Volumetric flow of the gaseous stream in time interval t on a dry basis</i> is measured by a multiple pressure differentials type equipment, which allows continuous and real time measurements of the N₂O volumetric flow. The parameter <i>Volumetric fraction of greenhouse gas i in a time interval t on a dry basis</i> is measured by a non-dispersive infrared photometry (NDIR). Both equipment are found to be in line with the description provided in the PDD. The N₂O outlet data for mass flow/volume and concentration of tail gas are recalculated using the QAL 2 /25/26/ correction factors, in line with the requirements of the methodology and EN14181.</p> <p>All CDM project related instruments and equipment are adjusted and/or calibrated according to a maintenance program based on industry standards and supplier specifications. This has been verified with the calibration planning and calibration certificates provided by PP. PP has also established a set of back up plans and emergency procedures for monitoring system to ensure availability of data what includes a contract with Emerson Process Management Argentina to execute onsite periodic "health checks". The operating and maintenance personal of the have been trained /31/.</p> <p>Information flow and data collection procedures associated to the CDM Project consist of monitoring instrument transmitters converting the primary sensing signal (resistance, voltage, infrared light etc.) in a signal that is hardwired transmitted to I/O cards (input cards) where they are collected by DeltaV processor system. These digital values are made available via fiber optics to the DeltaV Continuous Historian Server (CHS). The CHS stores continually the information of field process variables, calculated variables or normalized variables. From the CHS database the Excel Macros transfer the data for the internal reports. Project parameters are exported from the digitally available daily reports to an excel book for calculation of baseline emissions, project emissions and ER according to formulae as required by the applicable methodology.</p> <p>ERM CVS has checked each and every one of these shutdowns and data generation during these period and its usage in the ER Calculation spread sheet.</p>
Conclusion	<p>ERM CVS confirms that the all monitoring parameters stated in the monitoring plan /04/, the applied methodology /08/ and the relevant CDM EB decisions have been appropriately monitored. ERM CVS confirms that the monitoring activities comply with the registered monitoring plan. Please see Appendix 5 for further details.</p>

E.6.3. Implementation of sampling plan

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

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

Means of verification	<p>ERM CVS evaluated whether the calibration of measuring equipment that can have an impact on the claimed ER was conducted at the frequency specified in the applied monitoring methodology /08/ and/or the monitoring plan /04/. ERM CVS reviewed the status of the equipment on site, and reviewed documented technical specifications and calibration certificates where applicable. Please refer to Appendix 5 for details.</p>
------------------------------	--

Findings

If the calibration frequency deviates from the prescribed frequency, one of the two situations is applied:

- a) Calibration has been delayed and the calibration has already been implemented (i.e. the results of delayed calibration are available). In this case, the PP must adopt a conservative approach in the calculation of ER by either:
 - (i) If the results of the delayed calibration do not show any errors in the measuring equipment, or if the error is smaller than the maximum permissible error - Applying the maximum permissible error of the instrument to the measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration or
 - (ii) If the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the measuring equipment - Applying the error identified in the delayed calibration test,
- b) Calibration has been delayed and the results are not available at the time of verification. In this case, ERM CVS will request the PP to conduct the required calibration and then apply a conservative approach as set out in (a) above.

If ERM CVS determines that it is not possible for the PP to conduct the calibration at a frequency specified by either the applied methodology, guidance provided by the UNFCCC Executive Board, and/or the monitoring plan due to reasons beyond the control of PP, the requirements for post registration changes in section are followed (see section 6).

In cases where neither the monitoring methodology nor the monitoring plan specify any requirements for calibration frequency for measuring equipment, ERM CVS determines whether the equipment is calibrated either in accordance with the specifications of the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification or, if neither are available, appropriate international standards may be used.

The status of instrument calibration for this monitoring period is set in Appendix 5 below. In line with the requirements of EN14181 a QAL2 /26/ was conducted in November 2016 and is valid for 5 years. An AST/25/ has been done in January 2018 (no AST was done in 2017). The 2018 AST confirmed the calibration function of the 2016 QAL2, therefore all readings were considered to be correctly recalculated using the correction factors from the 2016 QAL2 and no issue has been raised by ERM CVS.

Applicable QAL2 Correction factors for this monitoring period are:

$V_{t,db}$ -Volumetric flow of the gaseous stream in time interval t on a dry basis (Nm ³ dry gas)	0,000	QAL2 2016 intercept a)
	0,969	QAL2 2016 slope b)
$V_{i,t,db}$ -Volumetric fraction of greenhouse gas i in the gaseous stream in a time interval t on a dry basis (Nm ³ gas i / Nm ³ dry gas) - RANGE 1	-50,00	AMS parameter, a)
	12,50	AMS parameter, b)
	-49,90	QAL2 2016 parameter, a)
	12,47	QAL2 2016 parameter, b)
$V_{i,t,db}$ -Volumetric fraction of greenhouse gas i in the gaseous stream in a time interval t on a dry basis (Nm ³ gas i / Nm ³ dry gas) - RANGE 2	-500,00	AMS parameter, a)
	125,00	AMS parameter, b)
	-498,80	QAL2 2016 parameter, a)
	124,69	QAL2 2016 parameter, b)

QAL3 has been duly implemented by PP /16/.

The calibration requirements for the current period were checked with the reference documents (PDD, international standards and manufacturer's information, etc.) and found to be in compliance with the guideline for assessing compliance with the calibration requirements including the application of calibration delay guidance.

	Calibration delay during this period occurred associated to the equipment measuring nitric acid production (equipment TAG PT-45095 and PT-45091). In all cases calibration delay guidance has been duly applied by PP. Nevertheless, since PP did not use the correct maximum permissible error of the instrument with TAG PT-45095 during the delayed calibration, CAR 01 was raised and closed successfully.
Conclusion	ERM CVS confirms that the calibration of the measuring equipment was conducted at the specified frequency (in the applied monitoring methodology and/or the approved monitoring plan), and were applicable, calibration delay guidance has been duly applied.

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>ERM CVS evaluated the data and calculations of baseline emissions of the project activity by the application of the selected approved methodology.</p> <p>In conducting this evaluation, the verification team evaluated whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A complete set of data for the monitoring period was available, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If only partial data are found to be available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan (or approved revised monitoring plan), ERM CVS will raise a CAR for the PP to comply with the requirements of the Project standard or submit a request for deviation prior to submitting the request for issuance, • Information provided in the monitoring report has been cross checked with other sources such as log books (DeltaV raw data), laboratory analysis; • Calculations of baseline emissions have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology; • Any assumptions used in the emission calculations have been justified; • Appropriate emission factors, IPCC default factors and other reference values have been correctly applied.
Findings	<p>The baseline emissions achieved in this monitoring period have been calculated to be 263,977 tCO₂e.</p> <p>Baseline emissions have been calculated in accordance with the monitoring plan and the applied methodology, and it was determined that the data processing and ER calculations resulted in real and measurable ER. Where there was any unavailability of data, conservative assumptions have been made in line with the methodology. All assumptions, emission factors and default values have been justified and the information has been cross checked with other sources.</p>
Conclusion	<p>ERM CVS confirms that the calculation of baseline emissions as set out in the ER calculation spreadsheet /02/ has been based on appropriate methods and formulae and that the calculation of baseline emissions during the monitoring period is accurate and in line with the monitoring plan and methodology.</p> <p>ERM CVS confirms that the ER at the latest version of the ER calculation spreadsheet /02/ and all assumptions, emission factors and default factors that have been appropriately justified and applied.</p> <p>ERM CVS confirms that all data and formulae in the final documents have been correctly presented and are transparent and consistent.</p>

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

Means of verification	<p>ERM CVS evaluated the data and calculations of project emissions resulting from the project activity by the application of the selected approved methodology. In conducting this evaluation, the verification team evaluated whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A complete set of data for the monitoring period was available, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If only partial data are found to be available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan (or approved revised monitoring plan), ERM CVS will raise a CAR for the PP to comply with the requirements of the Project standard or submit a request for deviation prior to submitting the request for issuance, • Information provided in the monitoring report has been cross checked with other sources such as log books (DeltaV raw data), laboratory analysis; • Calculations of project activity emissions have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology; • Any assumptions used in the emission calculations have been justified; • Appropriate emission factors, IPCC default factors and other reference values have been correctly applied.
Findings	<p>The project emissions achieved in this monitoring period have been calculated to be 159,956 tCO₂e.</p> <p>Project emissions have been calculated conservatively and it was determined that the data processing and ER calculation resulted in real and measurable ER. Where there was any unavailability of data, conservative assumptions have been made. All assumptions, emission factors and default values have been justified and the information has been cross checked with other sources as applicable.</p>
Conclusion	<p>ERM CVS confirms that the ER calculation spreadsheet /02/ and all assumptions, emission factors and default factors were appropriately justified and applied.</p> <p>ERM CVS confirms that all data and formulae in the final documents have been correctly presented and are transparent and consistent.</p>

E.8.3. Calculation of leakage GHG emissions

Means of verification	No leakage is considered under the Methodology.
Findings	No leakage is considered under the Methodology.
Conclusion	No leakage is considered under the Methodology.

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

Means of verification	<p>ERM CVS evaluated the data and calculations of ER resulting from the project activity by the application of the selected approved methodology. In conducting this evaluation, the verification team evaluated whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A complete set of data for the monitoring period was available, • Information provided in the monitoring report has been cross checked with other sources such as log books (DeltaV raw data), laboratory analysis; • Calculations of ER have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology, or conservative assumptions have been applied; • Any assumptions used in the ER calculations have been justified;
------------------------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate emission factors, IPCC default factors and other reference values have been correctly applied.
Findings	<p>The GHG emission reductions achieved in this monitoring period have been calculated to be 104,020 tCO₂e. PP use an excel spreadsheet which presents in a transparent manner the electronic recorded data and formulae used in the calculation. The signals generated by the measuring instruments are acquired and logged electronically by DeltaV processor system. From this raw database the Excel Macros transfer the data for the internal reports. Project parameters are exported from the digitally available daily reports to the excel book for calculation of baseline emissions, project emissions and ER according to formulae as required by the applicable methodology. Actual ER calculation uses values from such spreadsheet.</p> <p>ER have been calculated in accordance with the monitoring plan and the applied methodology, and conservative assumptions have been used where data was unavailable. It was determined that the data processing and ER calculation resulted in real and measurable ER. Where there was any unavailability of data, conservative assumptions have been made in line with the methodology. All assumptions, emission factors and default values have been justified and the information has been cross checked with other sources.</p>
Conclusion	<p>ERM CVS confirms that the calculation of ER as set out in the ER calculation spreadsheet /02/ has been based on appropriate methods and formulae and that the calculation of ER during the monitoring period is accurate and in line with the monitoring plan and methodology, and where data is not available, conservative assumptions have been applied.</p> <p>ERM CVS confirms that the final ER calculation spreadsheet /02/ and all assumptions, emission factors and default factors that have been applied have been appropriately justified and applied.</p> <p>ERM CVS confirms that all data and formulae in the final documents have been correctly presented and are transparent and consistent.</p>

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

Means of verification	ERM CVS reviewed the monitoring report to confirm that the PP has compared the ER with the number of ER estimated in the PDD for an equivalent number of days as the monitoring period.
Findings	<p>ERM CVS has reviewed the ER stated in the monitoring report and confirms that the PP has presented a clear comparison of the ER during the monitoring period with the prediction in the PDD.</p> <p>The ER for this monitoring period predicted in the registered PDD have been correctly calculated as 223,928tCO₂e.</p> <p>The total ER for the period of 104,020tCO₂e were therefore found to be lower than had been predicted in the PDD.</p>
Conclusion	ERM CVS confirms that the PP has appropriately presented the ER for the monitoring period and these were lower than predicted. The difference in the values does not lead to a substantial increment of the ER in this monitoring period or in future periods in relation to the estimates in the registered PDD.

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

Means of verification	ERM CVS reviewed the monitoring report to confirm that the PP has compared the ER with the number of ER estimated in the PDD for an equivalent number of days as the monitoring period. The total ER for the period were therefore found to be lower than had been predicted in the PDD.
Findings	As the ER are less than the estimation in the PDD for an equivalent number of days, no further explanation is required.
Conclusion	ERM CVS confirms that the PP has appropriately presented the ER for the monitoring period and these were lower than the prediction in the PDD.

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	ERM CVS reviewed the monitoring report to check whether the PP has correctly presented the actual ER or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks during the first commitment period and the period from 1 January 2013 onwards.
Findings	All ER during this monitoring period have occurred during the second commitment period, after 31 December 2012.
Conclusion	ERM CVS confirms that the PP has correctly presented the actual ER or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks (from 1 January 2013 onwards).

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

Means of verification	Not applicable – the project participants have not chosen to develop a separate document describing how they plan to monitor sustainable development co-benefits of the CDM project activity, nor have they requested ERM CVS to verify any monitoring results of the sustainable development co-benefits of the registered CDM project activity.
Findings	N/A
Conclusion	N/A

E.10. Global stakeholder consultation

Means of verification	Not applicable – the stakeholder consultation was conducted before registration of the CDM project activity.
Findings	N/A
Conclusion	N/A

SECTION F. Internal quality control

>> The verification activities and content of the report are subject to a review by an independent technical reviewer. The role of the Technical Reviewer is to provide oversight that all procedures have been followed by the verification team and all conclusions justified and supported by evidence. The Technical Reviewer will either accept or reject the recommendations made by the verification team.

SECTION G. Verification opinion

>> ERM CVS based its verification work on:

- the approved methodology applied in the project design document (PDD);
- the registered PDD;
- previous verification reports;
- the CDM Validation and Verification Standard (VVS);
- the CDM Project Standard (PS) and Project Cycle Procedure (PCP);
- UNFCCC criteria referred to in the Kyoto Protocol criteria and the CDM modalities and procedures as agreed in the Bonn Agreement and the Marrakech Accords;
- Relevant decisions, guidance and clarifications of the CMP and CDM Executive Board and any other information and references relevant to the project activity's reported ER.




Based on the verification activities undertaken, ERM CVS concludes that the project activity is implemented and operated as described in the registered Project Design Document.

The GHG ER set out in the monitoring report dated 02/03/2018 were found to be appropriately measured and calculated in accordance with the applied methodology ACM0019 v2 (N₂O Abatement from Nitric Acid Production) and the monitoring plan set out in the PDD, v1.4, dating from 17/09/2014.

Based on the verification activities undertaken, ERM CVS concludes that the reported ER for the monitoring period 01/01/2017 to 30/11/2017 are fairly stated.

SECTION H. Certification statement

>>

Basis of verification	ERM CVS based its verification work on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the approved methodology applied in the PDD; the registered PDD; previous verification reports; the CDM Validation and Verification Standard (VVS) for project activities, the CDM Project Standard (PS) and Project Cycle Procedure (PCP) for project activities; UNFCCC criteria referred to in the Kyoto Protocol criteria and the CDM modalities and procedures as agreed in the Bonn Agreement and the Marrakech Accords; Relevant decisions, guidance and clarifications of the CMP and CDM Executive Board and any other information and references relevant to the project activity's reported emission reductions; Relevant guidance and clarification of the Executive Board applicable to this project
Responsibilities of ERM CVS	ERM CVS is responsible to provide an independent verification conclusion on the reported greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions for the Project Activity during the relevant monitoring period. The verification activities included desk review, site visit, close out of open issues, preparation of report and technical review.
Responsibilities of Project Participants	The Project Participants (PPs) are responsible for the preparation of the information and GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emissions reductions of the Project Activity on the basis set out within the applicable monitoring plan.
ERM CVS Opinion	Based on the verification activities undertaken, ERM CVS concludes that the reported ER for the monitoring period 01/01/2017 to 30/11/2017 are fairly stated. Please see section G above for the detailed verification opinion.
Total GHG emission reductions certified	The total GHG emission reductions certified for this monitoring period are: 104,020 tonnes CO ₂ equivalent
Lead Verifier	Signature
Name: Alice Correa	
Technical Reviewer	Signature
Name: Huoyun Li	
Approved by	Signature 
Name: Melanie Eddis, Partner	
Date: 28 March 2018	

Appendix 1. Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Full texts
AMS	Automated Monitoring System
AOR	Ammonia Oxidation Reactor
AST	Annual Surveillance Test
CHS	Continuous Historian Server
DCS	Distributed Control System
ER	Emission Reductions
NA	Nitric Acid
PP	Project Participants
QAL1/2/3	Quality Assurance Level

Appendix 2. Competence of team members and technical reviewers

Alice Correa has been working in the Climate Change field since 2010 and has more than 20 years of professional experience in the environmental area. She has been involved in environmental audits and is experienced in developing documents and management system compatible with ISO 14001, OSHAS 18001, Ecuador Principles among others. She has conducted more than 100 projects associated to environmental audits/assessments for companies in diverse business sectors including chemical industries and has developed of GHG inventory for tobacco industry, which included the agricultural and processing activities. She has training as Lead Assessor for Mergers & Acquisitions, Auditing, Foundation Course in Environmental Auditing (EARA registered) and Advanced Environmental Management System Auditor. She is a civil engineer and has a Ph.D. in Engineering from the University of São Paulo and M.Sc. Environmental Sanitation (Chemical Engineering) from the University of Gent, Belgium.

Braulio Pikman has over 25 years of experience in GHG, energy and air quality related initiatives. He has extensive experience with the oil and gas and energy sectors. He is an expert in thermal measurements, combustion, energy efficiency, Climate Change, CDM Methodologies related to adipic acid, nitric acid and caprolactam production and EN 14181 uses. He has coordinated the Thermal Measurements Laboratory of the Technological Research Institute of Sao Paulo for 10 years, working with Combustion & Gasification Experimental Diagnostics, Air Emissions Monitoring & Control, development of instrumentation for measurements in flames and Energy Conservation Projects to the Oil & Gas Sector, Petrochemical and also Pulp & Paper. He has been responsible for the energy conservation program of the National Petroleum Agency of Brazil from 2000 to 2002 regarding the industrial and Transportation Sectors. Finally he is a member of the Methodological Panel of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change since June 2005.

Huoyun Li is a thermodynamic engineer and chartered accountant. She has eight years work experience in the power sector in China. Since 2006 she has worked in the carbon market, with project developers and then with ERM CVS. Her previous experience in CDM includes screening and due diligence of Carbon projects, investment appraisal, internal audit and risk management of CDM projects. She has managed carbon projects through the project design document (PDD) development, validation, registration and verification stages. She also has conducted technical review of CDM documentation during validation and verification stages. The sectors she was involved in include: Catalytic reduction of N₂O in HNO₃ plants, hydroelectricity, wind energy and solar energy, landfill gas, and coal mine methane. Huoyun Li graduated from Zhejiang University in China with a degree of BSc in Engineering (major in Energy). She also has a degree of BSc (Hons) in Applied Accounting from Oxford Brookes University, UK. Huoyun has completed the ERM CVS CDM validation and verification training course.

Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced

No.	Author	Title	References to the document	Provider
1	PP	<p>Monitoring Report for 'Catalytic N₂O destruction project at the new nitric acid plant PANNA 4 of Enaex S.A.'. (UNFCCC #5393)",</p> <p>PANNA 4 of Enaex S.A.– 9th Monitoring Report v1.0 (made available for public consultation)</p> <p>PANNA 4 of Enaex S.A. – 9th Monitoring Report v02.1 (final)</p>	-	PP
2	PP	<p>ER Calculation spread sheet</p> <p>PANNA 4 of Enaex S.A. – 9th ER Calculation spreadsheet version 1.0 (file 5393_MP09_ER v1)</p> <p>PANNA 4 of Enaex S.A. – 9th ER Calculation spreadsheet version 2.1 (file 5393_MP09_ER v2.1) (final)</p>	-	PP
3	PP	<p>Project Design Document</p> <p>Registered Project Design Document: <i>Catalytic N₂O destruction project at the new nitric acid plant PANNA 4 of Enaex S.A.</i> – v1.4 dated 17/09/2014</p>	Available at UNFCCC website	UNFCCC
4	PP	<p>Monitoring Plan</p> <p>Registered Project Design Document: <i>Catalytic N₂O destruction project at the new nitric acid plant PANNA 4 of Enaex S.A.</i> – v1.4 dated 17/09/2014 (monitoring plan in section B.7)</p>	Available at UNFCCC website	UNFCCC
5	TUVNord	<p>Validation Report</p> <p>Validation report prepared by TUV Nord for Catalytic N₂O destruction project at the new nitric acid plant PANNA 4 of Enaex S.A. rev 0.1 dating 04/10/2011</p>	Available at UNFCCC website	UNFCCC
6	TUV Sud	<p>Previous Verification Reports associated to the second crediting period:</p> <p>Reports issued by TUV Sud for monitoring period #01 through # 08</p>	Available at UNFCCC website	UNFCCC

7	UNFCCC	Project view page on the UNFCCC website http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/RWTUV1320421146.84/view	-	UNFCCC
8	UNFCCC	Approved Methodology and methodological tools applied for the project: ACM0019 v2 - N2O Abatement from Nitric Acid Production “Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream” in its latest version “Tool to calculate project or leakage CO2 emissions from fossil fuel combustion” in its latest version	Available at UNFCCC website	UNFCCC
9	UNFCCC	CDM Validation and Verification Standard, version 0.1 EB93	Available at UNFCCC website	UNFCCC
10	PP	Print screens from control room/ site walk over File: P4 Screenshot 01.02.18.jpg	-	PP
11	PP	Calibration Program (file 2017 ISO Calibration Program_CDMP4.pdf)		PP
12	Endress + Hauser and h&d	Acid Production Flow Transmitter /coriolis (FT-45026 and TT-45050) calibration reports		
13	Endress + Hauser	Acid Production Flow Transmitter (FT-45026 and TT-45050) – equipment specifications		PP
14	ENAEX	AOR Temperature Transmitter (TT-45030A, TT-45030B and TT-45030C) calibration reports		
15	WiKA	AOR Temperature Transmitter (TT-45030A, TT-45030B And TT-45030C) – Acceptance test certificate		PP
16	ENAEX	QAL3 evidence (Files Panna 4 Shewhart MP09 related to Differential pressure transmitter (FT-45092 and Non-dispersive infrared photometry for N ₂ O (AT-45094C))		PP
17	Durag	Differential pressure transmitter (FT-45092)– equipment manual		PP
18	Emerson Process Management	Non-dispersive infrared photometry for N ₂ O (AT-45094C) specifications		PP
19	ENAEX	Tail gas temperature transmitter (TT-45093) calibration reports		PP

20	Rosemount	Tail gas temperature transmitter (TT-45093) calibration reports		PP
21	ENAEX	Capacitive Differential pressure transmitter (PT-45091)		PP
22	Instytut Nawozów Sztucznych	Secondary Catalyst product specification		PP
23	ENAEX	Capacitive Barometric pressure transmitter (PT-45095)		PP
24	ENAEX	Panna 4_Instrument references		PP
25	Airtec	AST Report from 2017 (file17-239_ENAEX AST report 2017_Panna4_12012018.pdf) test dating from 04/01/2018 to 06/01/2018)		PP
26	Airtec	QAL 2 report 2016 (file 16-261_Panna4 - 22.02.2017_FINAL.pdf) - test dating from 17/11/2016 to 19/11/2016)		PP
27	PP	Production records: Daily reports (MDI files) Foxboro (cross check)		PP
28	Emerson Process Management	Emerson Process Management Argentina onsite health checks reports		PP
29	ENAEX	Organization Chart		PP
30	Emerson Process Management	Diagnostico Remoto Planta Panna 4 (<i>Delta V health check report and attachments</i> – files 000100027544_RT Diagnostico Panna 4-15 May 2017.pdf)		PP
31	ENAEX	Training records: -SC Training -On-site operation Training - Analyzer and DeltaV training		PP

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

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

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

Table 2. CL from this verification

CL ID	01	Section no.	D.2	31/01/2018
Description of CL				
PP please clarify that information on equipment substitution during the monitoring period (FT-45026 Serial number: KC075B16000 x Serial number: E8078D16000; TT-45030A Serial number: 11077G8D x Serial number: 1107GTB7; TT-45030B Serial number: 11077G8B x Serial number: 1106PH17; TT-45030C Serial number: 11077GTB6 x Serial number: 11077G8C).				
Project participant response				Date:05/02/2018
<p>Generally, please be informed that throughout the whole monitoring period for each above-mentioned TAG number, instrument with a valid calibration certificate was installed and no delay in calibration occurred. Please find a specific explanation for the different TAG numbers in the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>FT-45026</u>: The instrument history was wrongly described in MR v1, since during the onsite visit it was detected that the instrument with SN KC075B16000 was not replaced during this monitoring period. Hence, the MR was adapted accordingly (MR v2), which reflects now the actual situation at plant (instrument with SN KC075B16000 still installed). • <u>TT-45030A, TT-45030B, TT-45030C</u>: It shall be noted that for each TAG number during this monitoring period a replacement of the instrument took place and a new, calibrated instrument of the same type was installed. However, in order to improve the readability of the instruments' calibration history the MR was revised. 				
Documentation provided by project participant				
MR v2				
DOE assessment				Date:13/02/2018
ERM CVS has verified the revised document and confirms that the text brings a clear explanation of the equipment replacement that have occurred. Additionally ERM CVS confirms that SN KC075B16000 (serial number) is duly installed and operational. All the new equipment have the same accuracy class that the original equipment/15/13/, and were all duly calibrated during this monitoring period/14/12/.				
CL01 is closed.				

CL ID	02	Section no.	D.2	Date: 01/02/2018
Description of CL				
<i>Please clarify how the projects cross checks nitric acid production with consumption from plant.</i>				
Project participant response				Date: 05/02/2018
<i>The nitric acid production measured by the CDM monitoring equipment is compared with the production report. PPs provided daily production data for this monitoring period that includes data recorded manually once every day by the operation team. The nitric acid production is cross checked by comparing with these values. It shall be noted that there are 2 hours difference between the data of the DeltaV and the Foxboro DCS.</i>				
Documentation provided by project participant				
<i>Foxboro DCS files</i>				
DOE assessment				Date: 13/02/2018
<i>ERM CVS has verified the documentation provided/27/ crosschecking it with the data in the DeltaV and ER Excel spreadsheet. Production values reported for the monitoring period are deemed to be correct.</i>				
<i>CL03 is closed.</i>				

Table 3. CAR from this verification

CAR ID	01	Section no.	N/A (calculation Spreadsheet)	Date: 31/01/2018
Description of CAR				
<i>PP please to apply the correct maximum permissible error of the instrument to the measured values associated to the delay calibration of PT-45095.</i>				
Project participant response				Date: 05/02/2018
<i>PPs revised the ER calculation by applying the correct maximum permissible error of the measurement instrument during the relevant hours. The MR was revised accordingly.</i>				
<i>Additionally, please be informed that the PPs also checked and verified the given accuracy classes of all monitoring parameters. Doing so it was detected that some instruments do not reflect the exact wording as stated in the relevant reference (e.g. manufacturer's manuals, etc.). Hence, the accuracy class of these instruments (e.g. FT-45026, TT-45030A/B/C) were corrected as well in the MR v2. Nevertheless, it shall be noted that throughout the whole monitoring period for these instruments no recalculation needed to be applied and hence it did not influence the ER calculation at all.</i>				
Documentation provided by project participant				
<i>MR v2 ER calculation v2</i>				
DOE assessment				Date: 13/02/2018
<i>ERM CVS has verified the revised documents provided by PP and confirms that values have been duly corrected to reflect calibration delay guidance. PP is applying the correct maximum permissible error of the measurement instrument. This verification included a review of information in the equipment specifications /13/15/, confirming that the maximum equipment error is as per manufactures specification.</i>				
<i>In the course of responding to the raised CAR 01, the PP also checked the accuracy classes of all monitoring parameters and detected some inconsistencies, when reviewing equipment manuals, in relation to the information presented in the original version of the MR. Hence, the accuracy class of some instruments (FT-45026, TT-45030A/B/C) were corrected. ERM CVS has verified each and every correction made and confirms that they do not conflict with information originally presented in the PDD. Additionally all of these equipment are confirmed to have been duly calibrated throughout this monitoring period. Finally these corrections have no impact on ER.</i>				
<i>CAR01 is closed.</i>				

Table 4. FAR from this verification

FAR ID	N/A	Section No.		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description of FAR				
Project participant response				Date: DD/MM/YYYY

Documentation provided by project participant	
DOE assessment	Date: DD/MM/YYYY

Appendix 5- Data and parameters monitored

The verification findings for the monitoring of each parameter are set out below.

Data / Parameter:	P _{production,y}	Baseline emissions	
Data unit:	t HNO ₃		
Description:	Production of nitric acid in year y		
Measured/calculated/default	Measured		
Compliance question	Verification findings	Draft OK/ CAR/CL	Final OK/ Not OK
Is the monitoring equipment appropriately installed and operated and are the QA/QC procedures appropriately applied?	<p>ERM CVS evaluated whether this parameter was monitored as required in the monitoring plan.</p> <p>a) Equipment specification Nitric Acid Production Coriolis Flow and density transmitter (flowmeter FT-45026 with accuracy class ± 0.15% and temperature transmitter TT-45050 with accuracy class 0.1%).The equipment is found to be in line with the monitoring plan/methodology in terms of specification and accuracy.</p> <p>b) Calibration Every 2 years. Calibration information in provided in the final version of the Monitoring Report is confirmed to be correctly reported. ERM CVS confirms that the calibrations have been undertaken as required and were valid throughout the monitoring period. The calibrations have confirmed that the equipment has performed to the required level of accuracy.</p> <p>c) Measurement/reading/recording frequency Measuring: Continuously with readings every 1 seconds. Data is recorded hourly.</p> <p>d) QA/QC procedures applied Periodic calibration is performed according to supplier's recommendations. The quality assurance and quality control procedures, in terms of equipment operations and maintenance, have been incorporated in the plants ISO 9001:2008 management system.</p> <p>e) Cross check</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The daily nitric acid production data from the ER Calculation spread sheet was crosschecked for consistency with the daily nitric acid production from DeltaV daily reports (MDI files) and Foxboro /27/. These reading are confirmed to have been duly corrected considering the concentration and density of the nitric acid.• ERM CVS checked that the production reported is consistent with the nameplate capacity of the plant.• ERM CVS checked that raw data has been correctly transferred to the calculation tool. <p>f) Check of information flow The monitoring instrument transmitters convert the primary sensing signal in a signal that is hardwired transmitted to I/O</p>	OK	OK

Data / Parameter:	P_{production,y}	Baseline emissions	
Data unit:	t HNO ₃		
Description:	Production of nitric acid in year y		
Measured/calculated/default	Measured		
Compliance question	Verification findings	Draft OK/ CAR/CL	Final OK/ Not OK
	<p>cards (input cards) where they are collected by DeltaV processor system. These digital values are made available via fiber optics to the DeltaV Continuous Historian Server (CHS). The CHS stores continually the information. From the CHS database the Excel Macros transfer the data for the internal reports. The parameter is exported from the digitally available reports to an excel book for calculation.</p> <p>In addition, the NA at 100% is calculated by multiplying the mass flow with the concentration. The concentration is automatically calculated using the density measurement of the Coriolis flowmeter and the temperature instrument TT- 45050.</p>		
Does the monitoring report (section D) correctly state all relevant information and data relating to the monitoring of this parameter during the monitoring period?	<p>ERM CVS reviewed the content of the monitoring report section D and evaluated its alignment with the requirements of the monitoring plan and the actual monitoring observed during the site visit and document review.</p> <p>CL01 was raised due to unclear information on equipment usage history during the monitoring period. CL01 was duly closed.</p> <p>CL2 was raised so PP could clarify internal cross checking procedures. CL2 was duly closed.</p> <p>ERM CVS confirms that the final monitoring report (section D) and Excel spread sheet correctly state all relevant information and data relating to the monitoring of this parameter during the monitoring period.</p>	<p>CL01</p> <p>CL-2</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>OK</p>
Conclusion	<p>ERM CVS confirms that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The equipment for monitoring has an appropriate accuracy and has been controlled and operated in accordance with the monitoring plan. The calibrations have been conducted at the frequency as specified by the methodology and the monitoring plan of the registered PDD and/or manufacture specifications. Where applicable, calibration delay guidance was duly applied. The monitoring results have been recorded consistently as per the approved frequency in the monitoring plan. QA/QC procedures have been applied in accordance with the monitoring plan. 		

Data / Parameter:	h_y	Project emissions	
Data unit:	h		
Description:	Number of hours of operation in year y		
Measured/calculated/default	Measured		
Compliance question	Verification findings	Draft OK/ CAR/CL	Final OK/ Not OK
Is the monitoring equipment appropriately installed and operated and are the QA/QC procedures appropriately applied?	<p>ERM CVS evaluated whether this parameter was monitored as required in the monitoring plan.</p> <p>a) Equipment specification AOR Temperature Transmitter (TAG TT-45030A (main), TT-45030B (back up) and TT-45030C (back up))/ thermocouple have accuracy class: $\pm 0.25\%$.The equipment is found to be in line with the monitoring plan/methodology in terms of specification and accuracy.</p> <p>b) Calibration Every 2 years. Calibration information in provided in the final version of the Monitoring Report is confirmed to be correctly reported. ERM CVS confirms that the calibrations have been undertaken as required and were valid throughout the monitoring period. The calibrations have confirmed that the equipment has performed to the required level of accuracy.</p> <p>c) Measurement/reading/recording frequency The parameters is measured continuously with reading every 1 seconds. Data is recorded hourly.</p> <p>d) QA/QC procedures applied Periodic calibration is performed according to supplier's recommendations. The quality assurance and quality control procedures, in terms of equipment operations and maintenance, have been incorporated in the plants ISO 9001:2008 management system.</p> <p>e) Cross check</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The hours of operation are determined by the oxidation temperature in the AOR. As determined in the PDD, the temperature ranges from 850 – 905°C correspond to the hours of operation of the CDM project (the plant is considered to be in operation when the temperature is within this range). ERM CVS has therefore crosschecked the temperature ranges occurring during this monitoring confirming that in the Excel spread sheet the plant is considered ON when temperature is within the indicated range.• Cross crosschecked the replacement of the thermocouples that occurred during this monitoring period, confirming that the accuracy class in all cases has remained the same and that new equipment where duly calibrated during the monitoring period. <p>f) Check of information flow</p>	OK	OK

Data / Parameter:	h_y	Project emissions	
Data unit:	h		
Description:	Number of hours of operation in year y		
Measured/calculated/default	Measured		
Compliance question	Verification findings	Draft OK/ CAR/CL	Final OK/ Not OK
	The monitoring instrument transmitters convert the primary sensing signal in a signal that is hardwired transmitted to I/O cards (Input cards) where they are collected by DeltaV processor system. These digital values are made available via fiber optics to the DeltaV Continuous Historian Server (CHS). The CHS stores continually the information. From the CHS database the Excel Macros transfer the data for the internal reports. The parameter is exported from the digitally available reports to an excel book for calculation.		
Does the monitoring report (section D) correctly state all relevant information and data relating to the monitoring of this parameter during the monitoring period?	<p>ERM CVS reviewed the content of the monitoring report section D and evaluated its alignment with the requirements of the monitoring plan and the actual monitoring observed during the site visit and document review.</p> <p>CL01 was raised due to unclear information on equipment replacement during the monitoring period. CL01 was duly closed.</p> <p>ERM CVS confirms that the final monitoring report (section D) and Excel spread sheet correctly state all relevant information and data relating to the monitoring of this parameter during the monitoring period.</p>	CL01	OK
Conclusion	<p>ERM CVS confirms that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The equipment for monitoring has an appropriate accuracy and has been controlled and operated in accordance with the monitoring plan.• The calibrations have been conducted at the frequency as specified by the methodology and the monitoring plan of the registered PDD and/or manufacture specifications.• The monitoring results have been recorded consistently as per the approved frequency in the monitoring plan.• QA/QC procedures have been applied in accordance with the monitoring plan.		

Data / Parameter:	$h_{r,y}$	Baseline and Project emissions	
Data unit:	h		
Description:	Number of hours (h) in year y where for secondary N ₂ O abatement system was not installed, underperformed or failed		
Measured/calculated/default	Measured		
Compliance question	Verification findings	Draft OK/ CAR/CL	Final OK/ Not OK
Is the monitoring equipment appropriately installed and operated and are the QA/QC procedures appropriately applied?	<p>ERM CVS evaluated whether this parameter was monitored as required in the monitoring plan.</p> <p>a) Equipment specification As the project has not used AM0028or AM0034 in the first crediting period (Case 2 for the calculation of $h_{r,y}$ as defined in the applied methodology),the abatement system is deemed to be not installed, under performing or failed in the hour h in year y, if:</p> $F_{N2O,tailgas,h}>EF_{new,y}\times P_{NA,h}$ <p>b) Calibration Not applicable</p> <p>c) Measurement/reading/recording frequency The parameter is measured continuously with 1 second readings and hourly recording.</p> <p>d) QA/QC procedures applied The quality assurance and quality control procedures, in terms of plant equipment operations and maintenance have been incorporated in the plants ISO 9001:2008 management system.</p> <p>e) Cross check</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• PP has identified a mistake on the version of the MR that was originally uploaded related to the parameters $F_{N2O,tailgas,h}$ and voluntary corrected it. It is noted that the value does not impact ER calculations.• The verifiers went through the ER calculation spread sheet values, results were checked against raw data. Value are correctly considered in line with methodology in the final version of the MR and ER calculation spreadsheet. <p>f) Check of information flow The monitoring instrument transmitters convert the primary sensing signal in a signal that is hardwired transmitted to I/O cards (input cards) where they are collected by DeltaV processor system. These digital values are made available via fiber optics to the DeltaV Continuous Historian Server (CHS). The CHS stores continually the information. From the CHS database the Excel Macros transfer the data for the internal reports. The parameter is exported from the digitally available daily reports to an excel book for calculation.</p>	OK	OK
Does the monitoring report (section D) correctly state all	ERM CVS reviewed the content of the monitoring report section D and evaluated its alignment with the requirements of the	OK	OK

CDM VER FORM

Data / Parameter:	$h_{r,y}$	Baseline and Project emissions	
Data unit:	h		
Description:	Number of hours (h) in year y where for secondary N ₂ O abatement system was not installed, underperformed or failed		
Measured/calculated/default	Measured		
Compliance question	Verification findings	Draft OK/ CAR/CL	Final OK/ Not OK
relevant information and data relating to the monitoring of this parameter during the monitoring period?	monitoring plan and the actual monitoring observed during the site visit and document review. ERM CVS confirms that the final monitoring report (section D) and Excel spread sheet correctly state all relevant information and data relating to the monitoring of this parameter during the monitoring period.		
Conclusion	ERM CVS confirms that <ul style="list-style-type: none">The equipment for monitoring has an appropriate accuracy and has been controlled and operated in accordance with the monitoring plan.The monitoring results have been recorded consistently as per the approved frequency in the monitoring plan.QA/QC procedures have been applied in accordance with the monitoring plan.		

Data / Parameter:	V _{t,db}	Project emissions	
Data unit:	m ³ dry gas/h		
Description:	Volumetric flow of the gaseous stream in time interval t on a dry basis		
Measured/calculated/default	Measured		
Compliance question	Verification findings	Draft OK/ CAR/CL	Final OK/ Not OK
Is the monitoring equipment appropriately installed and operated and are the QA/QC procedures appropriately applied?	<p>ERM CVS evaluated whether this parameter was monitored as required in the monitoring plan.</p> <p>a) Equipment specification PP uses differential pressure transmitter(TAG FT-45092), with accuracy class 2% of range. The equipment is found to be in line with the monitoring plan/methodology in terms of specification and accuracy.</p> <p>b) Calibration Calibration of the meter occurs every 5 years according to EN 14181 (QAL2)and an AST is performed annually. QAL3 is done on a daily basis for zero check and every other day for span by ENAEX maintenance staff. Calibration information as provided in the final version of the Monitoring Report is confirmed to be correctly reported. ERM CVS confirms that the calibrations have been undertaken as required and were valid throughout the monitoring period. The calibrations have confirmed that the equipment has performed to the required level of accuracy. In</p>	OK	OK

Data / Parameter:	$V_{t,db}$	Project emissions	
Data unit:	m ³ dry gas/h		
Description:	Volumetric flow of the gaseous stream in time interval t on a dry basis		
Measured/calculated/default	Measured		
Compliance question	Verification findings	Draft OK/ CAR/CL	Final OK/ Not OK
	<p>line with the requirements of EN14181, a QAL2 /26/was conducted in November 2016 and is valid for 5 years. An AST/25/ has been done in January 2018 (no AST was done in 2017). The 2018 AST confirmed the calibration function of the 2016 QAL2, therefore all readings were considered to be correctly recalculated using the correction factors from the 2016 QAL2.</p> <p>c) Measurement/reading/recording frequency Measuring is continuous with reading every 1 seconds. Data is recorded hourly.</p> <p>d) QA/QC procedures applied The quality assurance and quality control procedures are based on the application of the requirements of EN 14181.</p> <p>e) Cross check</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ERM CVS has cross checked the consistency between raw data and input data in the ER calculation spreadsheet and it's used in calculations. The verifiers went through the ER Calculation spread sheet values, and confirm that all substitutions for default value were clearly and correctly considered in line with the methodology. The verifiers checked the usage of the correction factors obtained in the QAL2/26/. The verifiers crosschecked calibration certificates (calibration internal reports). All EN 14181 procedures are implemented and recorded/25/26/16/. These procedures were verified and all information found in the final version of the ER Calculation spread sheet is deemed correct. <p>f) Check of information flow The monitoring instrument transmitters convert the primary sensing signal in a signal that is hardwired transmitted to I/O cards (input cards) where they are collected by DeltaV processor system. These digital values are made available via fiber optics to the DeltaV Continuous Historian Server (CHS). The CHS stores continually the information. From the CHS database the Excel Macros transfer the data for the internal reports. The parameter is exported from the digitally available daily reports to an excel book for calculation.</p>		
Does the monitoring report (section D) correctly state all relevant information and data relating to the monitoring of this	ERM CVS reviewed the content of the monitoring report section D and evaluated its alignment with the requirements of the monitoring plan and the actual monitoring observed during the site visit and document review.	OK	OK

Data / Parameter:	V _{t,db}	Project emissions	
Data unit:	m ³ dry gas/h		
Description:	Volumetric flow of the gaseous stream in time interval t on a dry basis		
Measured/calculated/default	Measured		
Compliance question	Verification findings	Draft OK/ CAR/CL	Final OK/ Not OK
parameter during the monitoring period?	ERM CVS confirms that the final monitoring report (section D) and Excel spread sheet correctly state all relevant information and data relating to the monitoring of this parameter during the monitoring period.		
Conclusion	ERM CVS confirms that <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The equipment for monitoring has an appropriate accuracy and has been controlled and operated in accordance with the monitoring plan.• The calibrations have been conducted at the frequency as specified by the methodology and the monitoring plan of the registered PDD.• The monitoring results have been recorded consistently as per the approved frequency in the monitoring plan.• QA/QC procedures have been applied in accordance with the monitoring plan.		

Data / Parameter:	$V_{i,t,db}$	Project emissions	
Data unit:	m ³ gas i/m ³ dry gas		
Description:	Volumetric fraction of greenhouse gas i in a time interval t on a dry basis		
Measured/calculated/default	Measured		
Compliance question	Verification findings	Draft OK/ CAR/CL	Final OK/ Not OK
Is the monitoring equipment appropriately installed and operated and are the QA/QC procedures appropriately applied?	<p>ERM CVS evaluated whether this parameter was monitored as required in the monitoring plan.</p> <p>a) Equipment specification PP uses a Non-dispersive infrared photometry for N₂O (TAG AT-45094C), with accuracy class: 1% of range. The equipment is found to be in line with the monitoring plan/methodology in terms of specification and accuracy.</p> <p>b) Calibration Calibration of the meter occurs every 5 years according to EN 14181 (QAL2) and an AST is performed annually. QAL3 is done on a daily basis for zero check and every other day for span by ENAEX maintenance staff. Calibration information as provided in the final version of the Monitoring Report is confirmed to be correctly reported. ERM CVS confirms that the calibrations have been undertaken as required and were valid throughout the monitoring period. The calibrations have confirmed that the equipment has performed to the required</p>	OK	OK

Data / Parameter:	$V_{i,t,db}$	Project emissions	
Data unit:	m ³ gas i/m ³ dry gas		
Description:	Volumetric fraction of greenhouse gas i in a time interval t on a dry basis		
Measured/calculated/default	Measured		
Compliance question	Verification findings	Draft OK/ CAR/CL	Final OK/ Not OK
	<p>level of accuracy. In line with the requirements of EN14181, a QAL2 /26/was conducted in November 2016 and is valid for 5 years. An AST/25/ has been done in January 2018 (no AST was done in 2017). The 2018 AST confirmed the calibration function of the 2016 QAL2, therefore all readings were considered to be correctly recalculated using the correction factors from the 2016 QAL2.</p> <p>c) Measurement/reading/recording frequency Measuring is continuous with reading every 1 seconds. Data is recorded hourly.</p> <p>d) QA/QC procedures applied The quality assurance and quality control procedures are based on the application of the requirements of EN 14181.</p> <p>e) Cross check</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ERM CVS has cross checked the consistency between raw data and input data in the ER calculation spreadsheet and it's used in calculations. The verifiers went through the ER Calculation spread sheet values, and confirm that all substitutions for default value were clearly and correctly considered in line with the methodology. The verifiers checked the usage of the correction factors obtained in the QAL2/26/. The verifiers crosschecked calibration certificates (calibration internal reports). All EN 14181 procedures are implemented and recorded/25/26/16/. These procedures were verified and all information found in the final version of the ER Calculation spread sheet is deemed correct. <p>f) Check of information flow The monitoring instrument transmitters convert the primary sensing signal in a signal that is hardwired transmitted to I/O cards (input cards) where they are collected by DeltaV processor system. These digital values are made available via fiber optics to the DeltaV Continuous Historian Server (CHS). The CHS stores continually the information. From the CHS database the Excel Macros transfer the data for the internal reports. The parameter is exported from the digitally available daily reports to an excel book for calculation.</p>		
Does the monitoring report (section D) correctly state all relevant information and data relating to	ERM CVS reviewed the content of the monitoring report section D and evaluated its alignment with the requirements of the monitoring plan and the actual monitoring observed during the site visit and document review.	OK	OK

Data / Parameter:	$V_{i,t,db}$	Project emissions	
Data unit:	m ³ gas i/m ³ dry gas		
Description:	Volumetric fraction of greenhouse gas i in a time interval t on a dry basis		
Measured/calculated/default	Measured		
Compliance question	Verification findings	Draft OK/ CAR/CL	Final OK/ Not OK
the monitoring of this parameter during the monitoring period?	ERM CVS confirms that the final monitoring report (section D) and Excel spread sheet correctly state all relevant information and data relating to the monitoring of this parameter during the monitoring period.		
Conclusion	ERM CVS confirms that <ul style="list-style-type: none">The equipment for monitoring has an appropriate accuracy and has been controlled and operated in accordance with the monitoring plan.The calibrations have been conducted at the frequency as specified by the methodology and the monitoring plan of the registered PDD.The monitoring results have been recorded consistently as per the approved frequency in the monitoring plan.QA/QC procedures have been applied in accordance with the monitoring plan.		

Data / Parameter:	C _{H2O,t,db,n}	Project emissions	
Data unit:	mg H ₂ O/m ³ dry gas		
Description:	Moisture content of the gaseous stream at normal conditions in time interval t		
Measured/calculated/default	Measured (by a qualified third party)		
Compliance question	Verification findings	Draft OK/ CAR/CL	Final OK/ Not OK
Is the monitoring equipment appropriately installed and operated and are the QA/QC procedures appropriately applied?	<p>ERM CVS evaluated whether this parameter was monitored as required in the monitoring plan.</p> <p>a) Equipment specification Not applicable. The parameter is measured according to the USEPA CF42 method 4 – Gravimetric determination of water content (as set out in the applied methodology and tool) and measurements coincide with the AST /25/ done by a qualified third party.</p> <p>b) Calibration Not Applicable</p> <p>c) Measurement/reading/recording frequency Annually.</p> <p>d) QA/QC procedures applied Testing is done according to the USEPA CF42 method 4</p> <p>e) Cross check</p>	OK	OK

Data / Parameter:	$C_{H_2O,t,db,n}$	Project emissions	
Data unit:	mg H ₂ O/m ³ dry gas		
Description:	Moisture content of the gaseous stream at normal conditions in time interval t		
Measured/calculated/default	Measured (by a qualified third party)		
Compliance question	Verification findings	Draft OK/ CAR/CL	Final OK/ Not OK
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ERM CVS has cross checked the input parameter in the Excel spreadsheet against the results in the AST and QAL2 reports/25/. The moisture value in the QAL 2 report of year 2016 (<i>maximum measured value was 0,0022 kg H₂O/m³ dry gas on November 2016</i>), and in the AST report of year 2018 (<i>maximum measured value was 0,0040 kg H₂O/m³ dry gas on January 2018</i>), are in line with the requirements of the methodology and significantly lower than the maximum values permitted. As per the methodology the moisture should be less or equal to 0.05 kg H₂O/m³ dry gas so that the PP is eligible to use Option A of the Tool to Determine the Mass Flow of a Greenhouse Gas in a Gaseous Stream. ERM CVS has reviewed the values for all previous monitoring periods/6/, and confirms that historically moisture content of the gaseous stream at normal conditions where all significantly below 0.05 kg H₂O/m³ dry gas. Additionally, $C_{H_2O,t,db,n}$, has no direct impact on the ER calculations, no issue was raised by ERM CVS. ERM CVS confirms that, based on the results obtained, the project is eligible for Option A of the Tool to Determine the Mass Flow of a Greenhouse Gas in a Gaseous Stream. <p>f) Check of information flow The data is manually inserted in the Excel spread sheet and is generated by testing done by a qualified third party.</p>		
Does the monitoring report (section D) correctly state all relevant information and data relating to the monitoring of this parameter during the monitoring period?	<p>ERM CVS reviewed the content of the monitoring report section D and evaluated its alignment with the requirements of the monitoring plan and the actual monitoring observed during the site visit and document review.</p> <p>ERM CVS confirms that the final monitoring report (section D) and Excel spread sheet correctly state all relevant information and data relating to the monitoring of this parameter during the monitoring period.</p>	OK	OK
Conclusion	<p>ERM CVS confirms that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The monitoring results have been calculated and recorded consistently as per the approved frequency in the monitoring plan. 		

CDM FORM 001			
Data / Parameter:	T _t	Project emissions	
Data unit:	K		
Description:	Temperature of the gaseous stream in time interval t		
Measured/calculated/default	Measured		
Compliance question	Verification findings	Draft OK/ CAR/CL	Final OK/ Not OK
Is the monitoring equipment appropriately installed and operated and are the QA/QC procedures appropriately applied?	<p>ERM CVS evaluated whether this parameter was monitored as required in the monitoring plan.</p> <p>a) Equipment specification The temperature is measured with temperature transmitter (TAG TT-45093). The equipment is found to be in line with monitoring the plan/methodology in terms of specification and accuracy.</p> <p>b) Calibration All pieces of equipment are calibrated every 2 years. Calibration information in provided in the final version of the Monitoring Report is confirmed to be correctly reported. ERM CVS confirms that the calibrations have been undertaken as required and were valid throughout the monitoring period. The calibrations have confirmed that the equipment has performed to the required level of accuracy.</p> <p>c) Measurement/reading/recording frequency The parameters is measured Continuously with readings every 1 seconds. Data recording occurs on hourly basis.</p> <p>d) QA/QC procedures applied The quality assurance and quality control procedures, in terms of equipment operations and maintenance have been incorporated in the plants ISO 9001:2008 management system.</p> <p>e) Cross check ERM CVS has cross checked the consistency between raw data and input data in the ER calculation spreadsheet and it's used in calculations.</p> <p>f) Check of information flow The monitoring instrument transmitters convert the primary sensing signal in a signal that is hardwired transmitted to I/O cards (input cards) where they are collected by DeltaV processor system. These digital values are made available via fiber optics to the DeltaV Continuous Historian Server (CHS). The CHS stores continually the information. From the CHS database the Excel Macros transfer the data for the internal reports. The parameter is exported from the digitally available daily reports to an excel book for calculation.</p>	OK	OK
Does the monitoring report (section D) correctly state all relevant information and data relating to the monitoring of this	<p>ERM CVS reviewed the content of the monitoring report section D and evaluated its alignment with the requirements of the monitoring plan and the actual monitoring observed during the site visit and document review.</p> <p>ERM CVS confirms that the final monitoring report (section D) and Excel spread sheet correctly state all relevant information</p>	OK	OK

Data / Parameter:	T _t	Project emissions	
Data unit:	K		
Description:	Temperature of the gaseous stream in time interval t		
Measured/calculated/default	Measured		
Compliance question	Verification findings	Draft OK/ CAR/CL	Final OK/ Not OK
parameter during the monitoring period?	and data relating to the monitoring of this parameter during the monitoring period.		
Conclusion	ERM CVS confirms that <ul style="list-style-type: none">The equipment for monitoring has an appropriate accuracy and has been controlled and operated in accordance with the monitoring plan.The calibrations have been conducted at the frequency as specified by the methodology and the monitoring plan of the registered PDD.The monitoring results have been recorded consistently as per the approved frequency in the monitoring plan.QA/QC procedures have been applied in accordance with the monitoring plan.		

Data / Parameter:	P _t	Project emissions	
Data unit:	Pa		
Description:	Pressure of the gaseous stream in time interval t		
Measured/calculated/default	Measured		
Compliance question	Verification findings	Draft OK/ CAR/CL	Final OK/ Not OK
Is the monitoring equipment appropriately installed and operated and are the QA/QC procedures appropriately applied?	<p>ERM CVS evaluated whether this parameter was monitored as required in the monitoring plan.</p> <p>a) Equipment specification The pressure is measured by a capacitive differential pressure transmitter (TAG PT-45091), and by a capacitive barometric pressure transmitter (TAG PT-45095). Both equipment have an accuracy of 0.1% of span. The equipment are found to be in line with the monitoring plan/methodology in terms of specification and accuracy.</p> <p>b) Calibration All pieces of equipment are calibrated every month. Calibration information is provided in the final version of the Monitoring Report is confirmed to be correctly reported. ERM CVS confirms that the calibrations have been undertaken as required and were valid throughout the monitoring period. The calibrations have confirmed that the equipment has performed to the required level of accuracy.</p>	CAR01	OK

Data / Parameter:	P_t	Project emissions	
Data unit:	Pa		
Description:	Pressure of the gaseous stream in time interval t		
Measured/calculated/default	Measured		
Compliance question	Verification findings	Draft OK/ CAR/CL	Final OK/ Not OK
	<p>Calibration delay during this period occurred (equipment PT-45095). CAR01 was raised to the application of an incorrect factor associated to equipment error. CAR01 was duly closed.</p> <p>c) Measurement/reading/recording frequency The parameters is measured continuously with readings every 1 seconds. Data recording occurs on hourly basis.</p> <p>d) QA/QC procedures applied The quality assurance and quality control procedures, in terms of equipment operations and maintenance have been incorporated in the plants ISO 9001:2008 management system.</p> <p>e) Cross check</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ERM CVS has cross checked the consistency between raw data and input data in the ER calculation spreadsheet and it's used in calculations. Application of the correct equipment error in the calculation of calibration delay. <p>f) Check of information flow The monitoring instrument transmitters convert the primary sensing signal in a signal that is hardwired transmitted to I/O cards (input cards) where they are collected by DeltaV processor system. These digital values are made available via fiber optics to the DeltaV Continuous Historian Server (CHS). The CHS stores continually the information. From the CHS database the Excel Macros transfer the data for the internal reports. The parameter is exported from the digitally available daily reports to an excel book for calculation. The pressure of the gaseous stream is determined by the sum of the static pressure inside the stack and the barometric pressure the Excel file does this calculation automatically. Calibration delay corrections is manually considered in the Excel calculations sheet.</p>		
Does the monitoring report (section D) correctly state all relevant information and data relating to the monitoring of this parameter during the monitoring period?	<p>ERM CVS reviewed the content of the monitoring report section D and evaluated its alignment with the requirements of the monitoring plan and the actual monitoring observed during the site visit and document review.</p> <p>ERM CVS confirms that the final monitoring report (section D) and Excel spread sheet correctly state all relevant information and data relating to the monitoring of this parameter during the monitoring period.</p>	OK	OK
Conclusion	<p>ERM CVS confirms that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The monitoring results have been calculated and recorded consistently as 		

Data / Parameter:	P_t	<i>Project emissions</i>	
Data unit:	Pa		
Description:	Pressure of the gaseous stream in time interval t		
Measured/calculated/default	Measured		
Compliance question	Verification findings	Draft OK/ CAR/CL	Final OK/ Not OK
	per the approved frequency in the monitoring plan.		

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
02.1	11 January 2018	Editorial revision to correct the numbering of appendices in the instructions.
02.0	31 October 2017	Revision to align with the requirements of the “CDM validation and verification standard for project activities” (version 01.0).
01.0	23 March 2015	Initial publication.
Decision Class: Regulatory		
Document Type: Form		
Business Function: Issuance		
Keywords: project activities, verifying and certifying		