



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

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

BASIC INFORMATION

Title and UNFCCC reference number of the project activity	CTR Rosario Landfill Gas UNFCCC Ref. Number: 8242
Process track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prior approval <input type="checkbox"/> Issuance <input type="checkbox"/> Renewal of crediting period
Version number of the validation report	1.0
Completion date of the validation report	29/04/2020
Type(s) of PRCs	<input type="checkbox"/> Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents ¹ <input type="checkbox"/> Corrections <input type="checkbox"/> Changes to the start date of the crediting period <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion of a monitoring plan <input type="checkbox"/> Permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan, or permanent deviation of monitoring from the applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changes to the project design <input type="checkbox"/> Changes specific to afforestation and reforestation project activities
Version number of PDD to which this report applies	08
Project participants	Vital Engenharia Ambiental S.A.
Host Party	Brazil
Applied methodologies and standardized baselines	ACM0001: Flaring or use of landfill gas – version 19.0
Mandatory sectoral scopes	1 and 13
Conditional sectoral scopes, if applicable	-
Name and UNFCCC reference number of the DOE	Earthood Services Private Limited UNFCCC Ref. Number: E-0066

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

Name, position and signature of the approver of the validation report



Dr. Kaviraj Singh
Managing Director

SECTION A. Executive summary

Brief summary of the project activity

The project activity consists in the implementation of a landfill gas collection system and an electricity generation plant through LFG in the municipality of Rosario, state of Maranhão, in Brazil. The project has an actual installed capacity of 2.0 MW (at the time of site visit) for the electricity generation (one Power Generation System commissioned on August/2019 and one to be commissioned) and the proposed total installed capacity will be 3.0 MW. The generated electricity will be delivered to SIN, avoiding the dispatch of an equal amount of energy produced by fossil-fuelled thermal plants.

Technical description of project activity (actual):

- Flaring Station:
 - o 01 open flare ENC – serial # 180023;
 - o 02 blowers Continental Industrie – model 051A.06 – serial #s 18510005 and 18510006;
 - o 01 gas analyser MRU – model SWG100BIO-Ex – serial # 080902;
 - o 01 flow meter Endress+Hauser – model Prosonic Flow 200.
- Power Generation System:
 - o 02 units of GE Jenbacher – type JGC320GS-LL – power capacity (each): 1,000 kW – serial #s 1362594 (commissioned on Aug/2019) and 1362606 (not commissioned yet);
 - * another unit with power capacity of 1,000 kW will be installed, totalizing a forecasted installed capacity of 3.0 MW.*
 - o 02 flow meters Endress+Hauser – model Prosonic Flow 200;
 - o 01 electricity meter.
- Pressure meter Endress+Hauser;
- Temperature meter GE.

The estimated annual GHG emission reductions is 73,221 tCO₂e.

Scope of validation

Vital Engenharia Ambiental S.A. has contracted ESPL to conduct the validation of the PRC of the project activity “CTR Rosario Landfill Gas”.

The scope of the validation is to establish that the PRC is in accordance with CDM directives for a PRC.

Validation process

The validation process involved the following:

- contract with Vital Engenharia Ambiental S.A. for the scope of validation of the PRC of the project activity;
- desk review;
- physical on-site inspection;
- issuance of validation findings;
- reporting, calculation checks, QA/QC and resolution of findings;
- issuance of draft validation report;
- independent technical review of the project documentation;
- issuance of the final validation report;
- submission of the request for renewal, as appropriate.

Conclusion

ESPL has performed the validation of the PRC of the CDM PA “CTR Rosario Landfill Gas”, with UNFCCC Ref. Number 8242.

The validation team has confirmed that the PRC is in accordance with VVS and PS for project activities 02.0, relevant CDM rules and requirements and conditions of the applied methodology ACM0001 – version 19.0.

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

SECTION B. Validation team, technical reviewer and approver

B.1. Validation team member

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

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

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

SECTION C. Means of validation

C.1. Desk/document review

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

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

A complete list of documents/evidences reviewed is included as Appendix 3 of this Validation report form for post-registration changes.

C.2. On-site inspection

Duration of on-site inspection: 14 and 15/10/2019				
No.	Activity performed on-site	Site location	Date	Team member
1.	Opening Meeting: introduction, scope and objective of work, roles and responsibilities of audit team, resources required, and timetable of the onsite audit including venue for closing meeting and any concerns from PP.	Rosario landfill	14/10/2019	Sergio Cruz
2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Physical inspection of the site Implementation and operation of PA (boundary, technology, project equipment, monitoring and metering equipment) as per PDD Verification of the change in the project design 	Rosario landfill	15/10/2019	Sergio Cruz

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Management and monitoring procedures followed at project site - Verification checklist: compliance of monitoring procedures followed at project site with PDD 			
3.	Interview of management and operational personnel Management and operational system	Rosario landfill	15/10/2019	Sergio Cruz
4.	Review of evidences	Rosario landfill	15/10/2019	Sergio Cruz
5.	Compilation of the audit findings	Rosario landfill	15/10/2019	Sergio Cruz
6.	Closing Meeting: submission of the audit findings to the auditee and agreement on the issues raised and agreement on timelines. Suggestion for more or less frequent site visits.	Rosario landfill	15/10/2019	Sergio Cruz

C.3. Interviews

No.	Interviewee			Date	Subject	Team member
	Last name	First name	Affiliation			
1.	Carvalho	Rodolfo	ENC	14/10/2019 15/10/2019	- Management and monitoring - Implementation of the project activity	Sergio Cruz
2.	Sprovieri	João	BENG	14/10/2019 15/10/2019	- CDM aspects - PRC description - ER calculations	Sergio Cruz
3.	Reis	Jackes	ENC	15/10/2019	- Monitoring and Operation	Sergio Cruz
4.	Belfort	Jonas	ENC	15/10/2019	- Monitoring and Operation	Sergio Cruz

C.4. Sampling approach

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

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

Areas of validation findings	No. of CL	No. of CAR	No. of FAR
Compliance with PDD form	-	-	-
Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents	-	-	-
Corrections	-	-	-
Changes to the start date of the crediting period	-	-	-
Inclusion of a monitoring plan	-	-	-
Permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan, or permanent deviation of monitoring from the applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents	-	-	-
Changes to the project design	2	2	-
Changes specific to afforestation and reforestation project activities	-	-	-
Others (please specify)	-	-	-
Total	2	2	0

SECTION D. Validation findings

D.1. Compliance with PDD form

Means of validation	The project participants have used the latest version of the PDD form for the revised PDD.
----------------------------	--

	By checking the updated PDD, the DOE can confirm that the information transferred to the later version of the form is materially the same as that in the registered PDD.
Findings	-
Conclusion	A latest version of the PDD template (CDM-PDD-FORM – version 11.0) available at the UNFCCC website has been used. It has been filled out in accordance with the instructions for filling it out.

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

Means of validation	Not applicable
Findings	-
Conclusion	Not applicable

D.3. Corrections

Means of validation	Not applicable
Findings	-
Conclusion	Not applicable

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

Means of validation	Not applicable
Findings	-
Conclusion	Not applicable

D.5. Inclusion of a monitoring plan

Means of validation	Not applicable
Findings	-
Conclusion	Not applicable

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

Means of validation	Not applicable
Findings	-
Conclusion	Not applicable

D.7. Changes to the project design

Means of validation	Change #1: the project activity originally registered has not been implemented with its original proposed configuration. In fact, it continues being a landfill gas collection system and an electricity generation plant through LFG in the municipality of Rosario, but with different type of flare and with different (reduced) installed capacity of the electricity generation.				
	For a detailed actual technical configuration of the plant, please refer to Section A above.				
	The actual features of the plant are in place since its commissioning in August/2019, as evidenced by the validation team during the on-site visit and by means of document review.				
	According to PP, due to restriction of financial resources, the original configuration as per registered PDD will not be implemented and final total capacity will be 3.0MW. This decision to implement differently from the planned configuration occurred after the investment decision and registration of the project activity. The changes did not change the overall operation/ability of the project activity to deliver ERs, as stated in the PDD.				
	The comparison of the original configuration (described at the registered PDD) and actual configuration (described at the revised PDD) is described below:				
	<table><tr><th>Registered PDD</th><th>Revised PDD</th></tr><tr><td>01 enclosed flare</td><td>01 open flare</td></tr></table>	Registered PDD	Revised PDD	01 enclosed flare	01 open flare
Registered PDD	Revised PDD				
01 enclosed flare	01 open flare				

	Phase 1: Installed capacity of 4.3 MW (3 group generators) at end of 1 st CP	Actual installed capacity of 2.0 MW (2 group generators GE Jenbacher – type JGC320GS-LL – power capacity (each): 1,000 kW)
	Phase 2: Forecasted installed capacity of 5.7 MW by 2027	Proposed installed capacity of 3.0 MW (another unit with power capacity of 1,000 kW to be installed in the future)
	<p>The changes have no impact to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the registered monitoring plan; - the level of accuracy of the monitoring activity; - the applied methodology and other methodological regulatory documents. <p>In addition, the changes do not adversely impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the additionality of the registered CDM project activity. There is a decrease in proposed installed capacity and the project is deemed automatic additional as per the positive list of TOOL32, since the LFG is used to generate electricity in one plant with a total nameplate capacity that is below 10 MW and/or the LFG is flared; - the scale of the registered CDM project activity, as it continues being a large scale project activity; - the applicability and application of the applied methodologies and other methodological regulatory documents. The methodology version has been updated (Change #2 below), however applicability conditions of ACM0001 remains the same as before. The use of a less efficient type of flare (open) is more conservative than previously proposed flare, as a default efficient value is applied, which penalizes emission reductions; - the methodology version has been updated (Change #2 below), however applicability conditions of ACM0001 remains the same as before, which penalizes emission reductions; - the level of accuracy and compliance of the monitoring plan with the applied methodologies and other methodological regulatory documents. <p>Moreover, the revised PDD was thoroughly reviewed by validation team and complies with all requirements of the applied methodologies and other methodological regulatory documents.</p>	
Findings	CL 01; CL02; CAR 01; CAR 02	
Conclusion	<p>The proposed Changes to the project design is in accordance with paragraph 241 (b) of PS for project activities – version 2.0, as it represents a decrease in the installed capacity specified in the registered PDD. The actual installed equipment, operation and monitoring accurately reflect what was verified by the validation team at the on-site inspection.</p> <p>In addition, the changes are in accordance with paragraph 242 of PS, as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the changes have no impact to the applicability and application of the applied methodology, as there was no change in the conditions of applicability, when compared to the older version of the methodology; - the monitoring plan is in compliance with the version 19.0 of the methodology and respective tools. All monitoring means and parameters of version 19.0 of the applied tool are correctly described and the monitoring plan is totally in compliance with the requirements; - they have no impact to the level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring of the project activity, which remains as accurate and complete as before; - they have no negative impact to the additionality of the project activity. In fact, there is a decrease in proposed total installed capacity from 5.7 MW to 3.0 MW and the project is automatic additional as per the positive list of TOOL32, as the LFG is used to generate electricity in one plant with a total nameplate capacity that is below 10 MW and/or the LFG is flared. Therefore, the previous additionality argument became redundant and was deleted from revised PDD; - they have no impact to the scale of the project activity, as it continues being a large scale project activity. 	

Means of validation	<p>Change #2: the PP took the opportunity to voluntarily update the version of applied methodology. Therefore, the project is being updated to apply CDM methodology ACM0001: Flaring or use of landfill gas – version 19.0.</p> <p>In addition, the PP has also updated the value of parameter “Technical transmission and distribution losses” ($TDL_{k,y}$) in accordance with default value set in TOOL05 – version 03.0.</p> <p>The changes have no impact to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the registered monitoring plan, as it was revised in accordance with the new version of the methodology. All monitoring means and parameters of version 19.0 of the applied tool are correctly described and the monitoring plan is totally in compliance with the requirements; - the level of accuracy of the monitoring activity continues being the same proposed at the original registered PDD; - the applied methodology and other methodological regulatory documents. In fact, they reflect the update of the applied methodology. <p>In addition, the changes do not adversely impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the additionality of the registered CDM project activity, as with the update of the version of the applied methodology the project is deemed automatic additional as per the positive list of TOOL32, as the LFG is used to generate electricity in one plant with a total nameplate capacity that is below 10 MW and/or the LFG is flared; - the scale of the registered CDM project activity, as it continues being a large scale project activity; - the applicability and application of the applied methodologies and other methodological regulatory documents. In fact, although the version of the methodology has been updated, there are no changes to the applicability conditions vis a vis the previous version; - the level of accuracy and compliance of the monitoring plan with the applied methodologies and other methodological regulatory documents, which remains as accurate as before. <p>Moreover, the revised PDD was thoroughly reviewed by validation team and meets all requirements of the updated methodology, including the standards, methodological tools and guidelines applied in accordance with the updated methodology. Appendix 7 of the revised PDD clearly reflects the proposed changes.</p>
Findings	CL02
Conclusion	<p>The proposed Change to the project design is in accordance with paragraph 241 (j) of PS for project activities – version 2.0, as it represents a voluntary update of the applied methodology to its the latest version.</p> <p>In addition, to be in accordance with the update of the applied methodology, the PP has also updated the applied tools. Therefore, the value of parameter “Technical transmission and distribution losses” ($TDL_{k,y}$) was also updated, in accordance with default value set in TOOL05 – version 03.0.</p> <p>In addition, the change is in accordance with paragraph 242 of PS, as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - voluntarily, the PP is updating the applied methodology version to ACM0001 – version 19.0. It has no impact to the applicability and application of the applied methodology, as there was no change in the conditions of applicability, when compared to the older version of the methodology; - the monitoring plan is in compliance with the updated version of the methodology and tools. All monitoring means and parameters of version 19.0 of the applied tool are correctly described and the monitoring plan is totally in compliance with the requirements; - it has no impact to the level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring of the project activity, which remains as accurate and complete as before; - it has no impact to the additionality of the project activity, as the update of the version of the applied methodology does not impact the additionality assessment; - the change has no impact to the scale of the project activity, as it continues being a large scale project activity.

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

Means of validation	Not applicable
Findings	-
Conclusion	Not applicable

SECTION E. Internal quality control

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

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

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

SECTION F. Validation opinion

The change of project design and update to the actual version of the applied methodology (ACM0001 – version 19.0) are in accordance with paragraphs 241 and 242 of PS for project activities – version 2.0, and reflect the forecasted scenario for the project activity.

In addition, according to paragraphs 309 and 310 of VVS for project activities – version 2.0, the validation team can confirm that:

- the decision to change the configuration of the plant and consequent decrease of the installed capacity occurred after the project has been registered;
- the ER estimation is 14% greater than the expected estimation of the registered PDD and the installed capacity of electricity generation has decreased. The project activity complies with applicable limits of PS for project activities. In addition, the increase in ER estimation is not caused by any of the changes proposed now, but due to the increase in the $EF_{grid,CM,2018}$ (compared to the value of 2011 originally used) and the increase of the GWP_{CH4} for the 2nd commitment period;
- the changes have no impact to the applicability and application of the applied methodology. In fact, voluntarily, the PP is updating the applied methodology version;
- the changes have no impact to the project boundary and associated leakages;
- the monitoring plan is in compliance with the new version of the methodology and tools. All monitoring means and parameters of version 19.0 of the applied tool are correctly described and the monitoring plan is totally in compliance with the requirements;
- the changes have no impact to the level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring of the project activity, which remains as accurate as before;
- the changes have no impact to the additionality of the project activity. In fact, as said above, the project is automatic additional as per the positive list of TOOL32, as the LFG is used to generate electricity in one plant with a total nameplate capacity that is below 10 MW and/or the LFG is flared;
- the changes have no impact to the scale of the project activity, as it is already a large scale project activity.

In addition, no verifications have been performed until this moment.

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

Appendix 1. Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Full texts
ACM	Approved Consolidated Methodology
BE	Baseline Emission
BM	Build Margin
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CL	Clarification Request
CM	Combined Margin
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
CO ₂ e	Carbon dioxide equivalent
CP	Crediting Period
DNA	Designated National Authority
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
EB	Executive Board
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ESPL	Earthood Services Private Limited
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Green House Gas
GSC/GSP	Global Stakeholder Consultation Process
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
KP	Kyoto Protocol
kW	kilo Watt
kWh	kilo Watt hour
LoA	Letter of Approval/Authorization
MoC	Modalities of Communication
MP	Monitoring Plan
MW	Mega Watt
MWh	Mega Watt hour
OM	Operating Margin
PA	Project Activity
PCP	Project Cycle Procedure
PDD	Project Design Document
PE	Project Emission
PLF	Plant Load Factor
PP	Project Participant
PS	Project Standard
SEMA	Secretary of the Environmental and Natural Resources of the State of Maranhão
tCO ₂ e	Tonnes of Carbon dioxide equivalent
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VT	Validation Team
VVS	Validation and Verification Standard

Appendix 2. Competence of team members and technical reviewers

Competence Statement			
Name	Sergio Bonanno Cruz		
Country	Brazil		
Education	Post Graduate Diploma in Environment		
Experience	+25 Years		
Field	Environmental Law, CDM, Energy, Climate Change		
Approved Roles			
Team Leader	Yes		
Validator	Yes		
Verifier	Yes		
Methodology Expert	Yes (ACM0001, ACM0002, AM0026, ACM0006, AMS-I.D)		
Local expert	Brazil, Chile, Colombia		
Financial Expert	Yes		
Technical Reviewer	No		
TA Expert	Yes (1.2, 13.1)		
Reviewed by	Shreya Garg	Date	29/08/2019
Approved by	Anshika Gupta	Date	29/08/2019

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

Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced

No.	Author	Title	References to the document	Provider
1.	UNFCCC	Standard: CDM PS for PA	version 02.0	Other
2.	UNFCCC	Standard: CDM PCP for PA	version 02.0	Other
3.	UNFCCC	Standard: CDM VVS for PA	version 02.0	Other
4.	UNFCCC	Form: CDM-PDD-FORM	version 11.0	Other
5.	PP	Project design document (registered)	version 2 – 06/07/2012	PP
6.	PP	Revised Project design document (draft / revised)	version 03 – 13/08/2019 version 04 – 29/10/2019 version 06 – 12/03/2020 version 07 – 08/04/2020	PP
7.	PP	Revised Project design document (final)	version 08 – 29/04/2020	PP
8.	PP	ER calculations (draft / revised)	version 01 version 04	PP
9.	PP	ER calculations (final)	version 05	PP
10.	UNFCCC	Methodology: ACM0001 – Flaring or use of landfill gas	version 19.0	Other
11.	UNFCCC	<u>Methodological tools:</u> - TOOL02 – Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality - TOOL03 – Tool to calculate project or leakage CO ₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion - TOOL04 – Emissions from solid waste disposal sites - TOOL05 – Baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption and monitoring of electricity generation - TOOL06 – Project emissions from flaring - TOOL07 – Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system - TOOL08 – Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream - TOOL09 – Determining the baseline efficiency of thermal or electric energy generation systems - TOOL10 – Tool to determine the remaining lifetime of equipment - TOOL12 – Project and leakage emissions from transportation of freight - TOOL32 – Positive lists of technologies	version 07.0 version 03.0 version 08.0 version 03.0 version 03.0 version 07.0 version 03.0 version 02.0 version 01 version 01.1.0 version 01.0	Other
12.	SEMA	<u>License:</u> Dismissal of Environmental License # 1100941/2018 – valid until 19/06/2020	19/06/2018	PP

CDM-PRCV-FORM

13.	GE Jenbacher	Technical Description Genset-Container JGC 320 GS-L.L	01/2019	PP
14.	-	DNA of Brazil	mctic.gov.br	Other
15.	-	IPCC publications	www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp	Other
16.	-	UNFCCC	http://cdm.unfccc.int	Other

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

Table 1. CLs from this validation

CL ID	01	Section no.	D.7	Date:	15/10/2019
Description of CL					
<i>As there are important changes in the implementation of the project activity in comparison with original design, it is missing information in order to certify that it is indeed the same project activity already registered.</i>					
Project participant response				Date:	29/10/2019
<i>Included in PDD: "...The Project Activity is the same as the one before proposed PRC:</i>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>It is the same Project Participant (Vital Engenharia Ambiental S.A.);</i> <i>It is located in the same physical/geographical location;"</i> 					
Documentation provided by project participant					
PDD – version 04					
DOE assessment				Date:	22/11/2019
<p>The project activity is indeed the continuation of the one originally validated as a CDM project as it has the same project owner and the geographical coordinates remain the same.</p> <p>In addition, it is important to note PA continue to burn the methane by the use of a flare system and it is generating electricity with the LFG, with the same main objective, which is the reduction of emissions of GHG, with the same collection system already installed and continuously increased.</p> <p>Therefore, it can be concluded that it is exactly the same project activity with changes that are being reported and which validation will be requested by specific PRC. The validation team could verify the new scenario during the site visit and confirmed by the interviews performed with PP's representatives.</p>					

CL ID	02	Section no.	D.7	Date:	03/12/2019
Description of CL					
<i>As required by PS para 242, the PPs did not report in the revised PDD the impacts of the proposed changes in the following:</i>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>- the applicability and application of the applied methodologies;</i> <i>- the compliance of the monitoring plan with the applied methodologies;</i> <i>- the level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring of the project activity compared with the requirements contained in the registered monitoring plan;</i> <i>- the additionality of the project activity;</i> <i>- the scale of the project activity.</i> 					
Project participant response				Date:	12/03/2020
<i>Included in PDD.</i>					
Documentation provided by project participant					
PDD – version 06					
DOE assessment				Date:	31/03/2020
<p>Appendix 7 of the revised PDD has now the information about the requirements of PS – par. 242, and it can be confirmed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it has no impact to the applicability and application of the applied methodology. In fact, voluntarily, the PP is updating the applied methodology version to ACM0001 – version 19.0; - the monitoring plan is in compliance with the applied version of the methodology and tools; - it has no impact to the level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring of the project activity, which remains as accurate and complete as before; - it has no impact to the additionality of the project activity. In fact, the decrease in the installed capacity and forecasted installed capacity is more conservative; - the change has no impact to the scale of the project activity, as it continues being a large scale project activity. 					

Table 2. CARs from this validation

CAR ID	01	Section no.	D.7	Date:	15/10/2019
Description of CAR					
<i>The configuration of the project activity described in the PDD is not in accordance with the actual configuration verified by the validation team during the site visit.</i>					
Project participant response				Date:	29/10/2019
<i>Amended accordingly</i>					

Documentation provided by project participant			
PDD – version 04			
DOE assessment			Date: 22/11/2019
The description of the PA is now in accordance with the actual configuration verified by the validation team during the site visit.			

CAR ID	02	Section no.	D.7	Date: 15/10/2019
Description of CAR				
<i>In Section B.7.1:</i> <i>a. parameters $EF_{grid,CM,y}$, $EF_{grid,OM,y}$ and $EF_{grid,BM,y}$ have not been calculated as per applicable TOOL07, which requires that the latest data available to be used;</i> <i>b. parameter TDL is not in accordance with TOOL05.</i>				
Project participant response				Date: 29/10/2019
Amended accordingly				
Documentation provided by project participant				
PDD – version 04				
DOE assessment				Date: 22/11/2019
The parameters $EF_{grid,OM,y}$ and $EF_{grid,BM,y}$ used for the calculation of $EF_{grid,CM,y}$ are the latest available set published by the Brazilian DNA (from 2018). Parameter <i>TDL</i> is now in accordance with TOOL05, with the default value of 20%.				

Table 3. FARs from this validation

Not applicable.

- - - - -

Document information

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