Industrie Service

Choose certainty.
Add value.

Validation Report

AgCert International PLC

VALIDATION OF THE CDM-PROJECT:

AWMS METHANE RECOVERY PROJECT BR06-S-33, MINAS GERAIS AND SAO PAULO, BRAZIL

REPORT NO. 895231

Nov 23, 2007

TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH

Carbon Management Service
Westendstr. 199 - 80686 Munich – GERMANY

Industrie Service

Report No.	Date of first issue	Revision No.	Date of this revision	Certificate No.
895231	February 12, 2007	2	23-11-2007	---

Subject: Validation of a CDM Project	
Accredited TÜV SÜD Unit: TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH Certification Body "climate and energy" Westendstr. 199 - 80686 Munich FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY	**TÜV SÜD Contract Partner:** TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GMBH Carbon Management Service Westendstrasse 199 – 80686 Munich Federal Republic of Germany
Client: AgCert International PLC Apex Building, Blackthorn Road, Sanyford Business Park Dublin 18, IRELAND	**Project Site(s):** Fazenda da Barra (20222), Fazenda Rio Das Pedras e Palma da Babilônia - Sítio 1 (21252), Fazenda Rio Das Pedras e Palma da Babilônia - Sítio 2 (21542), Sítio Cafeara (2008055)
Project Title: AWMS METHANE RECOVERY PROJECT BR06-S-33, MINAS GERAIS AND SAO PAULO, BRAZIL	
Applied Methodology / Version: AMS III.D version 11	**Scope(s):** 10, 13
First PDD Version: Date of issuance: 2006-10-03 Version No.: 1 Starting Date of GSP 2006-10-25	**Final PDD version:** Date of issuance: 2007-11-23 Version No.: 4
Estimated Annual Emission Reduction:	9,576 tons CO_{2e}
Assessment Team Leader: Markus Knödlseder	**Further Assessment Team Members:** Wilson Tomao Sandro Marostica

Summary of the Validation Opinion:

☒ The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of all stated criteria. In our opinion, the project meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM. Hence TÜV SÜD will recommend the project for registration by the CDM Executive Board in case letters of approval of all Parties involved will be available before the expiring date of the applied methodology(ies) or the applied methodology version respectively.

☐ The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have not provided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of all stated criteria. Hence TÜV SÜD will not recommend the project for registration by the CDM Executive Board and will inform the project participants and the CDM Executive Board on this decision.

Abbreviations

ACM	Approved Consolidated Methodology
AM	Approved Methodology
AWMS	Animal Waste Management System
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emission Reduction
CR	Clarification Request
DNA	Designated National Authority
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
EB	Executive Board
EIA / EA	Environmental Impact Assessment / Environmental Assessment
ER	Emission reduction
GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
KP	Kyoto Protocol
MP	Monitoring Plan
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
PDD	Project Design Document
PP	Project Participant
TÜV SÜD	TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VVM	Validation and Verification Manual

Table of Contents

Page

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

The validation objective is an independent assessment by a Third Party (Designated Operational Entity = DOE) of a proposed project activity against all defined criteria set for the registration under the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). Validation is part of the CDM project cycle and will finally result in a conclusion by the executing DOE whether a project activity is valid and should be submitted for registration to the CDM-EB. The ultimate decision on the registration of a proposed project activity rests at the CDM Executive Board and the Parties involved.

The project activity discussed by this validation report has been submitted under the project title:

AWMS METHANE RECOVERY PROJECT BR06-S-33, MINAS GERAIS AND SAO PAULO, BRAZIL

1.2 Scope

The scope of any assessment is defined by the underlying legislation, regulation and guidance given by relevant entities or authorities. In the case of CDM project activities the scope is set by:

- The Kyoto Protocol, in particular § 12
- Decision 2/CMP1 and Decision 3/CMP.1 (Marrakech Accords)
- Further COP/MOP decisions with reference to the CDM (e.g. decisions 4 – 8/CMP.1)
- Decisions by the EB published under http://cdm.unfccc.int
- Specific guidance by the EB published under http://cdm.unfccc.int
- Guidelines for Completing the Project Design Document (CDM-PDD), and the Proposed New Baseline and Monitoring Methodlogy (CDM-NM)
- The applied approved methodology
- The technical environment of the project (technical scope)
- Internal and national standards on monitoring and QA/QC
- Technical guideline and information on best practice

The validation is not meant to provide any consulting towards the client. However, stated requests for clarifications and/or corrective actions may provide input for improvement of the project design.

Once TÜV SÜD receives a first PDD version, it is made publicly available on the internet at TÜV SÜD's webpage as well as on the UNFCCC CDM-webpages for starting a 30 day global stakeholder consultation process (GSP). In case of any request a PDD might be revised (under certain conditions the GSP will be repeated) and the final PDD will form the basis for the final evaluation as presented by this report. Information on the first and on the final PDD version is presented at page 1.

The only purpose of a validation is its use during the registration process as part of the CDM project cycle. Hence, TÜV SÜD can not be held liable by any party for decisions made or not made based on the validation opinion, which will go beyond that purpose.

2 METHODOLOGY

The project assessment aims at being a risk based approach and is based on the methodology developed in the Validation and Verification Manual, an initiative of Designated and Applicant Entities, which aims to harmonize the approach and quality of all such assessments.

In order to ensure transparency, a validation protocol was customised for the project. TÜV SÜD developed a "cook-book" for methodology-specific checklists and protocol based on the templates presented by the Validation and Verification Manual. The protocol shows, in a transparent manner, criteria (requirements), the discussion of each criterion by the assessment team and the results from validating the identified criteria. The validation protocol serves the following purposes:

- It organises, details and clarifies the requirements a CDM project is expected to meet;
- It ensures a transparent validation process where the validator will document how a particular requirement has been validated and the result of the validation.

The validation protocol consists of three tables. The different columns in these tables are described in the figure below.

The completed validation protocol is enclosed in Annex 1 to this report.

Validation Protocol Table 1: Conformity of Project Activity and PDD				
Checklist Topic / Question	***Reference***	***Comments***	***PDD in GSP***	***Final PDD***
The checklist is organised in sections following the arrangement of the applied PDD version. Each section is then further subdivided. The lowest level constitutes a checklist question / criterion.	*Gives reference to documents where the answer to the checklist question or item is found in case the comment refers to documents other than the PDD.*	*The section is used to elaborate and discuss the checklist question and/or the conformance to the question. It is further used to explain the conclusions reached. In some cases sub-checklist are applied indicating yes/no decisions on the compliance with the stated criterion. Any **Request** has to be substantiated within this column*	*Conclusions are presented based on the assessment of the first PDD version. This is either acceptable based on evidence provided (☑), or a **Corrective Action Request (CAR)** due to non-compliance with the checklist question (See below). **Clarification Request (CR)** is used when the validation team has identified a need for further clarification.*	*Conclusions are presented in the same manner based on the assessment of the final PDD version.*

Together with the new CDM-SCC-PDD format TÜV SÜD changed its validation report format as well. As for this specific project the final PDD was applying a different version of the CDM-SSC-PDD format than the first one, the validation protocol includes a table 2a and table 2b (considering the new PDD format).

Validation Protocol Table 2: Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests			
Clarifications and corrective action requests	***Ref. to table 1***	***Summary of project owner response***	***Validation team conclusion***
If the conclusions from table 1 are either a Corrective Action Request or a Clarification Request, these should be listed in this section.	*Reference to the checklist question number in Table 1 where the Corrective Action Request or Clarification Request is explained.*	*The responses given by the client or other project participants during the communications with the validation team should be summarised in this section.*	*This section should summarise the validation team's responses and final conclusions. The conclusions should also be included in Table 1, under "Final PDD".*

In case of a denial of the project activity more detailed information on this decision will be presented in table 3.

Validation Protocol Table 3: Unresolved Corrective Action and Clarification Requests		
Clarifications and corrective action requests	***Id. of CAR/CR 1***	***Explanation of the Conclusion for Denial***
If the final conclusions from table 2 results in a denial the referenced request should be listed in this section.	*Identifier of the Request.*	*This section should present a detail explanation, why the project is finally considered not to be in compliance with a criterion.*

2.1 Appointment of the Assessment Team

According to the technical scopes and experiences in the sectoral or national business environment TÜV SÜD has composed a project team in accordance with the appointment rules of the TÜV SÜD certification body "climate and energy". The composition of an assessment team has to be approved by the Certification Body ensuring that the required skills are covered by the team. The Certification Body TÜV SÜD operates four qualification levels for team members that are assigned by formal appointment rules:

- Assessment Team Leader (ATL)
- Greenhouse Gas Auditor (GHG-A)
- Greenhouse Gas Auditor Trainee (T)
- Experts (E)

It is required that the sectoral scope linked to the methodology has to be covered by the assessment team.

The validation team was consisting of the following experts (the responsible Assessment Team Leader in written in bold letters):

Name	Qualification	Coverage of technical scope	Coverage of sectoral expertise	Host country experience
Markus Knödlseder	**ATL**	☑	☑	
Wilson Tomao	GHG-A	☑	☑	☑
Sandro Marostica	GHG-A	☑	☑	☑

Markus Knödlseder is an auditor for climate change projects and GHG emission inventories at the department "Carbon Management Service" in the head office of TÜV Industrie Service GmbH, TÜV Süd Group in Munich. He has been involved in the topic of environmental auditing, baselining, monitoring and verification due to the requirements of the Kyoto Protocol since Oct. 2001. His main focus lies on renewable energies.

Wilson Tomao is lead auditor for environmental management systems. He is familiar with local laws and regulations and the assessment of technical installations. He has been working for TÜV SÜD as a GHG auditor since March 2002.

Sandro Marostica is a Food Engineer with an MBA from IMD, Lausanne Switzerland. He had acquired his first experiences in the CDM market through the creation of his broker dealer company in the UK to negotiate CER forward contracts from CDM projects in Brazil from August 2004. Based in Brazil he has been working for TÜV SÜD since April 06 as General Manager and GHG auditor, and is familiar with local laws and regulations.

2.2 Review of Documents

The first PDD version submitted by the client and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline were reviewed as initial step of the validation process. A complete list of all documents and proofs reviewed is attached as annex 2 to this report.

2.3 Follow-up Interviews

An initial onsite visit at the central office of Agcert do Brazil has been performed in June 2006, in order to check the principle project and data management (see Annex 2). In the period of October 31, 2006 TÜV SÜD performed interviews on-site with project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the first document review. The table below provides a list of all persons interviewed in the context of this on-site visit.

Organisation	Interviewed Person and function
Fazenda da Barra	Mario Augusto Silva
Fazenda da Barra	Leandro Dias Costa
Fazenda Rio das Pedras – sitio 2	Donizeth Urzedo
Fazenda Rio das Pedras – sitio 2	Ozeas do Nascimento
Agcert	Lydise Akemi

2.4 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the validation is to resolve the requests for corrective actions and clarifications and any other outstanding issues which needed to be clarified for TÜV SÜD`s positive conclusion on the project design. The Corrective Action Requests and Clarification Requests raised by TÜV SÜD were resolved during communication between the client and TÜV SÜD. To guarantee the transparency of the validation process, the concerns raised and responses that have been given are summarised in chapter 3 below and documented in more detail in the validation protocol in annex 1.

2.5 Internal Quality Control

As final step of a validation the validation report and the protocol have to undergo and internal quality control procedure by the Certification Body “climate and energy”, i.e. each report has to be approved either by the head of the certification body or his deputy. In case one of these two persons is part of the assessment team approval can only be given by the other one.

It rests at the decision of TÜV SÜD’s Certification Body whether a project will be submitted for requesting registration by the EB or not.

3 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The following description of the project as per PDD could be verified during the on-site audit:

The purpose of this project is to mitigate and recover animal effluent related GHG by improving AWMS practices.

This project proposes to apply the Methane Recovery methodology identified in Section III.D, of the Indicative Simplified Baseline and Monitoring Methodologies for Small-Scale CDM Project Activity Categories. The proposed project activities will mitigate and recover AWMS GHG emissions in an economically sustainable manner, and will result in other environmental benefits, such as improved water quality and reduced odour. In simple terms, the project proposes to move from a high-GHG AWMS practice, an open air lagoon, to a lower-GHG AWMS practice, an ambient temperature anaerobic digester with capture and combustion of resulting biogas.

Summarizing those findings briefly, the validation team identified that:

- The number of submitted population and the farm growth rate were not considered correctly,
- The location of sub-projects and project boundary were not transparent in the first PDD,
- The technical layout of the project were not clear at the beginning in order to access the total amount of potential emission reduction,
- During the validation the validity of applied methodology had changed, so the participants were requested to follow those changes as well,
- Further finding were addressed how Agcert will ensure reliable monitoring by using appropriate equipment and qualified employees.

The required documents and information have been submitted to the DOE and have been considered also in the final version of the PDD.

Hence, the project complies with the requirements.

4 COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOS

TÜV SÜD published the project documents on its website from and invited comments within 30 days, by Parties, stakeholders and non-governmental organizations

The following table presents all key information on this process:

webpage: http://www.netinform.de/KE/Wegweiser/Guide2.aspx?ID=2203&Ebene1_ID=26&Ebene2_ID=650&mode=1	
Starting date of the global stakeholder consultation process: **October 25 to November 23, 2006**	
Comment submitted by: none	**Issues raised:** -
Response by TÜV SÜD: -	

The GSP has not been repeated since the content of the PDD and the project layout has not changed.

5 VALIDATION OPINION

TÜV SÜD has performed a validation of the following proposed CDM project activity:

AWMS METHANE RECOVERY PROJECT BR06-S-33, MINAS GERAIS AND SAO PAULO, BRAZIL

The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of stated criteria. In our opinion, the project meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM. Hence TÜV SÜD will recommend the project for registration by the CDM Executive Board.

An analysis as provided by the applied methodology demonstrates that the proposed project activity is not a likely baseline scenario. Emission reductions attributable to the project are hence additional to any that would occur in the absence of the project activity. Given that the project is implemented as designed, the project is likely to achieve the estimated amount of emission reductions as specified within the final PDD version.

The validation is based on the information made available to us and the engagement conditions detailed in this report. The validation has been performed using a risk based approach as described above. The only purpose of this report is its use during the registration process as part of the CDM project cycle. Hence, TÜV SÜD can not be held liable by any party for decisions made or not made based on the validation opinion, which will go beyond that purpose.

Munich, 2007-11-23

Certification Body “climate and energy”
TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH

Munich, 2007-11-23

Assessment Team Leader

Annex 1: Validation Protocol

Table 1 Project’s Environment

REQUIREMENT	REFERENCE	Comment	CONCLUSION
1. The host country shall be a Party to the Kyoto Protocol	Marrakech Accords, CDM Modalities §30	Brazil has ratified the Kyoto Protocol on August 23, 2002	☑
2. Parties participating in the CDM shall designate a national authority for the CDM	Marrakech Accords, CDM Modalities §29	The Inter-Ministerial Commission on Global Climatic Change is the designated national authority for the CDM in Brazil.	☑
3. The project shall assist non-Annex I Parties in achieving sustainable development and shall have obtained confirmation by the host country thereof.	Kyoto Protocol Art. 12.2, Marrakech Accords, CDM Modalities §40a	Yes. Section A2	☑
4. The project shall have the written approval of voluntary participation from the designated national authorities of each party involved.	Kyoto Protocol Art. 12.5a, Marrakech Accords, CDM Modalities §40a	The Letter of Approval issued by the host country should be submitted to the audit team before registration.	Open issue
5. The project shall assist Parties included in Annex I in achieving compliance with part of their emission reduction commitment under Art. 3. A letter of approval for partici-	Kyoto Protocol Art.12.2	Yes.	☑

REQUIREMENT	REFERENCE	Comment	CONCLUSION
pants originating from Annex-I-Countries should be available.			
6. Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC accredited NGOs shall have been invited to comment on the validation requirements for minimum 30 days, and the project design document and comments have been made publicly available	Marrakech Accords, CDM Modalities, §40	A global public stakeholder process has started on the UNFCCC website from **October 25 to November 23, 2006**.	☑
7. The project design document shall be in conformance with the UNFCCC CDM-PDD format	Marrakech Accords, CDM Modalities, Appendix B, EB Decisions	The PDD is in conformance with the currently valid CDM Project Design Document for small-scale project activities (version 02).	☑
8. The project participants shall submit a letter on the modalities of communication (MoC) before submitting a request for registration	EB-09 F_CDM_REG form	The MoC issued by the project participants should be submitted to the audit team before registration	Open issue

Industrie Service

Table 2a PDD

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A. General Description of Project Activity					
A.1. Project Title					
A.1.1. Does the used project title clearly enable to identify the unique CDM activity?	2,4	DR, I	Yes, the bundling is clearly defined and explains in the PDD and Bundling Form.	☑	☑
A.1.2. Are there an indication of a revision number and the date of the revision?	4	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
A.1.3. Is this in consistency with the time line of the project’s history?	1,2,4	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
A.2. Description of the project activity					
A.2.1. Is the description delivering a transparent overview of the project activities?	2,4	DR, I	Yes, activity project is clearly defined in the PDD.	☑	☑
A.2.2. Is all information provided in compliance with actual situation or planning?	2,4	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
A.2.3. Are proofs available evidencing all information with relevance for the validity, for the determination of baseline, project emissions and for emission projections?	2,4	DR, I	Enough Proofs are acceptable	☑	☑

* MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A.2.4. Is all information provided in consistency with details provided by further chapters of the PDD?	4	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑
A.3. Project Participants					
A.3.1. Is the form required for the indication of project participants correctly applied?	4	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
A.3.2. Is the voluntary participation of all listed entities or Parties confirmed by each of them?	1,2,4	DR, I	Yes. Section A3	☑	☑
A.3.3. Is all information provided in consistency with details provided by further chapters of the PDD (in particular annex 1)?	4	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
A.4. Technical description of the project activity					
A.4.1. Does the information provided on the location of the project activity allow for a clear identification of the site(s)?	2,4	DR, I	Corrective Action Request 1: The indication in the figure A1 located in page 8 indicate the old farm’s name to Rio das Pedras site 2	CAR 1	☑
A.4.2. Do the project participants possess ownership or licenses which will allow the implementation of the project at that site / those sites?	1,2,4	DR, I	Clarification Request 1: For Granja Cafeára, the leasing contract expires in 12/08, which is before the end of crediting period. How the continuation of	CR 1	☑

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			the project activity can be assured after the end of the contract?		
A.4.3. Is the category(ies) of the project activity correctly identified?	4	DR, I	The category of the bundling are clearly identified in the PDD	☑	☑
A.4.4. Does the project design engineering reflect current good practices?	4	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
A.4.5. Does the description of the technology to be applied provide sufficient and transparent input to evaluate its impact on the greenhouse gas balance?	2,4,	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑
A.4.6. Is the brief explanation how the project will reduce greenhouse gas emission transparent and suitable?	4	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑
A.4.7. Is all information provided in compliance with actual situation or planning as available by the project participants?	1,2	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑
A.4.8. Does the project use state of the art technology or would the technology result in a significantly better performance than any commonly used technologies in the host country?	1,2,4	DR, I	Yes, the technology used is not common in the host country the project will improve the practice and the applied equipments are been improved to have the state of the art.	CR 2	☑

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			Clarification Request No 2 The number of biodigestor modules and its size should be mentioned in the PDD.		
A.4.9. Is the project technology likely to be substituted by other or more efficient technologies within the project period?	1,2,4	DR, I	No	☑	☑
A.4.10. Does the project require extensive initial training and maintenance efforts in order to work as presumed during the project period?	1,2, 4,16	DR, I	Yes, the training and a maintenance plan are considered. A manual in the host country language with this information and records training were submitted to the audit team.	☑	☑
A.4.11. Does the project make provisions for meeting training and maintenance needs?	1,2, 4,16	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
A.4.12. Is a schedule available on the implementation of the project and are there any risks for delays?	1,2,4 ,14	DR, I	Schedule is available. Risks of delay are not zero.	☑	☑
A.4.13. Is the form required for the indication of projected emission reductions correctly applied?	4	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑
A.5. Public Funding					
A.5.1. Is all information on public funding provided in compliance with actual situation or planning as	1,2,4	DR, I	The project does not use any public fund-	☑	☑

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
available by the project participants?			ing.		
A.5.2. Is all information provided in consistency with details provided by further chapters of the PDD (in particular annex 2)?	4	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
A.6. Bundling/Debundling					
A.6.1. Is all information provided that the project activity is not a debundled component of a larger project activity?	4	DR	GPS coordinates are supplied.	☑	☑
B. Baseline Methodology					
B.1. Choice and Applicability					
B.1.1. Is the baseline methodology previously approved by the CDM Methodology Panel?	4,10	DR, I	The project developer has added the version number to the title of the approved baseline methodology, in order to create a clear reference.	☑	☑
B.1.2. Is the choice of the methodology correctly justified by the PDD?	4,10	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
B.1.3. Is the baseline methodology the one deemed most applicable for this project?	2,4, 10	DR, I	Yes. The methodology AMS III. D. is the only approved small-scale methodology applicable for this project	☑	☑

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
B.1.4. Is the project in conformance with all applicability criteria of the applied methodology?	2,4, 10	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
B.2. Application of the Baseline Methodology / Identification of the Baseline Scenario					
B.2.1. Is the application of the methodology and the discussion and determination of the chosen baseline transparent?	2,4, 10	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
B.2.2. Does the application consider all potential baseline scenarios in the discussion?	4,10	DR, I	**Corrective Action Request 2:** A baseline scenario where number of heads increases is not considered. In cases where growth in the number animals is likely, the baseline should be calculated taking into account a bigger population in the near future, and evidence of such growth plan should be provided.	CAR 2	☑
B.2.3. Is conservativeness addressed in the way of identifying the baseline?	4	DR, I	As mentioned in CAR 2 the chosen scenario might be too conservative. A realistic approach of future changes of heads should be considered.	**CAR 2**	☑
B.2.4. Has the baseline been established on a project-specific basis?	1,2,4	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
B.2.5. Does the baseline scenario sufficiently take into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies, macro-economic trends and political aspirations?	1,2,4	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑
B.2.6. Is the baseline determination compatible with the available data?	2,4	DR, I	Corrective Action Request 3: On site Cafeara, a large retention box works as an open lagoon, and its dimensions should be included in the PDD to allow calculation of retention time of the entire lagoon system	CAR 3	☑
B.2.7. Does the selected baseline represent the most likely scenario among other possible and/or discussed scenarios?	4	DR, I	See CAR 2	CAR 2	☑
B.2.8. Does the PDD follow the approach for identifying the baseline scenario as given by the approved methodology?	4	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑
B.2.9. Is all literature and sources clearly referenced?	4	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑
B.3. Additionality					
B.3.1. Is the discussion of how emission reductions are archived by the project scenario in comparison to the identified project scenario provided in	2,4	DR, I	Yes. Section B3.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
a transparent manner?					
B.3.2. In case of using calculation models in order to demonstrate emission reductions: Are all formulae and input data based on provable records?	4	DR, I	For demonstrating the additionality no computer models have been applied	☑	☑
B.3.3. Does the PDD clearly demonstrate the additionality using the approach as given by the methodology?	4,10	DR, I	Yes. Section B3.	☑	☑
B.3.4. In case of using the additionality tool: Are all steps followed in a transparent and provable manner?	--	DR, I	Yes. Section B3.	☑	☑
B.3.5. Does the discussion sufficiently take into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies, macro-economic trends and political aspirations?	1,2,4	DR, I	Yes. Section B3.	☑	☑
B.3.6. Does the CDM registration have any impact on the implementation of the project?	1,2,4	DR, I	Yes. Section B3.	☑	☑
B.3.7. Is the approach for demonstrating additionality provided by the most recent (or still applicable) methodology correctly applied?	4,10	DR, I	Yes. Section B3.	☑	☑
B.3.8. Are other proofs than anecdotal evidence for all assumptions and statements used by the addi-	4	DR, I	Yes. Section B3.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
tionality discussion?					
B.4. Project Boundary					
B.4.1. Are all emission related to the baseline scenario clearly identified and described in a complete manner?	2,4	DR, I	Yes. Section B4.	☑	☑
B.4.2. In case of grid connected electricity projects: Is the relevant grid correctly identified due to the EB guidance and the underlying methodology?	--	DR, I	Not applicable	☑	☑
B.4.3. Are all emission related to the project scenario clearly identified and described in a complete manner?	2,4	DR, I	Yes the project emissions are mentioned in the PDD.	☑	☑
B.4.4. Are all emission related to leakage clearly identified and described in a complete manner?	--	DR, I	There is no leakage in this project considering the boundary defined in the methodology “project boundary is the physical, geographical site of the methane recovery facility”.	☑	☑
B.5. Detailed Baseline Information					
B.5.1. Is there any indication of a date when determine the baseline?	4	DR, I	Yes, the data used to calculate the baseline emission is based on the inventory data of 12 months and is different to each one site.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
B.5.2. Is this in consistency with the time line of the PDD history?	4	DR, I	Yes. Verified during the audit.	☑	☑
B.5.3. Is all data required provided in a complete manner by annex 3 of the PDD?	4	DR, I	The baseline is given in the methodology. Small scale projects do not have an annex 3	☑	☑
B.5.4. Is all data given in compliance with the methodology?	4,10	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
B.5.5. Is all data evidence by official data sources or replicable records?	4	DR, I	Yes. The use of farm software or Agcert form was evidenced.	☑	☑
B.5.6. Is the vintage of the baseline data correct?	2,4	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
C. **Duration of the Project / Crediting Period**					
C.1.1. Are the project's starting date and operational lifetime clearly defined and reasonable?	2,4	DR, I	**See CR 1**	CR 1	☑
C.1.2. Is the assumed crediting time clearly defined and reasonable (renewable crediting period of max 7 years with potential for 2 renewals or fixed crediting period of max. 10 years)?	4	DR, I	Yes. Section C 1.2.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
D. Monitoring Plan					
D.1. Monitoring Methodology					
D.1.1. Is the monitoring methodology previously approved by the CDM Methodology Panel?	4,11	DR, I	Yes. AMS-III.D ver 10	☑	☑
D.1.2. Is the choice of the methodology correctly justified by the PDD?	4,11	DR, I	Yes. Section D2.	☑	☑
D.1.3. Is the project in conformance with all applicability criteria of the applied methodology?	4,11	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
D.1.4. Does the monitoring methodology provide a consistent approach in the context of all parameter to be monitored and further information provided by the PDD?	4,11	DR, I	The PDD includes the necessary parameters for the calculations.	☑	☑
D.1.5. Does the monitoring methodology apply consistently the choice of the option selected for monitoring both of project and baseline emissions?	4,11	DR, I	Yes as far as the latest EB decisions are taking into account. The applied and approved methodology does not specify the monitoring of project	☑	☑
D.2. Monitoring of Project Emissions (if applied)					
D.2.1. Does the monitoring plan provide for the collection and archiving of all relevant data necessary	2,4,	DR, I	The monitoring plan does include relevant parameters to determine project emis-	☑	☑

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
for estimation or measuring the greenhouse gas emissions within the project boundary during the crediting period?			sions. Due to the choice made regarding the monitoring approach only the relevant parameters have been selected.		
D.2.2. Are the choices of project GHG indicators reasonable and in conformance with the requirements set by the approved methodology applied?	2,4, 11	DR, I	Yes. Due to the choice made regarding the monitoring approach only the relevant parameters have been selected.	☑	☑
D.2.3. Will it be possible to determine the specified project GHG indicators?	2,4	DR, I	Yes, it is possible to monitor and/or measure the currently specified GHG indicators. Data is collected by the farmer in a Agcert’s form and collected by Agcert representative.	☑	☑
D.2.4. Will the indicators enable comparison of project data and performance over time?	2,4	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
D.2.5. Is the information given for each monitoring variable by the presented table sufficient to ensure the verification of a proper implementation of the monitoring plan?	2,4		Yes	☑	☑
D.2.6. Is the information given for each monitoring variable by the presented table sufficient to ensure the delivery of high quality data free of po-	2,4,	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
tential for biases or intended or unintended changes in data records?					
D.2.7. Is the monitoring approach in line with current good practice, i.e. will it deliver data in a reliable and reasonably acceptable accuracy?	2,4	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑
D.2.8. Are all formulae used to determine project emission clearly indicated and in compliance with the monitoring methodology.	2,4	DR, I	Yes. Confirmed in the audit.	☑	☑
D.3. Monitoring of Baseline Emissions (if applied)					
D.3.1. Does the monitoring plan provide for the collection and archiving of all relevant data necessary for estimation or measuring the greenhouse gas emissions of the baseline emissions during the crediting period?	2,4	DR, I	Yes, the monitoring plan does include all relevant parameters to determine project emissions. Due to the choice made regarding the monitoring approach only the relevant parameters have been selected.	☑	☑
D.3.2. Are the choices of project GHG indicators reasonable and in conformance with the requirements set by the approved methodology applied?	2,4	DR, I	Yes. Due to the choice made regarding the monitoring approach only the relevant parameters have been selected.	☑	☑
D.3.3. Will it be possible to determine the specified project GHG indicators?	2,4	DR, I	Yes, it is possible to monitor and/or measure the currently specified GHG indicators. In case of indicators which are not meas-	☑	☑

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			ured, they can be obtained from IPCC documents.		
D.3.4. Is the information given for each monitoring variable by the presented table sufficient to ensure the verification of a proper implementation of the monitoring plan?	2,4	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑
D.3.5. Is the information given for each monitoring variable by the presented table sufficient to ensure the delivery of high quality data free of potential for biases or intended or unintended changes in data records?	2,4	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑
D.3.6. Is the monitoring approach in line with current good practice, i.e. will it deliver data in a reliable and reasonably acceptable accuracy?	2,4	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑
D.3.7. Are all formulas used to determine baseline emission clearly indicated and in compliance with the monitoring methodology.	2,4	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
D.4. Direct Monitoring of Emission Reductions (if applied)					
D.4.1. Does the monitoring plan provide for the collection and archiving of all relevant data necessary for estimation or measuring directly the greenhouse gas emissions reductions during the	2,4	DR, I	The monitoring plan does include relevant parameters to determine project emissions. Due to the choice made regarding the monitoring approach only the relevant	☑	☑

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
crediting period?			parameters have been selected.		
D.4.2. Are the choices of project GHG indicators reasonable and in conformance with the requirements set by the approved methodology applied?	2,4	DR, I	Yes. Due to the choice made regarding the monitoring approach only the relevant parameters have been selected.	☑	☑
D.4.3. Will it be possible to determine the specified project GHG indicators?	2,4	DR, I	Yes, it is possible to monitor and/or measure the currently specified GHG indicators. The indicators, which are not measured, can be obtained from IPCC documents.	☑	☑
D.4.4. Is the information given for each monitoring variable by the presented table sufficient to ensure the verification of a proper implementation of the monitoring plan?	2,4	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑
D.4.5. Is the information given for each monitoring variable by the presented table sufficient to ensure the delivery of high quality data free of potential for biases or intended or unintended changes in data records?	2,4	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑
D.4.6. Is the monitoring approach in line with current good practice, i.e. will it deliver data in a reliable and reasonably acceptable accuracy?	2,4	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑
D.4.7. Are all formulae used to determine project	2,4	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
emission reductions clearly indicated and in compliance with the monitoring methodology.					
D.5. Monitoring of Leakage (if applicable)					
D.5.1. Does the monitoring plan provide for the collection and archiving of all relevant data necessary for estimation or measuring of leakage emissions during the crediting period?	--	DR, I	Not applicable. See B.4.4	☑	☑
D.5.2. Are the choices of project GHG indicators reasonable and in conformance with the requirements set by the approved methodology applied?	--	DR, I	Not applicable.	☑	☑
D.5.3. Will it be possible to determine the specified project GHG indicators?	--	DR, I	Not applicable	☑	☑
D.5.4. Is the information given for each monitoring variable by the presented table sufficient to ensure the verification of a proper implementation of the monitoring plan?	--	DR, I	Not applicable	☑	☑
D.5.5. Is the information given for each monitoring variable by the presented table sufficient to ensure the delivery of high quality data free of potential for biases or intended or unintended changes in data records?	---	DR, I	Not applicable	☑	☑

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
D.5.6. Is the monitoring approach in line with current good practice, i.e. will it deliver data in a reliable and reasonably acceptable accuracy?	--	DR, I	Not applicable	☑	☑
D.5.7. Are all formulas used to determine leakage emissions clearly indicated and in compliance with the monitoring methodology.	--	DR, I	Not applicable	☑	☑
D.6. Determination of Emission Reductions					
D.6.1. Are all formulas used to determine leakage emissions clearly indicated and in compliance with the monitoring methodology.	--	DR, I	Not applicable	☑	☑
D.6.2. Is the information given for each calculated variable sufficient to ensure the delivery of high quality data free of potential for biases or intended or unintended changes in data records?	2,4	DR, I	Not applicable	☑	☑
D.7. Quality Control (QC) and Quality Assurance (QA) Procedures					
D.7.1. Is the selection of data undergoing quality control and quality assurance procedures complete?	4	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑
D.7.2. Is the belonging determination of uncertainty levels done correctly for each ID in a correct	4	DR, I	Clarification Request 3: The PDD shows the uncertainty parame-	CR 3	☑

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
and reliable manner?			ters. However, it is not determined the uncertainty level for each ID.		
D.7.3. Are quality control procedures and quality assurance procedures sufficiently described to ensure the delivery of high quality data?	4	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑
D.7.4. Is it ensured that data will be bound to national or internal reference standards?	4	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑
D.7.5. Is it ensured that data provisions will be free of potential conflicts of interests resulting in a tendency of overestimating emission reductions?	4	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑
D.8. Operational and management structure					
D.8.1. Is the authority and responsibility of project management clearly described?	2,4	DR, I	Yes. Confirmed in the audit.	☑	☑
D.8.2. Is the authority and responsibility for registration, monitoring, measurement and reporting clearly described?	2,4	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑
D.8.3. Are procedures identified for training of monitoring personnel?	2,4, 12	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
D.8.4. Are procedures identified for emergency preparedness for cases where emergencies can	2,4	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
cause unintended emissions?					
D.9. Monitoring Plan (Annex 4)					
D.9.1. Is the monitoring plan developed in a project specific manner clearly addressing the unique features of the CDM activity?	4,12	DR, I	Yes. AgCert has developed a set of instruments in order to monitor the project in a specific manner.	☑	☑
D.9.2. Does the monitoring plan completely describes all measures to be implemented for monitoring all parameter required?	4,12	DR, I	Yes. Corresponding documents completely describe all measures to be implemented for monitoring all parameter required.	☑	☑
D.9.3. Does the monitoring plan completely describes all measures to be implemented for ensuring data quality of all parameter to be monitored?	4, 12	DR, I	The monitoring plan completely describes all measures to be implemented for ensuring data quality of all parameter to be monitored.	☑	☑
D.9.4. Does the monitoring plan provide information on monitoring equipment and respective positioning in order to safeguard a proper installation?	4,12	DR, I	Yes. The monitoring plan provides information on monitoring equipment and respective positioning in order to safeguard a proper installation.	☑	☑
D.9.5. Are procedures identified for calibration of monitoring equipment?	4,12	DR, I	The monitoring equipment like the metering devices used for measurement of biogas is factory fully-calibrated and retain calibration for the service life of the unit.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			See also document “Especificação do Método” submitted to the validation team.		
D.9.6. Are procedures identified for maintenance of monitoring equipment and installations?	4,12	DR, I	Yes. The document “Especificação do Método” submitted to the validation team, describes such procedures in chapter 4.0.	☑	☑
D.9.7. Are procedures identified for monitoring, measurements and reporting?	4,12	DR, I	The processes for “Collecting” and “Handling” of data are described in the O &M Plan. Including QA/QC measures. Besides, the document “Especificação do Método” submitted to the validation team, describes such procedures in chapter 6.0 and 7.0.	☑	☑
D.9.8. Are procedures identified for day-to-day records handling (including what records to keep, storage area of records and how to process performance documentation)	4,12	DR, I	Yes. The document “Especificação do Método” submitted to the validation team, describes such procedures in chapter 6.0.	☑	☑
D.9.9. Are procedures identified for dealing with possible monitoring data adjustments and uncertainties?	4,12	DR, I	Yes. The document “Especificação do Método” submitted to the validation team, describes such procedures in chapter 4.2 and 4.3.	☑	☑
D.9.10. Does the monitoring plan provide procedures identified for troubleshooting allowing redundant	4,12	DR, I	The procedures for Emergency Maintenance notification are described in 4.3.1 of	☑	☑

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
reconstruction of data in case of monitoring problems?			the O&M Plan. “Alternative Operating Procedures” designed to prevent unintended emissions are found in 4.2.2.7, 4.2.3.6, 4.2.4.5, and 4.2.5.5 of the O&M Plan. Besides, the document “Especificação do Método” submitted to the validation team, describes such procedures in chapter 4.2 and 4.3.		
D.9.11. Are procedures identified for review of reported results/data?	1,4 ,12	DR, I	Yes. Procedures are identified for review of reported results/data.	☑	☑
D.9.12. Are procedures identified for internal audits of GHG project compliance with operational requirements where applicable?	4	DR, I	Yes. See document I020-2, QA Process-Product Audits from 11/05/03.	☑	☑
D.9.13. Are procedures identified for project performance reviews before data is submitted for verification, internally or externally?	4	DR, I	Yes. See document P025, Control of Measuring & Monitoring Devices (MMD) and document I031-5 Receiving Inspection from 19.02.04.	☑	☑
D.9.14. Are procedures identified for corrective actions in order to provide for more accurate future monitoring and reporting?	4	DR, I	Yes .See document I005-1, Corrective and Preventive Actions from 21.07.03.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
E. Calculation of GHG Emissions by Source					
E.1. Predicted Project GHG Emissions					
E.1.1. Are all aspects related to direct and indirect GHG emissions captured in the project design?	1,2,4	DR, I	Potential project emissions are considered completely. <u>Corrective Action Request 4:</u> The applied methodology states that the baseline emissions has to be fixed ex ante by : “The emission baseline is the amount of methane that would be emitted to the atmosphere during the crediting period in the absence of the project activity. For each year during the crediting period, emissions are calculated as specified in paragraph a and paragraph b below and lower of the two values is used (a) Actual monitored amount of methane captured and destroyed by the project activity. (b) The methane emissions calculated ex ante using the amount of the waste or raw material that would decay anaerobically in the absence of the project ac-	CAR 4	☑

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			tivity, with the most recent IPCC tier 2 approach” This information is not clearly mentioned in the PDD. Those baseline emissions shall have the common units of $CO_{2\text{-eq}}$ Furthermore, since this is a kind of parameter that needs to be considered in the monitoring the baseline emission shall be fixed in the monitoring plan either.		
E.1.2. Are the GHG calculations documented in a complete and transparent manner?	4	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑
E.1.3. Have conservative assumptions been used to calculate project GHG emissions?	4	DR, I	See CAR 2	CAR 2	☑
E.1.4. Are uncertainties in the GHG emissions estimates properly addressed in the documentation?	2,4 10	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑
E.1.5. Is the projection based on same procedures as used for later monitoring or acceptable alternative models?	-	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑
E.1.6. Is the projection based on provable input parameter?	-	DR, I	The projection is based on historical inventory data.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
E.2. 1Leakage					
E.2.1. Are potential leakage effects beyond the chosen project boundaries properly identified?	-	DR, I	Not applicable	☑	☑
E.2.2. Have these leakage effects been properly accounted for in calculations?	-	DR, I	Not applicable	☑	☑
E.2.3. Have conservative assumptions been used to calculate leakage emissions?	-	DR, I	Not applicable	☑	☑
E.2.4. Are uncertainties in the leakage estimates properly addressed in the documentation?	-	DR, I	Not applicable	☑	☑
E.2.5. Is the projection based on same procedures as used for later monitoring or acceptable alternative models?	-	DR, I	Not applicable	☑	☑
E.2.6. Is the projection based on provable input parameter?	-	DR, I	Not applicable	☑	☑
E.3. Baseline Emissions					
E.3.1. Have the most relevant and likely operational characteristics and baseline indicators been chosen as reference for baseline emissions?	2,4, 10	DR, I	See CAR 2	CAR 2	☑

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
E.3.2. Are the baseline boundaries clearly defined and do they sufficiently cover sources and sinks for baseline emissions?	2,4	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
E.3.3. Are the GHG calculations documented in a complete and transparent manner?	2,4	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
E.3.4. Have conservative assumptions been used when calculating baseline emissions?	4	DR,I	See CAR 2	CAR 2	☑
E.3.5. Are uncertainties in the GHG emission estimates properly addressed in the documentation?	4	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
E.3.6. Is the projection based on same procedures as used for later monitoring or acceptable alternative models?	---	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
E.3.7. Is the projection based on provable input parameter?	2,4	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
E.4. Emission Reductions					
E.4.1. Will the project result in fewer GHG emissions than the baseline scenario?	2,4	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
E.4.2. Is the form/table required for the indication of	4	DR, I	Yes.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
projected emission reductions correctly applied?					
E.4.3. Is the projection in line with the envisioned time schedule for the project’s implementation and the indicated crediting period?	2,4, 14	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
F. Environmental Impacts					
F.1.1. Has an analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity been sufficiently described?	2,4	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
F.1.2. Are there any Host Party requirements for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and if yes, is an EIA approved?	2,4	DR, I	An EIA is not necessary.	☑	☑
F.1.3. Will the project create any adverse environmental effects?	2,4	DR, I	No	☑	☑
F.1.4. Are transboundary environmental impacts considered in the analysis?	2,4	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
F.1.5. Have identified environmental impacts been addressed in the project design?	2,4	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
F.1.6. Does the project comply with environmental legislation in the host country?	2,4	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
G. Stakeholder Comments					
G.1.1. Have relevant stakeholders been consulted?	2,3,4	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
G.1.2. Have appropriate media been used to invite comments by local stakeholders?	2,4	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
G.1.3. If a stakeholder consultation process is required by regulations/laws in the host country, has the stakeholder consultation process been carried out in accordance with such regulations/laws?	-	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
G.1.4. Is the undertaken stakeholder process described in a complete and transparent manner?	-	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
G.1.5. Is a summary of the stakeholder comments received provided?	2,4	DR, I	Yes	☑	☑
G.1.6. Has due account been taken of any stakeholder comments received?	2,4	DR, I	No relevant comments form the Stakeholder.	☑	☑

Table 2b: Conformity of Project Activity and PDD (CDM-SC-PDD version 3 – new PDD format)

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
A. General description of small-scale project activity				
A.1. Title of the small-scale project activity				
A.1.1. Does the used project title clearly enable to identify the unique CDM activity?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the project is clearly defined in the title and explained in the PDD and Bundling Form.	☑	☑
A.1.2. Are there any indication concerning the revision number and the date of the revision?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the document ID, revision number and date of the PDD are posted on the front cover.	☑	☑
A.1.3. Is this consistent with the time line of the project’s history?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the date of the revision is consistent with the time line of the project.	☑	☑
A.2. Description of the small-scale project activity				
A.2.1. Is the description delivering a transparent overview of the project activities?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the project activity is clearly defined in the PDD.	☑	☑
A.2.2. What proofs are available demonstrating that the project description is in compliance with the actual situation or planning?	Tab. 2a	The actual situation has been checked during the on site visit.	☑	☑
A.2.3. Is the information provided by these proofs consistent with the information provided by the PDD?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the purpose of the project and the contribution to the sustainable development are in compliance with the actual situation.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
A.2.4. Is all information presented consistent with details provided by further chapters of the PDD?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the information is consistent with the details provided in the following chapters.	☑	☑
A.2.5. Describe the type of Waste Management System (WMS) used in the site (e. g. Anaerobic lagoon, composting, solid separator, etc.)	Tab. 2a	A covered anaerobic digester for capture and combustion of Biogas will be the Waste Management System used in the visited farms.	☑	☑
A.2.6. Does the description of the technology to be applied provide sufficient and transparent input to evaluate its impact on the greenhouse gas balance?	Tab. 2a	The technology description in the PDD provides a transparent input in the in the project impact on the greenhouse gas balance.	☑	☑
A.2.7. Is the brief explanation how the project will reduce greenhouse gas emission transparent and suitable?	Tab. 2a	An explanation is included on the PDD.	☑	☑
A.3. Project participants				
A.3.1. Is the form required for the indication of project participants correctly applied?	Tab. 2a	Yes, it is correctly applied.	☑	☑
A.3.2. Is the participation of the listed entities or Parties confirmed by each one of them?	Tab. 2a	Yes, it was confirmed.	☑	☑
A.3.3. Is all information on participants / Parties provided in consistency with details provided by further chapters of	Tab. 2a	The information about the project participants is consistent with the further chapters of the PDD.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
the PDD (in particular annex 1)?				
A.4. Technical description of the small-scale project activity				
A.4.1. Location of the small-scale project activity				
A.4.1.1. Does the information provided on the location of the project activity allow for a clear identification of the site(s)?	Tab. 2a	All farms are clearly described in the PDD with address, contact person and GPS coordinates. This information has been checked during the on-site visit.	☑	☑
A.4.1.2. How is it ensured and/or demonstrated, that the project proponents can implement the project at this site (ownership, licenses, contracts etc.)?	Tab. 2a	Yes, all the participants have the documents of the ownership of sites.	☑	☑
A.4.2. Type and category(ies) and technology/measure of the small-scale project activity				
A.4.2.1. To which type(s) does the project activity belong to? Is the type correctly identified and indicated?	Tab. 2a	The project activity is classified as Type III, other project activities. It is correctly indicated in the PDD.	☑	☑
A.4.2.2. To which category (ies) does the project activity belong to? Is the category correctly identified and indicated?	Tab. 2a	Category II.D, Methane recovery in agricultural and agro industrial activities, is correctly indicated in chapter A.4.2 of the PDD.	☑	☑
A.4.2.3. Does the technical design of the project activity reflect current good practices?	Tab. 2a	The technical design and the technology used in the project activity reflect good practices.	☑	☑
A.4.2.4. Does the implementation	Tab.	The used technology will be sourced from the host country	☑	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
of the project activity require any technology transfer from Annex-I-countries to the host country (ies)?	2a			
A.4.2.5. Is the technology implemented by the project activity environmentally safe?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the implemented technology is environmentally safe.	☑	☑
A.4.2.6. Is the information provided in compliance with actual situation or planning?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the information provided are in compliance with the actual situation	☑	☑
A.4.2.7. Does the project use state of the art technology and / or does the technology result in a significantly better performance than any commonly used technologies in the host country?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the technology to be employed by the project activity includes the installation of new covered lagoons creating an anaerobic digester. The project will improve the practice.	☑	☑
A.4.2.8. Is the project technology likely to be substituted by other or more efficient technologies within the project period?	Tab. 2a	No, this technology is not common in the host country and it will not be substituted within the project period.	☑	☑
A.4.2.9. Does the project require extensive initial training and maintenance efforts in order to be carried out as scheduled during the project period?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the project make considerations about training and maintenance to keep the normal operations during the project period,	☑	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
A.4.2.10. Is information available on the demand and requirements for training and maintenance?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the know-how transfer is duly taken into account in the PDD.	☑	☑
A.4.2.11. Is a schedule available for the implementation of the project and are there any risks for delays?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the construction of the project is implemented under schedule. Schedule documents have been submitted to the validator.	☑	☑
A.4.3. Estimated amount of emission reductions over the chosen crediting period				
A.4.3.1. Is the form required for the indication of projected emission reductions correctly applied?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the project emission reduction is correctly applied on chapter A.4.3 of the PDD.	☑	☑
A.4.3.2. Are the figures provided consistent with other data presented in the PDD?	Tab. 2a	The figures provided are consistent with other chapters of the PDD.	☑	☑
A.4.3.3. Are the figures consistent with the small-scale criteria for the used Type?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the estimated annual emission reductions are consistent with the small scale criteria.	☑	☑
A.4.4. Public funding of the small-scale project activity				

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
A.4.4.1. Is the information provided on public funding provided in compliance with the actual situation or planning as available by the project participants?	Tab. 2a	The project does not use any public funding.	☑	☑
A.4.4.2. Is all information provided consistent with the details given in remaining chapters of the PDD (in particular annex 2)?	Tab. 2a	Yes, see above.	☑	☑
A.4.5. Confirmation that the small-scale project activity is not a debundled component of a large scale project activity				

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>PPD in GSP</th><th>Final PDD</th></tr>
<tr><td>A.4.5.1. Is there a registered small-scale CDM site of a project activity or an application to register another small-scale CDM project activity: with the following characteristics:</td><td>Tab. 2a</td><td><table><tr><th>Debundling checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>the same project participants?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>In the same project category and technology/measure?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Registered within previous two years? Or in registration process?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Whose boundary is within 1 km of the project boundary of the small scale project activity (sites) under consideration?</td><td>No</td></tr></table></td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>A.4.5.2. If the answer to all the above question is ‘Yes’ then does the total size of the small scale project activity combined with previously registered small scale CDM project activity exceeds the limits of small scale CDM project activities?</td><td>Tab. 2a</td><td>Not applicable.</td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">B. Application of a baseline and monitoring methodology</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">B.1. Title and reference of the approved baseline and monitoring methodology applied to the small-scale project activity</td></tr>
<tr><td>B.1.1.1. Are reference number, version number, and title of the</td><td>Tab. 2a</td><td>Yes, the information is clearly indicated in page 8 of the PDD.</td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
</table>

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
baseline and monitoring methodology clearly indicated?				
B.1.1.2. Is the applied version the most recent one and / or is this version still applicable?	Tab. 2a	Version 11 of the methodology is used and it is still applicable.	☑	☑
B.2. Justification of the choice of the project category				
B.2.1.1. Is the applied methodology considered the most appropriate one?	Tab. 2a	Yes	☑	☑
B.2.1.2. Criterion 1: Does the project category comprise methane recovery from manure and wastes from agricultural or agro-industrial activities by a) installing methane recovery and combustion system to an existing source of methane emissions, or b) changing the management practice of a biogenic waste or raw material in order to achieve the controlled	Tab. 2a	Applicability checklist / Yes / No / NA Criterion discussed in the PDD? Yes Compliance provable? Yes Compliance verified? Yes	☑	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
anaerobic digestion equipped with methane recovery and combus-tion system?				

Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
B.2.1.3. Criterion 2: Does the project are not recovering methane from landfills or waste water treatment?	Tab. 2a	Applicability checklist: Yes / No / NA Criterion discussed in the PDD? Yes Compliance provable? Yes Compliance verified? Yes	☑	☑
B.2.1.4. Criterion 4: Are the technical measures being used (e.g. flared, combusted) to ensure that all bio-gas produced by the digester is destroyed?	Tab. 2a	Applicability checklist: Yes / No / NA Criterion discussed in the PDD? Yes Compliance provable? Yes Compliance verified? Yes	☑	☑
B.2.1.5. Criterion 3: Are the measures limited to those that result in emission reductions of less than or equal to 60 kt CO2 equivalent annually?	Tab. 2a	Applicability checklist: Yes / No / NA Criterion discussed in the PDD? Yes Compliance provable? Yes Compliance verified? Yes	☑	☑
B.3. Description of the project boundary				
B.3.1.1. Does the project boundary include physical, geographical site(s) where the methane recovery facilities are taking place?	Tab. 2a	The project boundary is clearly described in the PDD.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
B.3.1.2. Do the spatial and technological boundaries as verified on-site comply with the discussion provided by / indication included to the PDD?	Tab. 2a	The description complies with situation verified during the on-site visit.	☑	☑
B.4. Description of baseline and its development				
B.4.1.1. Have all technically feasible baseline scenario alternatives to the project activity been identified and discussed by the PDD? Why can this list be considered as being complete?	Tab. 2a	The alternatives has been identified and discussed in the PDD. Alternatives to the project activity without the help of CDM revenues have been discussed.	☑	☑
B.4.1.2. Does the project identifies correctly and excludes those options not in line with regulatory or legal requirements?	Tab. 2a	The legal requirement has been discussed in the PDD.	☑	☑
B.4.1.3. Have applicable regulatory or legal requirements been identified?	Tab. 2a	Yes, regulatory requirements have been identified.	☑	☑
B.4.1.4. Does the PDD identify the most likely baseline scenario in absence of the project activity?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the common practice is included in the PDD.	☑	☑
B.4.1.5. Is this identification supported by official and/or verifiable documents (e.g. studies, web pages, certificates, etc?	Tab. 2a	Yes, documentation regarding these options have been submitted to the DOE.	☑	☑

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>PPD in GSP</th><th>Final PDD</th></tr>
<tr><td>B.4.1.6. Is the identified baseline scenario in line with regulatory or legal requirements?</td><td>Tab. 2a</td><td>The baseline Scenario is in line with the local legal requirements.</td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">B.5. Description of how the anthropogenic emissions of GHG by sources are reduced below those that would have occurred in the absence of the registered small-scale CDM project activity:</td></tr>
<tr><td>B.5.1.1. If the starting date of the project activity is before the date of validation, is evidence available to prove that incentive from the CDM was seriously considered in the decision to proceed with the project activity?</td><td>Tab. 2a</td><td>N.A.</td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>B.5.1.2. Is a complete list of barriers developed that prevents the project activity to occur?</td><td>Tab. 2a</td><td>Yes, a list with all relevant barriers has been included in the PDD.</td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>B.5.1.3. Does this list include at least one of the following barriers?</td><td></td><td><table><tr><th>Barrier</th><th>Discussed?</th><th>Verifiable?</th></tr><tr><td>Investment</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Technological</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Due to prevailing practice</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Other</td><td>No</td><td>N.A.</td></tr></table></td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>B.5.1.4. Does the discussion sufficiently take into account relevant national and/or sectoral</td><td>Tab. 2a</td><td>National Policies and regulations are included in the PDD.</td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
</table>

Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
policies?				
B.5.1.5. Is transparent and documented evidence provided on the existence and significance of these barriers?	Tab. 2a	Documentation supporting the barriers have been verified by the audit team.	☑	☑
B.5.1.6. Is it appropriately explained how the approval of the project activity will help to overcome the identified barriers?	Tab. 2a	Yes, this issue is appropriately explained.	☑	☑
B.6. Emissions reductions				
B.6.1. Explanation of methodological choices				
B.6.1.1. Is it explained how the procedures provided in the methodology are applied by the proposed project activity?	Tab. 2a	Yes, formulas and calculations are included in the PDD.	☑	☑
B.6.1.2. Is every selection of options offered by the methodology correctly justified and is this justification in line with the situation verified on-site?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the right options have been chosen and are in lie with the situation verified on-site.	☑	☑
B.6.1.3. Component 1: emissions from methane not captured by the project and released to the atmosphere	Tab. 2a	Project emission checklist: Yes / No Component discussed in the PDD? Yes Formulae correctly applied? Yes	☑	☑

Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
B.6.1.4. Component 2: emissions from methane captured and not flared (e.g. physical leakage, flare inefficiency, flare availability)	Tab. 2a	Project emission checklist: Yes / No; Component discussed in the PDD? Yes; Formulae correctly applied? Yes	☑	☑
B.6.1.5. Component 3: emissions from CO2 emissions from combustion of non-biogenic methane;	Tab. 2a	Project emission checklist: Yes / No; Component discussed in the PDD? Yes; Formulae correctly applied? Yes	☑	☑
B.6.1.6. Component 4: emissions from CO2 emissions from use of fossil fuels or electricity for the operation of the facility	Tab. 2a	Project emission checklist: Yes / No; Component discussed in the PDD? Yes; Formulae correctly applied? Yes	☑	☑
B.6.1.7. Component 5: emissions from the aerobic treatment and/or proper soil application of the sludge leaving the digesters in the project activity shall also be ensured and monitored. If the sludge is treated and/or disposed anaerobically, the resulting methane emissions shall be considered as project emissions	Tab. 2a	Project emission checklist: Yes / No; Component discussed in the PDD? Yes; Formulae correctly applied? Yes	☑	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
B.6.1.8. Are the formulae required for the determination of base-line emissions correctly pre-sented, enabling a complete identification of parameters to be used and / or monitored?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the formula is correctly presented and corresponds to the methodology.	☑	☑
B.6.1.9. Are the formulae required for the determination of leak-age emissions correctly pre-sented, enabling a complete identification of parameter to be used and / or monitored?	Tab. 2a	Leakage calculations are not required.	☑	☑
B.6.1.10. Are the formulae required for the determination of emis-sion reductions correctly pre-sented?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the formula is correctly presented and corresponds to the methodology.	☑	☑
B.6.2. Data and parameters that are available at validation				
B.6.2.1. Is the list of parameters presented in chapter B.6.2 considered to be complete with regard to the requirements of the applied methodology?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the parameters presented are complete.	☑	☑
B.6.2.2. Parameter 1: amount of the waste or raw material	Tab. 2a	Data Checklist: Yes / No / NA Title in line with methodology? Yes	☑	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
		Data unit correctly expressed? Yes Appropriate description of parameter? Yes Source clearly referenced? Yes Correct value provided? Yes Has this value been verified? Yes Choice of data correctly justified? Yes Measurement method correctly described? Yes Derived from calculations in accordance with. IPCC 2006		

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>PPD in GSP</th><th>Final PDD</th></tr>
<tr><td>B.6.2.3. Parameter 2: most recent IPCC tier 2 (i.e. Vs, Bo, MCF)</td><td>Tab. 2a</td><td><table><tr><th>Data Checklist</th><th>Yes / No / NA</th></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Choice of data correctly justified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table></td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>B.6.2.4. Parameter 3 (only for Animal WMS): population and type of animals.</td><td>Tab. 2a</td><td><table><tr><th>Data Checklist</th><th>Yes / No / NA</th></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Choice of data correctly justified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table></td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">B.6.3. Ex-ante calculation of emission reductions</td></tr>
</table>

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
B.6.3.1. Is the projection based on the same procedures as used for future monitoring?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the projection used is based in the future monitoring.	☑	☑
B.6.3.2. Are the GHG calculations documented in a complete and transparent manner?	Tab. 2a	Yes, all GHG calculations are completely documented in the PDD.	☑	☑
B.6.3.3. If there is more than one component of the project activity, then, are emission reduction calculations provided separately for each component?	Tab. 2a	N.A.	☑	☑
B.6.3.4. Is the data provided in this section consistent with data as presented in other chapters of the PDD?	Tab. 2a	The data provided is consistent with other chapters of the PDD.	☑	☑
B.6.4. Summary of the ex-ante estimation of emission reductions				
B.6.4.1. Will the project result in fewer GHG emissions than the baseline scenario?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the emissions will be lower.	☑	☑
B.6.4.2. Is the form/table required for the indication of projected emission reductions correctly applied?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the form is correctly applied.	☑	☑
B.6.4.3. If the project activity involves more than one compo-	Tab. 2a	Yes, in this case the calculations have been done separately for every farm.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
nent, is separate table included for each of the component.				
B.6.4.4. Do these values comply with small-scale criteria for every year?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the values comply with the small scale criteria.	☑	☑
B.6.4.5. Is the projection in line with the envisioned time schedule for the project’s implementation and the indicated crediting period?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the projection is compliant with the schedule.	☑	☑
B.6.4.6. Is the data provided in this section in consistency with data as presented in other chapters of the PDD?	Tab. 2a	The presented data is consistent.	☑	☑
B.7. Application of the monitoring methodology and description of the monitoring plan				
B.7.1. Data and parameters monitored				
B.7.1.1. Is the list of parameters presented in chapter B.7.1 considered to be complete with regard to the requirements of the applied methodology?	Tab. 2a	Yes, all parameters are discussed on the PDD.	☑	☑
B.7.1.2. Parameter 1: biogas flow	Tab. 2a	Monitoring Checklist / Yes / No Title in line with methodology? / Yes Data unit correctly expressed? / Yes	☑	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS		PPD in GSP	Final PDD
		Appropriate description of parameter?	Yes		
		Source clearly referenced?	Yes		
		Correct value provided for estimation?	Yes		
		Has this value been verified?	Yes		
		Measurement method correctly described?	Yes		
		Correct reference to standards?	Yes		
		Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes		
		QA/QC procedures described?	Yes		
		QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes		

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>PPD in GSP</th><th>Final PDD</th></tr>
<tr><td>B.7.1.3. Parameter 2: biogas temperature</td><td>Tab. 2a</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th>Monitoring Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr>
<tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>B.7.1.4. Parameter 3: pressure</td><td>Tab. 2a</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th>Monitoring Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr>
<tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
</table>

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS			PPD in GSP	Final PDD
		QA/QC procedures appropriate?	N/A			

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>PPD in GSP</th><th>Final PDD</th></tr>
<tr><td>B.7.1.5. Parameter 4: fraction of CH_4</td><td>Tab. 2a</td><td><table>
<tr><th>Monitoring Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr>
<tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
</table></td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>B.7.1.6. Parameter 5: flare efficiency</td><td>Tab. 2a</td><td><table>
<tr><th>Monitoring Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr>
<tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
</table></td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
</table>

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
		QA/QC procedures appropriate? Yes		

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>PPD in GSP</th><th>Final PDD</th></tr>
<tr><td>B.7.1.7. Parameter 6: combusted gas</td><td>Tab. 2a</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th>Monitoring Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr>
<tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>
</td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>B.7.1.8. Parameter 7: fraction of time in which the gas is combusted in the flare</td><td>Tab. 2a</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th>Monitoring Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr>
<tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
</table>

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS		PPD in GSP	Final PDD
		Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes		
		QA/QC procedures described?	Yes		
		QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes		

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
B.7.2. Description of the monitoring plan				
B.7.2.1. Is the operational and management structure clearly described and in compliance with the envisioned situation?	Tab. 2a	Management structures are clearly described in the PDD.	☑	☑
B.7.2.2. Are responsibilities and institutional arrangements for data collection and archiving clearly provided?	Tab. 2a	Responsible and arrangements for monitoring are provided.	☑	☑
B.7.2.3. Does the monitoring plan provide current good monitoring practice?	Tab. 2a	The monitoring plan reflects current good practices.	☑	☑
B.7.2.4. If applicable: Does annex 4 provide useful information enabling a better understanding of the envisioned monitoring provisions?	Tab. 2a	Yes, annex 4 provides detailed information about the monitoring procedures and technical data.	☑	☑
B.8. Date of completion of the application of the baseline study and monitoring methodology an the name of the responsible person(s)/entity(ies)				
B.8.1.1. Is there any indication of a date when the baseline was determined?	Tab. 2a	The date and responsible for baseline development is included in the PDD.	☑	☑
B.8.1.2. Has dd/mm/yyyy format been used to indicate the date.	Tab. 2a	Yes, 15/03/2007	☑	☑
B.8.1.3. Is this consistent with the	Tab.	Yes, it is consistent.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
time line of the PDD history?	2a			
B.8.1.4. Is the information on the person(s) / entity (ies) responsible for the application of the baseline and monitoring methodology provided consistent with the actual situation?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the responsible for baseline and monitoring methodology is also the project developer.	☑	☑
B.8.1.5. Is information provided whether this person / entity is also considered a project participant?	Tab. 2a	Yes, see information above.	☑	☑
C. Duration of the project activity / crediting period				
C.1. Duration of the project activity				
C.1.1.1. Are the project’s starting date and operational lifetime clearly defined and reasonable?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the dates are reasonable.	☑	☑
C.2. Choice of the crediting period and related information				
C.2.1.1. Is the assumed crediting time clearly defined and reasonable (renewable crediting period of max 7 years with potential for 2 renewals or fixed crediting period of max. 10 years)?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the crediting period has been clearly defined and reasonable.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
C.2.1.2. Has dd/mm/yyyy format been used to indicate the start date of the crediting period?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the format is respected.	☑	☑
D. Environmental impacts				
D.1. If required by the host Party, documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity:				
D.1.1. Are there any Host Party requirements for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and if yes, has an EIA been approved?	Tab. 2a	Yes all legal requirements of the host country has been respected so far.	☑	☑
D.1.2. Has the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity been sufficiently described?	Tab. 2a	N.A.	☑	☑
D.1.3. Will the project create any adverse environmental effects?	Tab. 2a	No negative environmental impacts are expected from the proposed project.	☑	☑
D.1.4. Were transboundary environmental impacts identified in the analysis?	Tab. 2a	N.A.	☑	☑
D.2. If environmental impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the host Party, please provide conclusions and all references to support documentation of an environmental impact assessment undertaken in accordance with the procedures as required by the host Party				
D.2.1. Have the identified environmental impacts been addressed in the project design sufficiently?	Tab. 2a	Yes, no environmental impacts. .	☑	☑
D.2.2. Does the project comply with environmental legislation in the host coun-	Tab. 2a	Yes, the project respects the host country’s environmental legislation.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
try?				
E. Stakeholders' comments				
E.1. Brief description how comments by local stakeholders have been invited and compiled				
E.1.1. Have relevant stakeholders been consulted?	Tab. 2a	Yes, stakeholder meetings have been held.	☑	☑
E.1.2. Have appropriate media been used to invite comments by local stakeholders?	Tab. 2a	Yes, information on the meetings has been provided through newspapers.	☑	☑
E.1.3. If a stakeholder consultation process is required by regulations/laws in the host country, has the stakeholder consultation process been carried out in accordance with such regulations/laws?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the stakeholder consultation process had been carried out in accordance with host country regulations/laws.	☑	☑
E.1.4. Is the undertaken stakeholder process that was carried out described in a complete and transparent manner?	Tab. 2a	Yes, it is clearly described in the PDD.	☑	☑
E.2. Summary of the comments received				
E.2.1. Is a summary of the received stakeholder comments provided?	Tab. 2a	No relevant comments was received form the stakeholders.	☑	☑
E.3. Report on how due account was taken of any comments received				
E.3.1. Has due account been taken of any stakeholder comments received?	Tab. 2a	No relevant comments was received form the stakeholders.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
F. Annexes 1 - 4				
Annex 1: Contact Information				
F.1.1. Is the information provided consistent with the one given under section A.3?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the information is consistent.	☑	☑
F.1.2. Is the information on all private participants and directly involved Parties presented?	Tab. 2a	Yes, all involved parties are included.	☑	☑
Annex 2: Information regarding public funding				
F.1.3. Is the information provided on the inclusion of public funding (if any) in consistency with the actual situation presented by the project participants?	Tab. 2a	No public funding was provided for this project.	☑	☑
F.1.4. If necessary: Is an affirmation available that any such funding from Annex-I-countries does not result in a diversion of ODA?	Tab. 2a	See comment above.	☑	☑
Annex 3: Baseline information				
F.1.5. If additional background information on baseline data is provided: Is this information consistent with data presented by other sections of the PDD?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the baseline information presented is in line with other sections of the PDD.	☑	☑
F.1.6. Is the data provided verifiable? Has sufficient evidence been provided to	Tab. 2a	The audit team verified these values during the on-site visit.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PPD in GSP	Final PDD
the validation team?				
F.1.7. Does the additional information substantiate / support statements given in other sections of the PDD?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the information supports the calculations provided in other sections of the PDD.	☑	☑
Annex 4: Monitoring information				
F.1.8. If additional background information on monitoring is provided: Is this information consistent with data presented in other sections of the PDD?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the monitoring information presented is in line with other sections of the PDD.	☑	☑
F.1.9. Is the information provided verifiable? Has sufficient evidence been provided to the validation team?	Tab. 2a	The audit team verified the information during the on-site visit.	☑	☑
F.1.10. Do the additional information and / or documented procedures substantiate / support statements given in other sections of the PDD?	Tab. 2a	Yes, the information given supports other monitoring information given in the PDD.	☑	☑

Table 3 Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in tables 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
Open issues The MoC issued by the project participants should be submitted to the audit team before registration	Table 1	**OI1 -** MoC will be posted to the supporting documents portal upon receipt.	
The Letter of Approval issued by the host country should be submitted to the audit team before registration	Table 1	**OI2 -** LoA will be posted to the supporting documents portal upon receipt.	
Corrective Action Requests			
CAR 1: The indication in the figure A1 located in page 8 indicate the old farm’s name to Rio das Pedras site 2	A.4.1	**CAR1 –** PDD updated.	Accepted
CAR 2: A baseline scenario where number of heads increases is not considered. In cases where growth in the number animals is likely, the baseline should be calculated taking into account a bigger population in the near future, and evidence of such growth plan should be provided.	B.2.2	**CAR2 -** The PDD has been updated to reflect growth calculations. A growth declaration for Sitio Cafeara has been posted to the portal with other supporting documentation.	From the point of validation the proposed growth is plausible. Issue can be considered as resolved. ☑

CAR 3: On site Cafeara, a large retention box works as an open lagoon, and its dimensions should be included in the PDD to allow calculation of retention time of the entire lagoon system	B.2.6	**CAR3 –** PDD updated.	Issue can be considered as resolved. ☑
CAR 4: The applied methodology states that the baseline emissions have to be fixed ex ante by: “The emission baseline is the amount of methane that would be emitted to the atmosphere during the crediting period in the absence of the project activity. For each year during the crediting period, emissions are calculated as specified in paragraph a and paragraph b below and lower of the two values is used (a) Actual monitored amount of methane captured and destroyed by the project activity. (b) The methane emissions calculated ex ante using the amount of the waste or raw material that would decay anaerobically in the absence of the project activity, with the most recent IPCC tier 2 approach” This information is not clearly mentioned in the PDD. Those baseline emissions shall have the common units of $CO_{2\text{-}eq}$ Furthermore, since this is a kind of parameter that needs to be considered in the monitoring, the baseline emission shall be fixed in the monitoring plan either.	E.1.1	**CAR4 -** Direct project emissions are addressed in the PDD.	Issue can be considered as resolved. ☑

Clarification Requests			
Clarification Request 1: For Granja Cafeára, the leasing contract expires in 12/08, which is before the end of crediting period. How the continuation of the project activity can be assured after the end of the contract?	A.4.2	**CR1 -** The land owner signed the contract and is willing to continue with the project even if the farm land is not renewed by the leaser.	From the point of validation the proposed expression of continuing is plausible. Issue can be considered as resolved. ☑
Clarification Request 2 The number of biodigestor modules and its size should be mentioned in the PDD.	Table 2 A.4.8	**CR2 –** PDD updated.	Accepted ☑
Clarification Request 3: The PDD shows the uncertainty parameters. However, it is not determined the uncertainty level for each ID.	D.7.2	**CR3 –** The uncertainties addressed in the PDD apply to any and all IDs within the project. The project developer knows of no guidance that specifically states uncertainties shall be addressed by ID.	Issue can be considered as resolved. ☑

Annex 2: Information Reference List

Reference No.	Document or Type of Information
1	On-site interview at the offices of Agcert in São Paulo with the project developer conducted on June 16, 2006 by auditing team of TÜV SÜD **Validation team on-site:** Wilson Roberto Tomao TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH **Interviewed persons:** Miguel Gastão Agcert David Lawrence Agcert
2	On-site interview at the sites by auditing team of TÜV SÜD on 31/10/2006 **Validation team on-site:** Wilson Roberto Tomao TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH **Interviewed persons:** Mario Augusto Silva Fazenda da Barra Leandro Dias Costa Fazenda da Barra Donizeth Urzedo Fazenda Rio das Pedras – sitio 2 Ozeas do Nascimento Fazenda Rio das Pedras – sitio 2 Lydise Akemi Agcert

Reference No.	Document or Type of Information
3	Correio Uberlandense Newspaper , January 17, 2005
4	o Project Design Document, version 1 from October 03 submitted in October 2006 o Project Design Document BR06-S-33 VER 3, 31 JAN 2007 o Project Design Document BR06-S-33 VER 4, 14 Nov 2007
5	UNFCCC homepage http://www.unfccc.int
6	Interim Measures for Operation and Management of Clean Development Mechanism Projects, NDRC, June 2004
7	Operation/Environmental Licenses
8	http://www.ambientebrasil.com.br
9	http://www.gaemg.org.br
10	Approved baseline methodology Type III, Other Project activities, Category III.D Methane recovery
11	Approved monitoring methodology Type III, Other Project activities, Category III.D Methane recovery
12	Form MS 004 – Flare monitoring
13	Carbon Contracts with each farm, pdf-files on TUV Support Documentation Portal,
14	Monitoring Documentation “Especificacao do Metodo”, submitted in October 2005.
15	Validation and Verification Manual, IETA/World Bank (PCF), http://www.vvmanual.info

Reference No.	Document or Type of Information
16	Training records of Fazenda da Barra and Fazenda Rio das Pedras