

VERIFICATION REPORT FOR GUOHUA WULATE ZHONGQI CHUANJING PHASE II WIND FARM PROJECT



Document Prepared By SGS United Kingdom Limited

Project Title	Guohua Wulate Zhongqi Chuanjing Phase II Wind Farm Project
Version	1
Report ID	CCP.VOL0897B

Report Title	VCS Verification Report for Guohua Wulate Zhongqi Chuanjing Phase II Wind Farm Project
Client	Guohua Bayannaoer (Wulate Zhongqi) Wind Power Co.,Ltd.
Pages	32
Date of Issue	14-12-2012
Prepared By	SGS United Kingdom Limited
Contact	SGS Climate Change Programme, SGS United Kingdom Ltd, SGS House, 217-221, London Road, Camberley Surrey, GU15 3EY, United Kingdom
Approved By	Linda Hu - Technical Reviewer
Work Carried Out By	Michael Wu – Lead Assessor/Team Leader/Local Assessor/Sectoral Scope Expert (TA 1.2) Simon Zhao - Assessor

Summary:

SGS United Kingdom Ltd has performed the verification of the project Guohua Wulate Zhongqi Chuanjing Phase II Wind Farm Project (SGS Ref. No.: CCP.VOL0897B / UNFCCC Ref. No: 4303) against VCS Standard Version 3.3. The verification includes confirming the implementation of the monitoring plan of the CDM PDD Version 02 dated 24/11/2010 which was included in the VCS PD version 02 dated 16/11/2012 and the application of the monitoring methodology as per ACM0002 Version 11 dated 12/02/2010 and the gap validation for the project's compliance with the VCS rules. A site visit was conducted to verify the data submitted in the monitoring report.

Total 33 sets of wind turbines, each of which has a rated installed capacity of 1.5 MW, providing a total installed capacity of 49.5 MW have been equipped. The annual output of the project is estimated to be 129,580 MWh. As a renewable wind power project, the project generates greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions by displacing power from the North China Power Grid (NCPG) which is of high-growth and dominated by fossil-fuel fired power plants.

The report describes a total of 2 findings which have been satisfactorily closed out, including:

- 1 Corrective Action Requests (CARs);
- 1 Clarification Requests (CLs);
- 0 Forward Action Requests (FARs); and

SGS confirms that the project is implemented in accordance with the validated VCS Project Description. The monitoring system is in place and the emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements. SGS's opinion relates to the projects GHG emissions and the resulting GHG emission reductions reported and related to the valid and validated project baseline and monitoring and its associated documents. Based on the information seen and evaluated, SGS confirms that the implementation of the project has resulted in **113,850 tCO₂e** emission reductions during period 01/12/2009 up to 31/12/2010 (5,642 tCO₂e for the period from 01/12/2009 to 31/12/2009; 108,208 tCO₂e for the period from 01/01/2010 to 31/12/2010).

TABLE OF CONTENT

Table of Content	3
1 Introduction	5
1.1 Objective.....	5
1.2 Scope and Criteria	5
1.3 Level of assurance.....	5
1.4 Summary Description of the Project.....	6
2 Validation Process, Findings and Conclusion	6
2.1 Validation Process	6
2.2 Validation Findings	7
2.2.1 Gap Validation	7
2.2.2 Methodology Deviations	11
2.2.3 Project Description Deviations	11
2.2.4 New Project Activity Instances	11
2.3 Validation Conclusion.....	12
3 Verification Process.....	12
3.1 Method and Criteria	12
3.2 Document Review.....	12
3.3 Interviews	12
3.4 Site Inspections.....	13
3.5 Resolution of Any Material Discrepancy	13
4 Verification Findings	14
4.1 Project Implementation Status.....	14
4.1.1 Implementation status of the project activity	14
4.1.2 Remaining Issues from Previous Validation or Verification.....	15
4.1.3 Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology.....	15

4.1.4	Implementation Status of the Monitoring Plan and Completeness of Monitoring	15
4.1.5	Accuracy of Equipment	18
4.1.6	Data from External Sources	19
4.2	Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction or Removal Calculations	19
4.2.1	Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction or Removal Calculations	19
4.2.2	Calculation of Emission Reductions or Removals	19
4.3	Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions or Removals	20
4.4	Management and Operational System	20
5	Verification conclusion	20
6	Document References	24
Annex 1: Overview of Findings		26
Annex 2: Team Members Statements of Competency		29
Annex 3: Photographic Evidence		32

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

SGS United Kingdom Ltd has been contracted by Guohua Bayannaoer (Wulate Zhongqi) Wind Power Co.,Ltd. to perform an independent verification of its project Guohua Wulate Zhongqi Chuanjing Phase II Wind Farm Project against VCS Standard Version 3.3. The verifiers have reviewed the GHG data collected to date for the period between 01/12/2009 and 31/12/2010.

The purposes of this verification exercise are, by review of objective evidence, to independently review:

- Whether the project has resulted in emission reductions as declared by the organisation or GHG project's GHG assertion;
- The data reported are accurate, complete, consistent, transparent and free of material error or omission.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

This engagement covers verification of emission reductions from anthropogenic sources of greenhouse gases included within the project boundary of Guohua Wulate Zhongqi Chuanjing Phase II Wind Farm Project.

Our approach is risk-based, drawing on an understanding of the risks associated with reporting GHG emissions data and the controls in place to mitigate these. Our examination includes assessment, on a test basis, of evidence relevant to the amounts and disclosures in relation to the project's GHG emission reductions for the defined reporting period.

The verification 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.

1.3 Level of assurance

The level of assurance of the verification report is reasonable assurance engagements as selected by the Client. Materiality for the project is 5%.

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

This engagement covers emissions and emission reductions from anthropogenic sources of greenhouse gases included within the project boundary of the following project and period.

Title of Project Activity:	Guohua Wulate Zhongqi Chuanjing Phase II Wind Farm Project
Monitoring Period Covered in this Report	01/12/2009 to 31/12/2010
Project Proponent	Guohua Bayannaoer (Wulate Zhongqi) Wind Power Co.,Ltd.
Location of the Project Activity:	Chuanjing Windfarm, Wulate Zhongqi, Bayannaoer City, Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region, P.R. China

The project has an installed capacity of 49.5MW, consisting of 33 sets of 1.5MW wind turbines. Electricity generated by the project is fed into the North China Power Grid (NCPG), substituting part of electricity generation in fossil fuel fired power plants connected to NCPG. It is expected that the annual electricity delivered to the grid is 129,580MWh. And the estimated annual emission reductions are 123,126 tCO₂e. The project started construction on 12/06/2009. The project was put into commercial operation on 22/11/2009 (i.e. the project start date), and started full operation on 15/12/2009.

2 VALIDATION PROCESS, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

2.1 Validation Process

Method and Criteria:

The project was registered as a CDM project on 05/01/2011. According to section 3.11.8 of VCS Standard Version 3.3, a further validation shall be completed of the cover page and sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.9, 1.10, 1.12.1, 1.12.2, 1.12.3, 1.12.4 and 1.13 of the VCS Project Description Template. Relevant information is discussed in Section 2.2.1 of this report.

Document Review:

The validated CDM PDD, VCS PD and the Monitoring Report submitted by the client and additional background documents related to the project design were reviewed. A complete list of all documents reviewed is included in Section 6 of this report.

Interview:

On 13/11/2012, all members of the assessment team performed interviews with staff members from Guohua Bayannaoer (Wulate Zhongqi) Wind Power Co.,Ltd. to confirm the information in the cover page and sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.9, 1.10, 1.12.1, 1.12.2, 1.12.3, 1.12.4 and 1.13 of the VCS Project Description Template. Persons Interviewed are listed in section 3.4 of this report.

Site Inspection:

The onsite inspection was conducted by members of the assessment team on 13/11/2012 to verify the physical situation and complement the desk based assessment of the relevant gaps between CDM and VCS Version 3.3. See section 3.4 for detailed information.

Resolution of Any Material Discrepancy:

As an outcome of the validation process, the team can raise different types of findings

A Clarification Request (CL) is raised if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable VCS requirements have been met

Where a non-conformance arises the Assessor shall raise a Corrective Action Request (CAR). A CAR is issued, where:

- i. The project proponents have made mistakes that will influence the ability of the project activity to achieve real, measurable additional emission reductions;
- ii. The VCS requirements have not been met;
- iii. There is a risk that emission reductions cannot be monitored or calculated.

The validation process may be halted until this information has been made available to the assessors' satisfaction. Failure to address a CL may result in a CAR. Information or clarifications provided as a result of a CL may also lead to a CAR.

A Forward Action Request (FAR) is raised during validation to highlight issues related to project implementation that require review during the first verification of the project activity. FARs shall not relate to the VCS requirements for registration.

2.2 Validation Findings

2.2.1 Gap Validation

The project was registered as a CDM project on 05/01/2011 (/4/). According to section 3.11.8 of VCS Standard Version 3.3 (/23/), a further validation shall be completed of the cover page and sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.9, 1.10, 1.12.1, 1.12.2, 1.12.3, 1.12.4 and 1.13 of the VCS Project Description Template (/25/).

The cover page and sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.9, 1.10, 1.12.1, 1.12.2, 1.12.3, 1.12.4 and 1.13 of the VCS Project Description Template were discussed in the VCS PD version 02 (/2/).

Validation of the cover page and sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.9, 1.10, 1.12.1, 1.12.2, 1.12.3, 1.12.4 and 1.13 of the VCS Project Description Template are pursuant to Section 3.11.8 of VCS Standard Version 3.3 and Section 4.1.5 of Registration and Issuance Process VCS Standard Version 3.4. Requirement set out in Section 3.11.8 of VCS Standard Version 3.3 and Section 4.1.5 of Registration and Issuance Process VCS Standard Version 3.4 is fulfilled.

The cover page:

The project title “*Guohua Wulate Zhongqi Chuanjing Phase II Wind Farm Project*” has been validated to be the same as the registered CDM project and the project name indicated in the Letter of Approval (LoA) from China (/21/). The version, date of issue, the entity preparing the relevant sections of the PD, and the corresponding contact information has been validated to be correct.

Section 1.2 Sectoral Scope and Project Type:

Through the onsite visit, interviewing the project owner and reviewing the project design, it was confirmed that the project was implemented to generate electricity using renewable wind resources and replace the electricity which would otherwise be generated by grid connected power plants. Therefore, it was confirmed that the sectoral scope is scope 1 Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources). It was confirmed that the project is not a grouped project.

Section 1.3 Project Proponent:

The project proponent (*Guohua Bayannaoer (Wulate Zhongqi) Wind Power Co., Ltd.*) and the contact information reported in section 1.3 of the VCS PD have been confirmed to be correct through checking the LoA and interviewing with the project owner through the onsite visit.

Section 1.5 Project Start Date:

The indicated project start date is 22/11/2009, which is confirmed to be the date on which the project began generating GHG emission reductions by checking the operation log (/10/) and the summary of the grid connection time of each wind turbine of this project (/26/).

As per information available on the UNFCCC website, the CDM registration date of the project is 05/01/2011 (UNFCCC Ref. No.:4303) with the first CDM crediting period from 05/01/2011 to 04/01/2018 (/4/). The start date of the project was 22/11/2009 which was the day when the project began reducing GHG emissions. The first version of CDM validation report of the project was completed on 16/09/2010, the final revision of the validation report was issued on 27/12/2010 (/3/) for CDM registration. The gap between the start date of the project (22/11/2009) and validation completion is less than two years and thus in compliance with the requirement that non-AFOLU projects shall complete validation within two years of the project start date as per Section 3.8.1 of VCS Standard Version 3.3.

Section 1.6 Project Crediting Period:

As per information available on the UNFCCC website, <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/BVQI1293507800.73/view>, the project was registered as a CDM project on 05/01/2011 (UNFCCC Ref. No.:4303). The start date of the project crediting period of VCS is 01/12/2009, which is confirmed to be later than the starting date (22/11/2009) on which the project began generating GHG emission reductions. The end date of the project crediting period of VCS is 31/12/2010 which was prior to the CDM registration date and the start date of CDM crediting period (05/01/2011). The project crediting period covers 2 years, i.e., 2009 and 2010. PP did not claim the emission reduction for the following two periods from 22/11/2009 to 30/11/2009 and from 01/01/2011 to 04/01/2011.

Section 1.7 Project Scale and Estimated GHG Emission Reductions or Removals:

The ERs of each vintage indicated below are based on the annual ERs in the CDM registered PDD and days included in each vintage. The average annual ERs reported is the same as the annual ERs in the CDM registered PDD which covers a full year period.

The average annual ERs of the project are 123,126 tCO₂e, which is below the threshold of mega-project (1,000,000 tCO₂e per year). Therefore the project falls in the category of "Project" as per definition.

Project	√
Mega-project	

Years	Estimated GHG emission reductions or removals (tCO ₂ e)
Year 2009 (01/12/2009-31/12/2009)	10,457
Year 2010 (01/01/2010-31/12/2010)	123,126
Total estimated ERs	133,583
Total number of crediting years	2
Average annual ERs	123,126

Section 1.9 Project Location:

The project is located at Wulate Zhongqi, Bayannaoer City, Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region, P.R. China. The central geographic coordinates of the project location are north latitude 41°33'54" and east longitude 108°31'31". The location of the project is verified to be consistent with the one in the registered CDM PDD and also confirmed through onsite visit.

Section 1.10 Conditions Prior to Project Initiation:

There is no power plant existing prior to the project at the project site, the project is the installation of new grid connected wind power plant. The conditions prior to project initiation has been validated in the CDM PDD to be the same as the baseline scenario identified in the CDM registered PDD, i.e., supply of equivalent annual power output by the North China Power Grid to which the project is connected. Therefore, the project is deemed not to be implemented to generate GHG emissions for the purpose of their subsequent reduction, removal or destruction.

Section 1.12.1 Proof of Title:

Business license of *Guohua Bayannaoer (Wulate Zhongqi) Wind Power Co., Ltd.* dated 25/06/2012 (/20/), approval of the Feasibility Study Report (FSR) of the project (/22/), the Letter of Approval (LoA) issued by the Chinese DNA (/21/) on the UNFCCC website of the project, and the Power Purchase Agreement (PPA, /9/) signed with the grid company were provided to confirm the ownership of the project. It is clearly indicated in the LoA that the project owner is authorized as Chinese participant to voluntarily participate in and carry out the project activity. The Chinese DNA had examined the ownership of the project before it issued the LoA to the project proponent. The business license, approval of the FSR and the PPA also indicated that *Guohua Bayannaoer (Wulate Zhongqi) Wind Power Co., Ltd. is the owner of this project and responsible for the operation and maintenance of this project.* Thus, it was confirmed that the project owner has the ownership of the project.

Section 1.12.2 Emissions Trading Programmes and Other Binding Limits:

Through interview with the project owner, it is confirmed that the project does not take part in emission trading programmes other than the CDM under which it is registered as a CDM project (UN reference number 4303). The VCUs claimed are related to a different period (before the start of the CDM Crediting Period) and therefore there is no double counting.

Section 1.12.3 Participation under Other GHG Programmes:

Through interview with the project owner, it is validated that the project owner is not included in another voluntary emission trading programme listed on the website of VCS during this monitoring period and the ERs generated from the project will be sold only once.

Section 1.12.4 Other Forms of Environmental Credit:

The project was registered as CDM project (Ref. No.: 4303) with a registration date of 05/01/2011 and the start date of the first CDM crediting period is 05/01/2011. The project does not take part in emission trading programmes besides their status under CDM. The VCUs claimed is related to a different period (before the start of the CDM Crediting Period) and therefore there is no double counting.

Through interview with the project owner, it is validated that the project has not created another form of environmental credit.

Section 1.13 Additional Information Relevant to the Project

Eligibility Criteria:

N/A

Leakage Management:

According to the applied consolidated methodology ACM0002 (Version 11, /18/), the leakage of the Project is not considered.

Commercially Sensitive Information:

It is confirmed that no commercially sensitive information relevant to the project description has been excluded from the public version of the project description.

Further Information: Include any additional relevant legislative, technical, economic, sectoral, social, environmental, geographic, site-specific and/or temporal information that may have a bearing on the eligibility of the project, the net GHG emission reductions or removals, or the quantification of the project's net GHG emission reductions or removals.

It is confirmed that there is no further information that may have a bearing on the eligibility of the project, the net GHG emission reductions or removals, or the quantification of the project's net emission reductions or removals.

2.2.2 Methodology Deviations

N/A

2.2.3 Project Description Deviations

N/A

2.2.4 New Project Activity Instances

N/A

2.3 Validation Conclusion

According to the validation report for the project for CDM registration and the above further validation of the cover page and sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.9, 1.10, 1.12.1, 1.12.2, 1.12.3, 1.12.4 and 1.13 of the VCS Project Description Template, it is validated that Guohua Wulate Zhongqi Chuanjing Phase II Wind Farm Project is in compliance with the VCS Programmes requirements as set out in the VCS Rules.

3 VERIFICATION PROCESS

3.1 Method and Criteria

SGS' approach to the verification is a two-stage process.

In the first stage, SGS completed a strategic review and risk assessment of the projects activities and processes in order to gain a full understanding of:

- Activities associated with all the sources contributing to the project emissions and emission reductions, including leakage if relevant;
- Protocols used to estimate or measure GHG emissions from these sources;
- Collection and handling of data;
- Controls on the collection and handling of data;
- Means of verifying reported data; and
- Compilation of the monitoring report.

At the end of this stage, SGS produced a Verification Checklist which, based on the risk assessment of the parameters and data collection and handling processes for each of those parameters, describes the verification approach and the sampling plan.

Using the Verification checklist, SGS verified the implementation of the monitoring plan and the data presented in the Monitoring Report for the period in question. This involved a site visit and a desk review of the monitoring report. This verification report describes the findings of this assessment.

3.2 Document Review

The validated CDM PDD, the monitoring report submitted by the client and additional background documents related to the project performance were reviewed. A complete list of all documents reviewed is attached in Section 6 of this report.

3.3 Interviews

On 13/11/2012, all members of the assessment team performed interviews with Project Managers from Guohua Bayannaoer (Wulate Zhongqi) Wind Power Co.,Ltd. to confirm that the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan. The person interviewed are reported in section 3.4 below

3.4 Site Inspections

As part of the verification, the following on-site inspections have been performed by members of the assessment team:

Location: Wulate Zhongqi, Bayannaoer City, Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region, P.R. China	
Date: 13/11/2012	
Coverage:	Source of Information / Persons Interviewed
1. Assessment of the compliance with the requirement of sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.9, 1.10, 1.12.1, 1.12.2, 1.12.3, 1.12.4 and 1.13 of the VCS Project Description.	Ms. Li Jia, Guohua Bayannaoer (Wulate Zhongqi) Wind Power Co.,Ltd.
2. Assessment of the implementation and operation of the project activity as per the CDM registered PDD;	Ms. Zhao Xuequan, Guohua Bayannaoer (Wulate Zhongqi) Wind Power Co.,Ltd.
3. Review of information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters;	Ms. Fan Wenyan, Guohua Bayannaoer (Wulate Zhongqi) Wind Power Co.,Ltd.
4. Interviews with relevant personnel to confirm that the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan.	Ms. Zhang Hui, Guohua Bayannaoer (Wulate Zhongqi) Wind Power Co.,Ltd.
5. A cross-check between information provided in the monitoring report and data from other sources such as MRRs, DRRs and sales receipts;	Mr. Zhang Weidong, Guohua Bayannaoer (Wulate Zhongqi) Wind Power Co.,Ltd.
6. A check of the monitoring equipment including calibration performance and observations of monitoring practices against the requirements of the PDD and the selected methodology;	Ms. Li Ying, Ruineng ZhiYuan Technology Company.
7. Review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and emission reductions;	
8. Identification of quality control and quality assurance procedures in place to prevent or identify and correct any errors or omissions in the reported monitoring parameters.	

3.5 Resolution of Any Material Discrepancy

As an outcome of the verification process, the team can raise different types of findings

In general, where insufficient or inaccurate information is available and clarification or new information is required the team shall raise a Clarification Request (CL) specifying what additional information is required.

Where a non-conformance arises the team shall raise a Corrective Action Request (CAR). A CAR is issued, where:

- I. the verification is not able to obtain sufficient evidence for the reported emission reductions or part of the reported emission reductions. In this case these emission reductions shall not be verified and certified;
- II. the verification has identified misstatements in the reported emission reductions. Emission reductions with misstatements shall be discounted based on the verifiers ex-post determination of the achieved emission reductions

The verification process may be halted until this information has been made available to the assessors' satisfaction. Failure to address a CL may result in a CAR. Information or clarifications provided as a result of a CL may also lead to a CAR.

FARs may be raised which are for the benefit of future projects and future verification actors. These have no impact upon the completion of the verification activity.

Corrective Action Requests and Clarification Requests are detailed in Verification Checklist. The Project Developer is given the opportunity to "close" outstanding CARs and respond to CLs and FARs.

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Project Implementation Status

4.1.1 Implementation status of the project activity

The monitoring period under verification is verified under VCS version 3.3 refer to section 2.2.1 of this report.

Through the on site visit, it has been confirmed that the project was implemented and the equipments were installed as described in the registered CDM PDD (/1//7/). The Project consists of only one site and is not implemented in phases. The construction of the project started on 12/06/2009 and commissioned on 22/11/2009. All turbines were put into operation on 15/12/2009 (/26/). All 33 sets of wind turbines with unit capacity of 1.5 MW as well as auxiliary equipments had been set up. It has been confirmed by the assessment team through on-site visit that all physical features of the project activity proposed in the registered PDD are in place. Through interviewing with the project proponent and reviewing the operation logs (/10/), the project operated smoothly and normally during this monitoring period. No events or situations occurred during the monitoring period which may impact the applicability of the methodology.

Through reviewing the Power Purchase Agreement (PPA, /9/), and line connection schematic of the electricity system of the wind farm (/8/), it is confirmed that the electricity generated by the project is supplied to the North China Power Grid and the project boundary is consistent with the registered CDM PDD. As per the registered CDM PDD, there are no other sources of GHG emissions attributable to the project activity which has been verified through onsite visit and

interview with the project proponent (PP). No fossil fuels were observed to be used for power generation by the project during this monitoring period.

The project proponent (PP) has set up monitoring manual and other internal management procedures referring to the monitoring plan in the registered PDD. During this monitoring period, the project has been well operated following monitoring manual and management procedure (/15/). The staffs are well trained and are qualified (/17/). Through document review and on-site visit, it has been confirmed by the assessment team that the PP has operated the project activity as per the registered PDD (/1/). All the information (data and variables) provided in the monitoring report (/5/) are in compliance with that is stated in the registered PDD.

The emission reductions (ERs) estimated in the VCS PD for this monitoring period of 396 days (from 01/12/2009 to 31/12/2010) is 133,583 tCO₂e (133,583 tCO₂e = 123,126 tCO₂e / 365days * 396 days). The verified actual emission reduction in this monitoring period is 113,850 tCO₂e, which is 14.77% lower than the estimated ERs for the same period as per the VCS PD. It is deemed reasonable as the estimation in the registered PDD is based on long-term data while the actual wind resources can fluctuate over years.

4.1.2 Remaining Issues from Previous Validation or Verification

VCS validation and verification was combined as the project is already registered under the CDM programmes. This is the VCS verification prior to CDM registration. There are no remaining issues for this project.

4.1.3 Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology

The project was registered under the CDM against the approved consolidated methodology ACM0002 Version 11 dated 12/02/2010 "Consolidated methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" (/18/).

By observing and interviewing during site visiting, the monitoring plan in the registered CDM PDD and the applied methodology was properly implemented and followed by the project proponent (PP). It is confirmed that the monitoring plan in the registered CDM PDD is in accordance with the approved methodology ACM0002 Version 11.

4.1.4 Implementation Status of the Monitoring Plan and Completeness of Monitoring

Monitoring of reductions in GHG emissions to result from the project has been implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD. The monitoring mechanism is effective and reliable.

According to the monitoring plan in the registered PDD, baseline emission parameters need to be monitored are the net electricity supplied by the project activity to the grid in year (EG_{facility,y}), electricity delivered to NCPG by the project in year y (EG_{export,y}) and electricity consumed by the project which is imported from the NCPG in year y (EG_{import,y}). No project emission parameters and leakage parameters are required to be monitored, since project emission is zero and leakage is not considered, as per the applied methodology and monitoring plan in the registered PDD.

EG_{export,y}: Electricity delivered to NCPG by the project in year y

According to the monitoring plan in the registered PDD, EG_{export,y} shall be continuously measured by two bidirectional electricity meters installed in parallel connection at low voltage side of the booster station on the project site. Accuracy of the meters shall be no less than 0.5S, and calibration shall be done at least once per year. Meter readings shall be double checked by receipt of sales or relevant commercial data.

Through onsite visit, it was confirmed that EG_{export,y} has been continuously measured by two bidirectional electricity meters (M1 and M2) installed in parallel connection at 35kV side of the 35kV/220kV main transformer on the project site. Electricity delivered to NCPG by the project is the sum of electricity quantity measured by meter M1 and M2. Accuracy level of both meter M1 and M2 is 0.5s, and calibrations have been done once per year, which is in compliance with the monitoring plan in the registered PDD.

During this monitoring period, meter M1 and M2 were read by designated person of the wind farm at 24:00 every day and data was manually recorded into daily reading records (DRRs, /11/). Monthly cut-off time is 24:00 of last day of every month. The wind farm reported meter readings at the cut-off time to the grid company on a monthly basis, the grid company checked and confirmed electricity quantity together with the wind farm, then the wind farm issued sales receipts (i.e. invoice, /12/) on electricity delivered to NCPG by the project to the grid company.

During the onsite visit, the assessment team checked the monitoring procedure and interviewed relevant staffs on monitoring and data collection procedures. The DRRs and sales receipts were provided by the PP to the assessment team. According to the requirement in the monitoring plan, the data monitored by meters have been double checked by receipt of sales or relevant commercial data in the ER calculation sheet. It was observed that the data in the sale receipt of December 2009 for the EG_{export,y} was higher than the measured data while the data in the receipts of the other months are lower than the measured data. CL #2 (a) was raised for clarifications for the difference. The PP clarified that one of the junctions of the voltage bus of switch counter of M1 and M2 was loose which resulted in the lower measured data. The problem was found and solved on 02/01/2010. The operation form dated 02/01/2010 was provided to the assessment team. It was confirmed that the lower measured data was attributed to the loose connection of the junctions of the voltage bus of switch counter of M1 and M2. The data in the sale receipts was issued by the grid company based on its own monitoring equipment, therefore, it is considered to be reliable. Moreover, the lower value out of the measured data and sale receipts was used for the calculation of emission reductions, which is conservative. Therefore, CL # 2 (a) was closed.

The data from the DRRs were double checked against sales receipts, and conservative values of the two sources were used for the ER calculation. The assessment team confirmed that all the reported values of EG_{export,y} in the Monitoring Report version 02 and the ER calculation spreadsheet version 02 (/6/) are correct and complete.

EG_{import,y} : Electricity consumed by the project which is imported from the NCPG in year y

EG_{import,y} has been continuously measured by meter M1 and M2 installed in parallel connection at 35kV side of the 35kV/220kV main transformer on the project site. The monitoring procedure of EG_{import,y} is the same as EG_{export,y}. However, monthly cut-off time of electricity consumed by the

project which is imported from the NCPG is determined by the grid company, which is out of Project Company's control. At the designated time every month, the wind farm were asked to report meter readings to the grid company, the grid company checked and confirmed electricity quantity together with the wind farm, then issued sales receipts on electricity consumed by the project which is imported from the NCPG to the PP.

During the onsite visit, the assessment team checked the monitoring procedure and interviewed relevant staffs on monitoring and data collection procedures. As there is no specific sale receipt for this project covering this monitoring period, a confirmation letter of the monthly imported electricity covering this monitoring period, serving as sale receipt, was obtained from the grid company. The DRRs and sales receipts were provided by the PP to the assessment team.

According to the requirement in the monitoring plan, the data monitored by meters have been double checked by receipt of sales or relevant commercial data in the ER calculation sheet. It was observed that the data in the sale receipt for the $EG_{import,y}$ for April, 2010, from August 2010 to December 2010 was higher than the measured data while the data in the receipts of the other months are lower than the measured data. CL #2 (b) was raised for clarifications for the difference. The PP clarified that the grid company used one meter to measured the electricity imported by different consumers and divided the electricity among them, which resulted in the difference between the data measured by the PP and the sale receipts. For conservative consideration, the whole electricity consumed by consumers who shared the same meter were provided to the project owner and were used to cross check with data measured by M1 and M2, the larger data were adopted. The ER calculation sheet version 2 was checked by the assessment team and it was confirmed that the values of imported electricity of the two wind farms of the PP in the sale receipts have been used to double check the measured data of M1 and M2. It was observed that the data in the sale receipts were higher than the measured data, which is deemed to be conservative. CL #2(b) was closed.

The DRRs were double checked against sales receipts, and conservative values of the two sources were used for ER calculation. The assessment team confirmed that all the reported values of $EG_{import,y}$ in the Monitoring Report version 02 and ER calculation spreadsheet version 02 are correct and complete.

$EG_{facility,y}$: the net electricity supplied by the project activity to the grid in year y

As per the monitoring plan in the registered PDD, $EG_{facility,y}$ is calculated based on the data of $EG_{export,y}$ and $EG_{import,y}$.

$$EG_{facility,y} = EG_{export,y} - EG_{import,y}$$

Where:

$EG_{facility,y}$ the net electricity supplied by the project activity to the grid in year y;

$EG_{export,y}$ electricity delivered to NCPG by the project in year y;

$EG_{import,y}$ electricity consumed by the project which is imported from the NCPG in year y

The assessment team confirmed that all the reported values of $EG_{\text{facility},y}$ in the Monitoring Report version 02 have been calculated in accordance with the monitoring plan. The results are correct and complete.

4.1.5 Accuracy of Equipment

According to the monitoring plan in the registered PDD, the accuracy level for both monitoring meter M1 and M2 shall be no less than 0.5S and uncertainty level of the meter shall not exceed 0.5%; and the calibration frequency shall be at least once a year. Through onsite visit, it was confirmed that the accuracy level for both monitoring meters M1 and M2 is 0.5S, which means that the maximum uncertainty of the meters is 0.5%, thus this is in compliance with the monitoring plan. Calibrations have been conducted once a year according to China national regulation JJG1055-1997 (/19/), which is also in compliance with the monitoring plan. The entity that conducted the calibration is Bayannaoer Power Administration Electric Energy Measurement and Verification Center, which is a qualified third party. The calibration certificates and accreditation certificate of the calibrating entity have been checked on-site by the assessment team. Details are shown in the table 1.

Table 1 Calibration details of monitoring meters

Meter	Type	Serial No.	Accuracy Class	Calibration dates	Validity of the calibrations
M1	electricity meter	LY807324	0.5S	24/06/2009	24/06/2009 – 23/06/2010
				24/01/2010	24/01/2010 – 23/01/2011
M2	electricity meter	LY807185	0.5S	24/06/2009	24/06/2009 – 23/06/2010
				24/01/2010	24/01/2010 – 23/01/2011
Calibration entity: Bayannaoer Power Administration Electric Energy Measurement and Verification Center, accreditation issued by Quality and Technology Supervision Bureau of Inner Mongolia, document No.: (Meng) Faji (2009) 15034 issued on 02/01/2009 valid to 01/01/2014.					

The calibration certificates (/14/) of the meter and accreditation certificate (/13/) of the calibration entity were provided to and verified by the assessment team. It was verified that the meter has been calibrated by the qualified third party without any delay and were properly maintained during this monitoring period.

A number of typos are observed in the VCS MR version 01, i.e. the number of meters measuring $EG_{\text{import},y}$ was reported as four meters in section 3.2 while only two meters were actually used. The meter name in the calibration of meters was mentioned as two “M1” in section 3.3 of the MR while it should be M1 and M2. Also, the period for Feb. 2010 was reported as “01/02/2010-28/10/2010” and Dec. 2010 was reported as “01/11/2010-31/12/2010” in table 4-2 of section 4.1 of the MR. CAR #1 was raised and closed later after the PP made related corrections to the typos in section 3.2, section 3.3 and table 4-2 of section 4.1 of the MR.

4.1.6 Data from External Sources

Based on the information in the CDM registered PDD (/1/), the baseline emission factor ($EF_{grid,CM,y}$) was ex-ante determined and is fixed for the first CDM crediting period. The value of baseline emission factor used in the monitoring report is 0.9502 tCO₂e/MWh, which is the same as the one in the registered CDM PDD.

4.2 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction or Removal Calculations

4.2.1 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction or Removal Calculations

A complete set of data covering the period from 01/12/2009 to 31/12/2010 has been provided and verified by the assessment team. CL #2 was raised relating to the accuracy of GHG ER calculation and has been closed satisfactorily. The calculation of emission reductions in Monitoring Report version 02 is found to be correct. With the conservative approach, monitoring of reductions in GHG emissions to result from the registered project has been implemented in accordance with the registered CDM PDD. The monitoring parameters have been cross-checked with relevant evidences. See Section 4.1.4 for details. The appropriate methods and formulae for calculating baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage have been followed. And the assumptions and emission factor that were applied in the calculations have been justified.

4.2.2 Calculation of Emission Reductions or Removals

Table 2 Reported and verified data of $EG_{export,y}$

Period	Reported Value in MR version 01 (MWh)	Verified Value in MR version 02 (MWh)
01/12/2009-31/12/2009	6,013.350	6,013.350
01/01/2010-31/12/2010	114,583.917	114,583.917
Total	120,597.267	120,597.267

Table 3 Reported and verified data of $EG_{import,y}$

Period	Reported Value in MR version 01 (MWh)	Verified Value in MR version 02 (MWh)
01/12/2009-31/12/2009	35.350	74.860
01/01/2010-31/12/2010	397.10	704.320
Total	432.450	779.180

Table 4 Reported and verified data of $EG_{facility,y}$

Period	Reported Value in MR version 01 (MWh)	Verified Value in MR version 02 (MWh)
01/12/2009-31/12/2009	5,978.000	5,938.490
01/01/2010-31/12/2010	114,186.817	113,879.597
Total	120,164.817	119,818.087

As per the registered CDM PDD baseline emissions (BE_y), project emissions (PE_y) and emission reductions (ER_y) calculated as follows:

$$BE_y = EG_{\text{facility},y} \times EF_{\text{grid,CM},y}$$

$$PE_y = 0$$

$$ER_y = BE_y - PE_y$$

The emission reductions reported in the monitoring report Version 02 are verified to be correct as the following table.

Table 5 Verified emission reductions calculation

Period	Baseline emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Emission reductions (tCO ₂ e)
01/12/2009-31/12/2009	5,642	0	5,642
01/01/2010-31/12/2010	108,208	0	108,208
Total: 01/12/2009-31/12/2010	113,850	0	113,850

4.3 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions or Removals

Critical parameters used for the determination of the Emission Reductions are discussed above in Section 4.1.4. All the data recorded is in compliance with the monitoring report.

4.4 Management and Operational System

Management system and quality assurance procedures have been stipulated in the Monitoring Manual (/15/) and internal operation procedure and have been implemented. Emergency plan is in place (/16//15/). The staffs are well trained and qualified. These have been verified during on-site visit and document review. Therefore, the assessment team confirms that the management system of the project is in place; with the responsibilities properly identified and in place, and that QA/QC procedures well implemented.

Therefore, it is confirmed that responsibilities and authorities for monitoring and reporting are in accordance with what is stated in the monitoring plan in the registered PDD.

5 VERIFICATION CONCLUSION

The scope of the verification

We, SGS, have been contracted by Guohua Bayannaoer (Wulate Zhongqi) Wind Power Co.,Ltd. to certify that the greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions reported for the Guohua Wulate Zhongqi Chuanjing Phase II Wind Farm Project for the period from 01/12/2009 to 31/12/2010 in the monitoring report version 02 dated 16/11/2012 are eligible for registration as Voluntary Carbon Units.

This engagement covers the verification of emission reductions from anthropogenic sources of greenhouse gases included within the project boundary of the Guohua Wulate Zhongqi Chuanjing Phase II Wind Farm Project, as well as an additional confirmation of the compliance of the VCS PD with the requirements of VCS Standard Version 3.3.

The verification 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.

Conclusions of the verification

(a) SGS is an entity accredited by the United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change (UNFCCC) to undertake certification and verification services in the sector in which the Project is undertaken. The accreditation is accepted by VCSA as indicated in Clause 5 of VCS Programmes Guide Version 3.4 (/24/).

(b) The monitoring report, together with other information examined, was prepared as per the VCS Monitoring Report Template, Version 3.0.

(c) The information in the monitoring report together with other information examined by the assessment team, including all the information necessary to determine that the emission reductions achieved have been determined correctly.

(d) Based on the examination of the monitoring report and other relevant information, the project meets all the requirements of the VCS Standard Version 3.3.

(e) Based on our examination of the monitoring report and other relevant information, the claiming emission reductions during the monitoring period from 01/12/2009 to 31/12/2010 are verified as 113,850 tonnes CO₂ equivalent.

Liability statement with regards to the accuracy of the verification statement

The management of Guohua Bayannaoer (Wulate Zhongqi) Wind Power Co., Ltd. is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emissions reductions. SGS is responsible for verification and confirming emission estimates for the project, as described in the monitoring report.

Our certification approach draws on an understanding of the risks associated with reporting GHG emissions data and the controls in place to mitigate these. Our examination includes an assessment of evidence, through desk review, and where necessary, interviews, stakeholder discussions and site visits, relevant to certifying the rightfulness of the amounts and disclosures in relation to the Project's GHG emission reductions. Our examination includes assessment, on a test basis, of evidence relevant to the amounts and disclosures in relation to the project's GHG emission reductions for the defined reporting period.

We planned and performed our work to obtain the information and explanations that we considered necessary to provide sufficient evidence for us to give reasonable assurance that the

amount of GHG emission reductions for the given period, prepared on the basis of the monitoring report, are fairly stated.

This assessment included:

- Collection of evidence supporting the reported data;
- Checking whether the provisions of the Monitoring Plan in the registered PDD, were consistently and appropriately applied;
- Site visit and interview of relevant staff.

We have verified whether the information included in the monitoring report representing the emission reductions achieved has been determined correctly for the given period from the baseline figure.

Certification statements

Based on process and procedures conducted, in our opinion, the monitoring report version 02 dated 16/11/2012 on emission reductions for Guohua Wulate Zhongqi Chuanjing Phase II Wind Farm Project during the reporting period from 01/12/2009 to 31/12/2010 is materially correct and is a fair representation of the GHG data and information and the emission reductions are fairly stated. All relevant facts have been found correct by our examination. The GHG emission reductions calculation is correct.

Therefore, SGS is able to certify that the project is in full compliance with the VCS Standard Version 3.3, and the quantity of the reported emission reductions during below reporting period are completely, comparably, accurately and correctly reported.

(1) Reporting period: From 01/12/2009 to 31/12/2009

Verified GHG emission reductions in the above reporting period:

GHG Emission Reductions or Removals	tCO ₂ e
Baseline Emissions	5,642
Project Emissions	0
Net GHG emission reductions or removals	5,642

(2) Reporting period: From 01/01/2010 to 31/12/2010

Verified GHG emission reductions in the above reporting period:

GHG Emission Reductions or Removals	tCO ₂ e
Baseline Emissions	108,208
Project Emissions	0
Net GHG emission reductions or removals	108,208

Statement of Confidentiality

SGS will hold all information confidential until the client instructs otherwise or until it has been released in accordance with the VCS Standard Version 3.3 requirements.

Signed on behalf of the Verification Body by Authorized Signatory

SGS United Kingdom Limited

Date: 14/12/2012

Date: 14/12/2012

Signature:

Signature:

Lead Assessor:

Michael Wu

Technical Reviewer:

Linda Hu

6 DOCUMENT REFERENCES

- /1/ Registered PDD version 02 dated 24/11/2010, available at:
<http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/BVQI1293507800.73/view>
- /2/ VCS PD version 01 dated 08/10/2012 and version 02 dated 16/11/2012
- /3/ Validation Report for Guohua Wulate Zhongqi Chuanjing Phase II Wind Farm Project issued by BV, Report No. CHINA-VAL/0372/2009, First issue, dated 16/09/2010 and Revision No. 01, dated 27/12/2010
- /4/ Project webpage at UNFCCC
<http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/BVQI1293507800.73/view>
- /5/ Monitoring Report of the project

MR Version	Date of Revision	Main changes reason for Revision
Version 01	08/10/2012	Initial version issued to DOE
Version 02	16/11/2012	1. Typos in section 3.2, section 3.3 and table 4-2 of section 4.1 of the MR were revised. 2. The amount of electricity consumed by the project which is imported from the NCPG in sections 3.2 and 4.1 was revised. The $EG_{facility,y}$ in section 3.2 and 4.1, the BE_y and ER_y in section 1 and section 4 was also updated accordingly.

- /6/ ERs Calculation Spreadsheet version 01 dated 08/10/2012 and version 02 dated 16/11/2012
- /7/ Specification of the Turbines
- /8/ Power connection diagram of the project
- /9/ Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) signed between the grid company and the project owner dated January 2010
- /10/ Operation log of the wind farm
- /11/ Daily Reading Records (DRRs) of the project covering this monitoring period
- /12/ Sales receipts of the project covering this monitoring period
- /13/ Accreditation of Bayannaoer Power Administration Electric Energy Measurement and Verification Center, that issuing the calibration certificates (Document No.: (Meng) Faji(2009) 15034 issued on 02/01/2009 valid to 01/01/2014)
- /14/ Calibration certificates for meter M1 (S/N:LY807324, calibrated on 24/06/2009 and 24/01/2010) and meter M2 (S/N:LY807185, calibrated on 24/06/2009 and 24/01/2010)
- /15/ Monitoring Manual of the project
- /16/ Emergency plan of the project
- /17/ Staff Training Records and Qualification Certificates of the wind farm
- /18/ ACM0002 Version 11 dated 12/02/2010
- /19/ JJG1055-1997 Technical Norm of the calibration of AC Watt-hour at place of installation
- /20/ Business License of Guohua Bayannaoer (Wulate Zhongqi) Wind Power Co.,Ltd.
- /21/ Letter of Approval (LoA) for the project as a CDM project by China DNA
- /22/ Approval of FSR dated 14/10/2008 (Ref. No.: Inner-Mongolia Energy [2008]1932)
- /23/ VCS Standard Version 3.3

- /24/ VCS Programmes Guide Version 3.4
- /25/ VCS Project Description Template version 3.2
- /26/ Summary of the grid connection time of each wind turbine of this project dated 15/12/2009

ANNEX 1: OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS

Findings Overview Summary

	CARs	CLs	FARs
Total Number raised	1	1	0

Date:	15/11/2012	Raised by:	Assessment team		
Type:	CAR	Number:	#1	Reference:	Section 4.2 of the checklist
Lead Assessor Comment:				Date: 15/11/2012	
A number of typos are observed in the VCS MR version 01, i.e. the number of meters measuring EG _{import,y} was reported as four meters in section 3.2 while only two meters were actually used. The meter name in the calibration of meters was mentioned as two “M1” in section 3.3 of the MR while it should be M1 and M2. Also, the period for Feb. 2010 was reported as “01/02/2010-28/10/2010” and Dec. 2010 was reported as “01/11/2010-31/12/2010” in table 4-2 of section 4.1 of the MR. CAR #1 was raised requesting PP to make relevant corrections.					
Project Participant Response:				Date: 16/11/2012	
Relevant corrections were made to section 3.2, 3.3 and Table 4-2 in MR V2.					
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:					
MR V2 dated 16/11/2012					
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:					
Section 3.2, 3.3 and Table 4-2 of the MR version 2.0 was checked by the assessment team. The number of meters measuring EG _{import,y} is revised to be two meters in section 3.2 of the MR version 02. The meter name in the calibration of meters is now reported as M1 and M2 in section 3.3 of the MR version 02. The period for Feb. 2010 and Dec. 2010 is now corrected to be “01/02/2010-28/02/2010” and “01/12/2010-31/12/2010” in table 4-2 of section 4.1 of the MR version 02.					
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:					
The typos observed in the MR version 01 have been corrected in the MR version 02. Thus, CAR #1 was closed.					
Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:				Date: 30/11/2012 [Michael Wu]	

Date:	15/11/2012		Raised by:	Assessment team	
Type:	CL	Number:	#2	Reference:	Section 4.3 and section 4.4 of the checklist
Lead Assessor Comment:				Date: 15/11/2012	
According to the requirement in the monitoring plan, the data monitored by meters have been double checked by receipt of sales or relevant commercial data in the ER calculation sheet. It was observed that the data in the sale receipt of December 2009 for the EG_{export,y} was higher than the measured data while the data in the receipts of the other months are lower than the measured data. CL #2 (a) was raised for clarifications for the difference. It was observed that the data in the sale receipt for the EG_{import,y} for April, 2010, from August 2010 to December 2010 was higher than the measured data while the data in the receipts of the other months are lower than the measured data. CL #2 (b) was raised for clarifications for the difference.					
Project Participant Response:				Date: 16/11/2012	
One of the junctions of the voltage bus of switch counter of M1 and M2 was loose, which resulted in the electricity measured lower than in normal. This problem was discovered and solved in 02/01/2010 according to the operation record. However, for conservative consideration, the smaller value was adopted. The sale receipts were issued by the grid company who used one meter to measure the whole electricity consumed by different consumers and divided such electricity among them. It resulted in the difference between the measured data and the data of sale receipt. For conservative consideration, the whole electricity consumed by consumers who shared the same meter were provided to the project owner and were used to cross check with data measured by M1 and M2, the larger data were adopted. Emission Reduction Calculation Spreadsheet and relevant information in MR were revised.					
Documentation Provided as Evidence by Project Participant:					
Electricity Imported from the Grid-other consumers.pdf Operation record; MR V2 dated 16/11/2012 ER V2 dated 16/11/2012					
Information Verified by Lead Assessor:					
For EG_{export,y}: The operation form dated 02/01/2010 was provided to the assessment team. It was confirmed that the lower measured data was attributed to the loose connection of the junctions of the voltage bus of switch counter of M1 and M2. The data in the sale receipts was issued by the grid company based on its own monitoring equipment, therefore, it is considered to be reliable. Moreover, the lower value out of the measured data and sale receipts was used for the calculation of emission reductions, which is conservative. For EG_{import,y}: The sale receipts (i.e. confirmation note) for both this project and other consumers were checked by the assessment team. For conservative consideration, the whole electricity consumed by consumers who shared the same meter were provided to the project owner and were used to cross check with data measured by M1 and M2, the larger data were adopted. The MR version 02 and ER calculation sheet version 2 was checked by the assessment team and it was confirmed that the values of imported electricity of the two wind farms of the PP in the sale receipts have been used to double check the measured data of M1 and M2. It was observed that the data in the sale receipts were higher than the measured data, which is deemed to be conservative.					
Reasoning for not Acceptance or Acceptance and Close Out:					

The variation between the measured data and sale receipts have been clarified and found to be reasonable. Moreover, more conservative value has been adopted for calculation of emission reduction in the MR version 02 and ER calculation sheet version 02. CL #2 was closed.

Acceptance and Close out by Lead Assessor:

Date: 30/11/2012 [Michael Wu]

ANNEX 2: TEAM MEMBERS STATEMENTS OF COMPETENCY

Statement of Competence

Name: Michael Wu

Status

- Lead Assessor	x	- Expert	x
- Assessor	x	- Financial Expert	
- Local Assessor	China	- Technical Reviewer	x

Scopes of Expertise

1. Energy Industries (renewable / non-renewable)	x
<i>Technical Area(s): TA 1.2 Energy generation from renewable energy sources.</i>	
2. Energy Distribution	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
3. Energy Demand	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
4. Manufacturing	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
5. Chemical Industry	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
6. Construction	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
7. Transport	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
8. Mining/Mineral Production	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
9. Metal Production	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
10. Fugitive Emissions from Fuels (solid, oil and gas)	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
11. Fugitive Emissions from Production and Consumption of Halocarbons and Sulphur Hexafluoride	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
12. Solvent Use	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
13. Waste Handling and Disposal	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
14. Afforestation and Reforestation	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
15. Agriculture	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	

Approved Member of Staff by: Siddharth Yadav Date: 19/10/2012

Statement of Competence

Name: Simon Zhao

Status

- Lead Assessor	x	- Expert	x
- Assessor	x	- Financial Expert	
- Local Assessor	China	- Technical Reviewer	x

Scopes of Expertise

1. Energy Industries (renewable / non-renewable)	x
<i>Technical Area(s): TA 1.2 Energy generation from renewable energy sources</i>	
2. Energy Distribution	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
3. Energy Demand	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
4. Manufacturing	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
5. Chemical Industry	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
6. Construction	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
7. Transport	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
8. Mining/Mineral Production	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
9. Metal Production	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
10. Fugitive Emissions from Fuels (solid, oil and gas)	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
11. Fugitive Emissions from Production and Consumption of Halocarbons and Sulphur Hexafluoride	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
12. Solvent Use	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
13. Waste Handling and Disposal	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
14. Afforestation and Reforestation	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
15. Agriculture	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	

Approved Member of Staff by: Siddharth Yadav Date: 04/07/2012

Statement of Competence

Name: Linda Hu

Status

- Lead Assessor	x	- Expert	x
- Assessor	x	- Financial Expert	
- Local Assessor	China	- Technical Reviewer	x

Scopes of Expertise

1. Energy Industries (renewable / non-renewable)	x
<i>Technical Area(s): 1.2 Energy generation from renewable energy sources</i>	
2. Energy Distribution	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
3. Energy Demand	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
4. Manufacturing	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
5. Chemical Industry	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
6. Construction	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
7. Transport	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
8. Mining/Mineral Production	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
9. Metal Production	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
10. Fugitive Emissions from Fuels (solid, oil and gas)	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
11. Fugitive Emissions from Production and Consumption of Halocarbons and Sulphur Hexafluoride	x
<i>Technical Area(s): TA 11.2 GHG capture and destruction</i>	
12. Solvent Use	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
13. Waste Handling and Disposal	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
14. Afforestation and Reforestation	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	
15. Agriculture	
<i>Technical Area(s):</i>	

Approved Member of Staff by: Siddharth Yadav Date: 10/09/2012

ANNEX 3: PHOTOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE

Unique reference number: LY807324	Parameter: EG _{facility,y}
Name of equipment: M1	Date:13/11/2012
	

Unique reference number: LY807185	Parameter: EG _{facility,y}
Name of equipment: M2	Date:13/11/2012
	

- o0o -