



VERIFICATION REPORT FOR JOBURG LANDFILL GAS TO ENERGY PROJECT



Document Prepared by: Carbon Check (India) Private Limited,

Unit No.: 1701, Logix Office Tower, Plot No.: BW - 58, Sector - 32, NOIDA (Uttar Pradesh) - 201301, India, Phone: +91 120 4373114

<https://www.carboncheck.co.in>

Project Title	Joburg Landfill Gas to Energy Project
Version	Version 4
Report ID	CCIPL1711/FVR

Report Title	Verification Report for Joburg Landfill Gas to Energy Project
Client	ENERGY Joburg RF (PTY) Limited

Pages	78 pages
Date of Issue	27-July-2023 report issued
Prepared By	Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd.
Contact	Unit No.: 1701, Logix Office Tower, Plot No.: BW - 58, Sector - 32, NOIDA (Uttar Pradesh) - 201301, India, Phone: +91 120 4373114 projects@carboncheck.co.in www.carboncheck.co.in
Approved By	Vikash Kumar Singh, Compliance Officer
Work Carried Out By	Anubhav Dimri (Team Leader, Technical Expert and Local Expert) Rohit Singh (Observer) Seshan Ranganathan (Technical Reviewer)

Summary:

The client ENERGY Joburg RF (PTY) Limited has appointed the validation/verification body Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd. to perform a verification of VCS Project Activity “Joburg Landfill Gas to Energy Project” in South Africa (hereafter “project activity”) for the period from 27/05/2021 to 31/12/2022.

The project proponent applied the approved CDM Methodology: ACM0001: Large-scale Consolidated Methodology Flaring or use of landfill gas, Version 19. In addition, the applicable tools referenced in the methodology and the PD have been used.

The verification consisted of the following three phases: i) a desk review of the Monitoring Report ii) Onsite Visit; iii) the resolution of outstanding issues and internal technical review followed by the issuance of the final verification report and opinion. In the course of the verification process 05 CARs, 06 CLs and 00 FARs were raised, all the CARs and CLs are closed. No FARs were raised during the course of verification. The list of Clarification and Corrective Actions Requests (CL and CAR) is presented in this report.

CC IPL confirms that the project is implemented in accordance with the validated VCS-PD and the monitoring plan; and then, claimed emissions reductions are calculated without material misstatements. No uncertainties associated with the calculations of emission reductions have been observed by the validation team.

CC IPL has performed the verification of Joburg Landfill Gas to Energy Project on the basis of all issues and criteria of VCS Standard version 4.4/B01-1/ and VCS Program Guide version 4.3/B01-2/ for VCS projects and also on the criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. Hence, in CC IPL’s opinion the project correctly applies the baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0001: Large-scale Consolidated Methodology Flaring or use of landfill gas, Version 19/B02/ and meets the relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM Methodology, Voluntary Carbon Standard requirements and the relevant host country criteria.

Therefore, CC IPL is able to certify that the emissions reductions from the “Joburg Landfill Gas to Energy Project” project during the period from 27/05/2021 to 31/12/2022 amount to 326,507 tonnes of CO₂e. The year-wise break up of verified emission reduction is as below:

Year	Baseline emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Net GHG emission reductions or removals (tCO ₂ e)
2021 (27/05/2021 to 31/12/2021)	130,349	122	0	130,227
2022 (01/01/2022	196,721	440	0	196,280

to 31/12/2022)				
Total	327,070	562	0	326,507

CONTENTS

1	Introduction	7
1.1	Objective	7
1.2	Scope and Criteria	7
1.3	Level of Assurance.....	8
1.4	Summary Description of the Project	9
2	Verification Process	9
2.1	Method and Criteria.....	9
2.2	Document Review	10
2.3	Interviews	11
2.4	Site Visits	13
2.5	Resolution of Findings	13
2.5.1	Forward Action Requests	14
2.6	Eligibility for Validation Activities	14
3	Validation Findings	14
3.1	Participation under Other GHG Programs	14
3.2	Methodology Deviations.....	14
3.3	Project Description Deviations.....	16
3.4	Grouped Project	16
4	Verification Findings	16
4.1	Project Implementation Status	16
4.2	Safeguards	17
4.2.1	No Net Harm	17
4.2.2	Local Stakeholder Consultation	18
4.3	AFOLU-Specific Safeguards	18
4.4	Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction and Removal Calculations	19
4.5	Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions and Removals	28
4.6	Non-Permanence Risk Analysis.....	51
5	Verification OPINION	52
	APPENDIX 1: REFERENCES	55

APPENDIX 2: ABBREVIATIONS	58
APPENDIX 3: COMPETENCY CERTIFICATE	60
APPENDIX 4: LIST OF FINDINGS	63

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

ENERGY Joburg RF (PTY) Limited (Project Proponent) has appointed CCIPL for verification service for the registered VCS project - “Joburg Landfill Gas to Energy Project” (VCS Project ID 1240) located in South Africa against the requirements of the VCS Program.

Verification is the periodic independent review and ex post determination of both quantitative and qualitative information by a Validation and Verification Body (VVB) of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions that have occurred as a result of the VCS project activity during a defined monitoring period. The purpose of verification is to review the monitoring results and verify that the monitoring methodology was implemented according to the monitoring plan and monitoring data and used to confirm the reductions in emissions is sufficient, definitive and presented in a concise and transparent manner. Carbon Check’s objective is to perform a thorough, independent assessment of the registered projects activities. In particular, the monitoring plan, monitoring report and the project’s compliance are verified against the relevant criteria and guidance documents provided by VCS. This allows for the confirmation that the project has been implemented in accordance with the registered VCS PD and conservative assumptions, as documented. And, also to confirm if the monitoring plan is in compliance with the VCS PD /B04/and approved monitoring methodology/B02/. The objective of this verification was to verify and certify emission reductions reported for the “Joburg Landfill Gas to Energy Project” for the period 27/05/2021 to 31/12/2022.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The verification of this project is based on the registered Project Description/B04/, the Monitoring Report of this monitoring period /01/, emission reduction calculation spread sheet /03/, supporting documents made available to the verifier and information collected through performing interviews and during the onsite visit assessment. Furthermore, publicly available information was considered as far as available and required.

Carbon Check has employed a risk-based approach in the verification, focusing on the identification of significant risks and reliability of project monitoring and generation of emission reductions.

The verification is carried out on the basis of the following requirements (latest available on VCS website at the time of verification), applicable for this project activity:

- VCS Standard version 4.4
- VCS Program Guide version 4.3

- VCS Validation and Verification Manual version 3.2
- Program Definitions (v4.3)
- Registration & Issuance Process (v4.3)
- Approved CDM methodology (ACM0001: Large-scale Consolidated Methodology Flaring or use of landfill gas, Version 19)
- Other relevant rules, including the host country legislation

The scope of this verification, by independent checking of objective evidence, is as follows:

- To verify that the project is implemented as described in the project description
- To assess the project's compliance with other relevant rules including the host country legislation.
- To assess the implementation of the monitoring plan content as mentioned in the registered VCS-PD
- To confirm that the monitoring system is implemented and fully functional to generate voluntary emission reductions (VERs/VCUs) without any double counting and
- To establish that the data reported are accurate, complete, consistent, transparent and free of material error or omission by checking the monitoring records and the emissions reduction calculation /03/, /04/.
- To evaluate the GHG emission reduction data and express a conclusion with a reasonable level of assurance about whether the reported GHG emission reduction data is free from material misstatement.
- To verify that reported GHG emission data is sufficiently supported by evidence.

The verification shall ensure that the reported emission reductions are complete and accurate in order to be certified.

The method and criteria used for verification consisted of the following phases:

1. Completeness check and desk review:
2. Onsite Visit;
3. Resolution of outstanding issues and issuance of final verification report and applicable VCS Validation and Verification Deeds of Representation.

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

1.3 Level of Assurance

- ☒ Reasonable level of assurance
- ☐ Limited level of assurance

The level of assurance of the verification report falls under reasonable assurance engagements as selected by the Client. The verification team verified the complete monitoring data for all the parameters of the monitoring plan and confirms that the reported emission reductions are free from any type of material errors.

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

The project activity 'Joburg Landfill Gas to Energy Project' is a VCS project activity and involves collection and utilisation of the landfill gas at the Johannesburg landfill sites located in Johannesburg, South Africa. The objective of the project is to collect and destroy/utilise the LFG generated at five Johannesburg landfill sites. Prior to implementation of the project activity, the LFG was being freely emitted into the atmosphere resulting in GHG emissions. In the baseline scenario, the LFG would have been released into the atmosphere resulting in GHG (CH₄) emissions to the atmosphere. The electricity would have been produced in the fossil fuel based South African grid resulting in CO₂ emissions.

The project includes five sites. The Robinson Deep flare was commissioned on 27 May 2011 and electricity generation was commissioned on 26 November 2016. The Marie Louise landfill site flare was commissioned on 04 May 2012 and electricity generation was commissioned on 25 January 2018. The Goudkoppies flare and electricity generation components were commissioned on 25 April 2017. The last two sites, namely Linbro Park and Ennerdale sites, are currently not constructed and will remain within the basket of projects, subject to economic drivers required to commit to build these sites.

The reported monitoring period for the project activity is 27/05/2021 to 31/12/2022. This is the first monitoring period under VCS.

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

2.1 Method and Criteria

The method and criteria used for verification:

The verification consists of the following three phases:

1. Completeness check and desk review of the validation report, monitoring plan, monitoring report, monitoring methodology, VCS PD, applicable tools in particular attention to the frequency of measurements, quality of metering equipment's including calibration requirements, QA/QC procedures, any changes to the project activity and new project activity instances and other relevant documents;
2. Onsite visit (including follow-up interviews with project stakeholders, when deemed necessary). The onsite visit assignment includes the following;

- An assignment of implementation and operation of project activity with respect to validated VCS PD;
- Review of information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters;
- Interview with relevant personals to determine whether the operational and data collection procedures are implemented and in accordance with monitoring plan of the validated VCS PD;
- Cross check of information and data provided in the monitoring report with plant logbooks, inventories, purchase records or similar data sources;
- Check of monitoring equipment's, calibration frequency and monitoring practice in-line with methodology and validated VCS PD;
- Review of assumptions made in calculating the emission reduction;
- Implementation of QA/QC procedure in-line with the validated VCS PD and methodology requirement.

Resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final Verification report and if applicable, the VCS Validation and Verification Deeds of Representation.

2.2 Document Review

The registered VCS PD/B04/, VCS MR /01/, /02/, emission reduction calculation spread sheet /03/, /04/ and supporting documents related to the project implementation, project design, monitoring and baseline were reviewed as per VCS standard version 04 requirements. The desk review included:

- A review of the data and information presented to verify completeness and consistency in accordance with VCS standard version 04 requirements/B01/;
- A review of the approved monitoring plan and monitoring methodology, paying particular attention to the frequency of measurements, quality of monitoring equipment (including calibration requirements) and the quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) procedures;
- An evaluation of data management and the QA/QC system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of emission reductions.

Data input values were also checked from the records maintained by the project proponents. Results of calculations reported in the monitoring report were checked against data values as available from the project proponent in VER calculation sheet /03/, /04/.

These data values and other information related to project performance are available in the form of data records duly archived and maintained as per the quality assurance/quality control procedure specified as a part of monitoring plan in the registered VCS-PD.

Furthermore, the verification team used additional documentation by third parties like host-party legislation, technical reports referring to the project design or to the basic conditions and technical data.

2.3 Interviews

A physical onsite visit to the project activity was undertaken on 21/04/2023 to assess the implementation and operation of the project activity and to review evidence, and interview key personnel to confirm evidence associated with the data generation, aggregation, and calculation and reporting of the monitoring parameters. The onsite visit assessment addressed:

- An assessment of the project implementation and operation as per the PD (including physical inspection to confirm physical existence and operation of project components);
- Review of information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters;
- Interviews with relevant personnel to confirm that the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan in the monitoring report /01/, /02/.

The key personnel interviewed, and the main topics of the interviews are summarized in the table below:

S. No.	Name	Organization	Topic
/i/	David Cornish (General manager of the group responsible for the overall operations for the group of companies)	Energy Joburg RF (Pty) Ltd	Project implementation and operation, monitoring procedure, Monitoring and measuring system, Collection of measurements, Observations of established practices, Testing of the accuracy of monitoring equipment, Data and information flow, Data Verification of monitoring parameters, On-site Flare operation, Operational parameters, Electricity Generation and supply to the Eskom grid, Metering of the electricity, Thermocouple functionality and CER calculation
/ii/	Christopher Doff (Engineering and design of the site and gas collection systems and project management of gas field works)	Energy Joburg RF (Pty) Ltd	Project implementation and operation, Project design, monitoring procedure, data and information flow, compliance of monitoring plan with monitoring methodology and approved VCS-PD, Roles and responsibility, Qualification and Training, CER calculation and completeness of monitoring report, Electronic Monitoring system, Data collection and data flow
/iii/	Charlene Du Preez (Finance department responsible for all accounting and finance related activities)	Energy Joburg RF (Pty) Ltd	Project implementation and operation, monitoring procedure, Monitoring and measuring system

/iv/	Eric Ramalebane (Senior site technician responsible for routine and corrective maintenance, gas balancing, plant and instrument servicing and gas field expansion works)	Energy Joburg RF (Pty) Ltd	Project implementation and operation, monitoring procedure, Monitoring and measuring system
/v/	Kamdheh Soeisane (Site technician responsible for a sites cleanliness, gas balance and preventative maintenance on the site)	Energy Joburg RF (Pty) Ltd	Project implementation and operation, monitoring procedure, Monitoring and measuring system
/vi/	Bruno Matsila (Health Safety environment and socio-economic development officer Responsible for HSE and social projects)	Energy Joburg RF (Pty) Ltd	Project implementation and operation, monitoring procedure, Monitoring and measuring system
/vii/	Elleck Mkhari (Senior site technician responsible for routine and corrective maintenance, gas balancing, plant and instrument servicing and gas field expansion)	Energy Joburg RF (Pty) Ltd	Project implementation and operation, monitoring procedure, Monitoring and measuring system, Collection of measurements, Observations of established practices, Testing of the accuracy of monitoring equipment, Data and information flow, Data Verification of monitoring parameters, On-site Flare operation, Operational parameters, Thermocouple functionality, Electricity Generation and supply to the Eskom grid, Metering of the electricity, Span Gas records.
/viii/	Alan Solomon (Maintenance engineer for ENERGY Construction Services responsible for routine and scheduled maintenance of the flares and electricity generation plant and ancillaries)	Energy Joburg RF (Pty) Ltd	Project implementation and operation, monitoring procedure, Monitoring and measuring system

2.4 Site Visits

Carbon Check has conducted an onsite visit for the assessment of the project activity. A reasonable level of assurance has been maintained through the onsite visit for the purpose of verification as follows:

- 1) An assessment of the implementation and operation of the project activity as per the registered VCS PD /B04/
- 2) A review of information aggregating and reporting of the monitoring parameters
- 3) Interviews with relevant personnel to confirm that the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the MP (section 2.3 above)
- 4) A cross-check between the emission reduction information provided in the MR /01/ and data from other sources (section 2.3 above).
- 5) A check of the monitoring equipment for calibration performance, and observations of monitoring practices against the requirements of the VCS PD and the applied monitoring methodologies /B02/
- 6) A review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and ERs /02//04/, and
- 7) An identification of QA/QC procedures in place to prevent, or identify and correct, any errors or omissions in the reported monitoring parameters
- 8) The duly calibration/testing of all monitoring equipment was checked.
- 9) The monitoring processes, routines and documentations were audited to check their proper application.
- 10) The monitoring data were checked completely.

2.5 Resolution of Findings

Material discrepancies identified in the course of the verification are addressed either as CARs, CLs or FARs. **Corrective action requests (CAR)** are issued, where:

- i. Mistakes have been made with a direct influence on project results requiring adjustments of the VERs/VCUs monitoring report;
- ii. Applicable methodological specific requirements have not been met.

A **Clarification request (CL)** may be used where additional information is needed to fully clarify an issue or where the information is not transparent enough to establish whether a requirement is met.

A **forward action request (FAR)** should be issued, where:

- i. The actual project monitoring and reporting practices requires attention and /or adjustment for the next consecutive verification period, or
- ii. An adjustment of the MP is recommended.

In the context of FARs, risks have been identified, which may endanger the delivery of high-quality emissions reductions in the future, i.e. by deviations from standard procedures as defined by the MP. As a consequence, such aspects should receive a special focus during the next consecutive verification. A FAR may originate from lack of data sustaining claimed emission reductions.

A total of 05 CARs and 06 CLs had been raised for the verification of the project activity and all the findings have been closed.

2.5.1 Forward Action Requests

There are no forward action requests raised during the validation of the project activity.

2.6 Eligibility for Validation Activities

Validation/Verification body (VVB), Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd. holds accreditation for validation for the relevant sectoral scope 13 and is eligible for validation/verification for the project activity.

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

3.1 Participation under Other GHG Programs

The project is already registered with VCS as a project activity (project ID is 1240). The project activity is registered under CDM with UNPA reference number 6797. Project proponent has provided a declaration/26/ confirming that the emission reductions are not claimed from the same monitoring period under CDM or any other GHG program.

3.2 Methodology Deviations

A temporary deviation has been applied by the project proponent for the duration 01/07/2021 to 13/10/2021. The consumption meter at Robinson Deep landfill site failed during the period and thus the parameter $EC_{PJ,y}$ "Quantity of electricity consumed by the project electricity consumption source in year y" was not monitored during the period. In order to account for project emissions for electricity consumption during this period in which meter readings are not available, PP used the average power consumption from the subsequent period and added an additional 50% onto this calculated value. The approach proposed by the project proponent has been accepted as it complies with the §3.19.1 of the VCS Standard v4.4/B01-1/.

In accordance with the §3.19.1 of the VCS Standard, version 4.4/B01-1/, the deviation represents a deviation from the criteria and procedures relating to monitoring or measurement set out in the methodology and thus complies with the criteria and specifications for permitted methodology deviations.

The assessment of the deviation in context of the VCS Standard, version 4.4 has been provided below:

Section	Requirement	Deviation	VVB Assessment
---------	-------------	-----------	----------------

3.19.1	Deviations from the applied methodology are permitted where they represent a deviation from the criteria and procedures relating to monitoring or measurement set out in the methodology (i.e., deviations are permitted where they relate to data and parameters available at validation, data and parameters monitored, or the monitoring plan).	A temporary deviation has been applied by the project proponent for the duration 01/07/2021 to 13/10/2021. The consumption meter at Robinson Deep landfill site failed during the period and thus the parameter $EC_{PJ,y}$ "Quantity of electricity consumed by the project electricity consumption source in year y" was not monitored during the period. In order to account for project emissions for electricity consumption during this period in which meter readings are not available, PP used the average power consumption from the subsequent period and added an additional 50% onto this calculated value.	The proposed deviation represents a deviation from the criteria and procedures relating to monitoring or measurement set out in the methodology and thus complies with the criteria and specifications for permitted methodology deviations and thus complies with the requirements of the §3.19.1 of the VCS Standard, version 4.4/B01-1/.
3.19.2	Methodology deviations shall not negatively impact the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG emission reductions or removals, except where they result in increased accuracy of such quantification. Deviations relating to any other part of the methodology shall not be permitted.	A temporary deviation has been applied by the project proponent for the duration 01/07/2021 to 13/10/2021. The consumption meter at Robinson Deep landfill site failed during the period and thus the parameter $EC_{PJ,y}$ "Quantity of electricity consumed by the project electricity consumption source in year y" was not monitored during the period. In order to account for project emissions for electricity consumption during this period in which meter readings are not available, PP used the average power consumption from the subsequent period and added an additional 50% onto this calculated value.	The proposed approach for deviation leads to conservative estimates as 50% higher consumption of subsequent months has been used to calculate the consumption during the applicable months. As not much variation is observed during the months of operation, the approach chosen has been accepted by the verification team. As the proposed deviation does not negatively impact the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG emission reductions, it complies with the requirements of the §3.19.2 of the VCS Standard, version 4.4/B01-1/.
3.19.3	Methodology deviations shall be permitted at	A temporary deviation has been applied by the project proponent for the duration 01/07/2021 to	The methodology deviation has been proposed during

	validation or verification and their consequences shall be reported in the validation or verification report, as applicable, and all subsequent verification reports. Methodology deviations are not considered to be precedent setting.	13/10/2021. The consumption meter at Robinson Deep landfill site failed during the period and thus the parameter $EC_{PJ,j,y}$ "Quantity of electricity consumed by the project electricity consumption source in year y" was not monitored during the period. In order to account for project emissions for electricity consumption during this period in which meter readings are not available, PP used the average power consumption from the subsequent period and added an additional 50% onto this calculated value.	verification and the applicable consequences have been reported in the verification report. Thus, compliance with the requirements of the §3.19.3 of the VCS Standard, version 4.4/B01-1/ is demonstrated.
--	--	---	---

Overall, the proposed methodology deviation complies with the requirements of the VCS Standard, version 4.4/B01-1/.

3.3 Project Description Deviations

No project description deviations have been applied to the project activity during the reported monitoring period.

3.4 Grouped Project

The project activity is not a grouped project activity and thus this section is not applicable.

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Project Implementation Status

The implemented project activity involves the destruction/utilisation of methane emissions as well as the displacement of electricity from the South African coal-based grid, resulting in a consequent reduction in CO₂ emissions. In the baseline scenario, the LFG would have been released into the atmosphere resulting in GHG (CH₄) emissions to the atmosphere. The electricity would have been produced in the fossil fuel based South African grid resulting in CO₂ emissions. Emission reductions are produced by the capture and destruction/utilisation of LFG and the displacement of coal-based electricity from the grid by the generation of electricity from captured LFG.

The project includes five sites. The Robinson Deep flare was commissioned on 27 May 2011 and electricity generation was commissioned on 26 November 2016. The Marie Louise landfill site flare was commissioned on 04 May 2012 and electricity generation was commissioned on 25 January 2018. The Goudkoppies flare and electricity generation components were commissioned on 25 April 2017. The last two sites, namely Linbro Park and Ennerdale sites, are currently not

constructed and will remain within the basket to projects, subject to economic drivers required to commit to build these sites. The implementation and operation status of the landfill sites was inspected by the VVB through onsite visit. The applicable monitoring period for the project activity is 27/05/2021 to 31/12/2022 and the total emission reductions claimed during the monitoring period are 326,507 tCO₂e.

In the baseline scenario, the LFG would have been released into the atmosphere resulting in GHG (CH₄) emissions to the atmosphere. The electricity would have been produced in the fossil fuel based South African grid resulting in CO₂ emissions. Prior to implementation of the project activity, the LFG was being freely emitted into the atmosphere resulting in GHG emissions. The Project involves the destruction/utilisation of methane emissions as well as the displacement of electricity from the South African coal-based grid, resulting in a consequent reduction in CO₂ emissions.

During the onsite visit, CCIPL was able to verify the implementation and operation status of all the landfill sites. There were no material misstatements between the actual monitoring system, and the monitoring plan set out in the project description/B04/ and the applied methodology/B02/.

The project activity is also registered under CDM with UNPA reference number 6797. PP has provided a declaration/26/ confirming that the emission reductions are not claimed with CDM for the reported monitoring period. The project activity has not received or sought any other form of environmental credit or has become eligible to do so since validation or previous verification. The GHG emission reductions or removals generated by the project have not been included in an emissions trading program or any other mechanism that includes GHG allowance trading.

The project proponent has also received confirmation from City of Joburg and PickitUp (waste contractor) that the carbon rights from the project activity rest with the project proponent /25-1/. An email has also been sent to the national electricity distribution company, Eskom on the claims of carbon rights/25-2/ and thus notifications for potential risks for Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions have been mitigated.

The project has implemented the activities that result in the SD contributions described in the monitoring report.

SDG13: Tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions avoided or removed; During the monitoring period total of 326,507 tCO₂e has been avoided.

SDG3: Total CH₄ (tonnes) destroyed; During the monitoring period a total of 11,160 tonnes of CH₄ has been destroyed.

SDG3: Total LFG (Nm³/h) destroyed and/or utilised. LFG has been destroyed at the rate of 2,476 Nm³/h during the monitoring period.

The SDGs are defined by the project proponent based on the project activity in the project description and deemed appropriate for the type of project activity.

Overall, the project has been implemented in accordance with the registered VCS-PD/B04/.

4.2 Safeguards

4.2.1 No Net Harm

The project activity removes the greenhouse gas and is established on an existing operational landfill. The identified impacts for the project activity involves water and noise related impacts. The impacts are mitigated through regular maintenance. PP has provided the maintenance

records and the service records to confirm that the impacts are appropriately mitigated as per the plan. This was also confirmed through the review of the VCS PD/B04/, MR/02/ and confirmed during the onsite visit.

4.2.2 Local Stakeholder Consultation

Ongoing engagement with the local community takes place through the environmental monitoring committee meetings which are set up and managed by Pickup, who are the landfill site owners and operators. Meetings were held on the 18 November 2022 and 28 February 2023. PP has confirmed that no comments have been received from the local stakeholders during the reported monitoring period. Local stakeholder consultation has also been carried out for the project activity at the time of the project validation and found appropriate.

Verification team confirms that the local stakeholder consultation conducted meets the requirements as provided.

PP has also provided for a continuous grievance mechanism process for the project activity. The details for the project proponent and the environmental assessment practitioner have been provided for the continuous grievance mechanism. During the reported monitoring period (27 May 2021 to 31 December 2022), no LSC comments were received. The process involved undertaking a needs assessment every three months/27/. However, no comments were received during the monitoring period.

4.3 AFOLU-Specific Safeguards

Not Applicable.

4.4 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction and Removal Calculations

Baseline Emissions

The baseline emissions are determined according to equation (1) of the applied methodology:

$$BE_y = BE_{CH,y} + BE_{EC,y} + BE_{HG,y} + BE_{NG,y} \quad (\text{Equation 1 of ACM0001, v19})$$

Where

$BE_{CH,y}$ Baseline emissions of methane from the SWDS ($BE_{CH4,y}$)

$BE_{EC,y}$ baseline emissions associated with electricity generation

$BE_{HG,y}$ there was no use of methane for heating: Value is 0.

$BE_{NG,y}$ there was no upgrading and use of methane for natural gas: Value is 0.

$$BE_y = 327\,047 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$$

Baseline emissions of methane from the SWDS ($BE_{CH4,y}$)

Baseline emissions of methane from the SWDS are determined according to equation (2) of the applied methodology:

$$BE_{CH4} = \left((1 - OX_{toplayer}) \times F_{CH4,PJ,y} - F_{CH,BL,y} \right) \times GWP_{CH4} \quad (\text{Equation 2 of ACM0001, v19})$$

Where:

$OX_{toplayer}$ Fraction of methane in the LFG that would be oxidized in the top layer of the SWDS in the baseline (dimensionless),

$F_{CH4,PJ,y}$ Amount of methane in the LFG which is flared and/or used in the project activity in year y (t CH₄/yr).

$F_{CH,BL,y}$ Amount of methane in the LFG that would be flared in the baseline in year y (t CH₄/yr), the baseline value is 0.

GWP_{CH4} Global warming potential of CH₄ (t CO₂e/t CH₄) value used 28 (as per ACM0001 which states that the "Default value of 28 from IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) shall be updated according to any future COP/MOP decisions").

$F_{CH4,PJ,y}$ is determined as the sum of the quantities of methane flared and used in power plant(s), boiler(s), air heater(s), glass melting furnace(s), kiln(s) and natural gas distribution, as follows:

$$F_{CH4,PJ,y} = F_{CH4,flared,y} + F_{CH4,EL,y} + F_{CH4,HG,y} + F_{CH4,NG,y}$$

(Equation 3 of ACM0001, v19)

Where:

$F_{CH_4,PJ,y}$	Amount of methane in the LFG which is flared and/or used in the project activity in year y (t CH ₄ /yr)
$F_{CH_4,flared,y}$	Amount of methane in the LFG which is destroyed by flaring in year y (t CH ₄ /yr)
$F_{CH_4,EL,y}$	Amount of methane in the LFG which is used for electricity generation in year y (t CH ₄ /yr)
$F_{CH_4,HG,y}$	Amount of methane in the LFG which is used for heat generation in year y (t CH ₄ /yr) this value is 0 as no methane was used for heating.
$F_{CH_4,NG,y}$	Amount of methane in the LFG which is sent to the natural gas distribution network and/or dedicated pipeline and/or to the trucks in year y (t CH ₄ /yr) this value is 0 as no methane was upgraded and supplied as natural gas.

$F_{CH_4,flared,y}$ in the workbooks take the flow to the flare per minute and adjusts it for the methane concentration and then multiplies it by the density for methane. This is then adjusted for the actual mass for that time interval to provide an actual unit and not a flow rate.

$F_{CH_4,EL,y}$ in the workbooks take the flow to the generators per minute and adjusts it for the methane concentration and then multiplies it by the density for methane. This is then adjusted for the actual mass for that time interval to provide an actual unit and not a flow rate.

The baseline emissions associated with electricity generation in year y ($BE_{EC,y}$) are calculated using the “Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption and monitoring of electricity generation, Version 3”.

$BE_{EC,y} = \sum_k EC_{BL,k,y} \times EF_{EF,k,y} \times (1 + TDL_{k,y})$ (Equation 2 of Electricity Consumption and Generation Tool, v3). This case we are doing the calculation for Electricity generation:

Where:

$BE_{EC,y}$	Baseline emissions from electricity consumption in year y (t CO ₂ / yr)
$EC_{BL,k,y}$	Quantity of electricity that would be consumed by the baseline electricity consumer k in year y (MWh/yr). $EC_{BL,k,y}$ is equivalent to $EG_{PJ,y}$.
$EF_{EF,k,y}$	Emission factor for electricity generation for source k in year y (t CO ₂ /MWh) value 0.9647 t/MWh.
$TDL_{k,y}$	Average technical transmission and distribution losses for providing electricity to source j in year y is 11.78 in 2021 and 11.34 in 2022.
k	Sources of electricity consumption in the baseline

Project Emissions

The project emissions are calculated in accordance with equation (22) of the applied methodology:

$$PE_y = PE_{EC,y} + PE_{FC,y} + PE_{DY,y} \quad (\text{Equation 22 of ACM0001, v19})$$

Where:

PE_y = Project emissions in year y (tCO₂/y)

$PE_{EC,y}$ = Emissions from consumption of electricity due to the project activity in year y (tCO₂/y); value from below calculation 535

$PE_{FC,y}$ = Emissions from consumption of fossil fuels due to the project activity, for purpose other than electricity generation, year y (tCO₂/y); value from below calculation 2 is 27

$PE_{DY,y}$ = Emissions from distribution of compressed/liqefied LFG using trucks in year y (tCO₂/y); this is 0 as no distribution of the gas took place in this monitoring period.

$$PE_y = 562 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$$

Project emissions from electricity consumption:

$PE_{EC,y}$ is calculated according to the “Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption and monitoring of electricity generation, Version 3” using the following equation:

$$PE_{EC,y} = \sum_j EC_{PJ,j,y} \times EF_{EF,j,y} \times (1 + TDL_{j,y})$$

(Equation 1 of Electricity Consumption Tool and Generation, v3)

Where:

$EF_{EF,j,y}$ = Emission Factor for electricity consumed value applied is 0.9647 tCO₂/MWh for all periods

$EC_{PJ,j,y}$ = Total electricity consumed 107 MWh consumed in 2021 and 390 MWh consumed in 2022.

$TDL_{j,y}$ = Transmission and Distribution losses; 11.78 in 2021 and 11.34 in 2022.

$$PE_{EC,y} = 535 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$$

All of the above calculations are contained in the consolidated workbook titled “Consolidated CDM ER Sheet 27 May 2021 to 31 December 2022 V1” under the Project Emissions sheet.

Project emissions from fossil fuel consumption:

$$PE_{FC,j,y} = FC_{i,j,y} \times COEF_{i,y}$$

Where

$PE_{FC,j,y}$ CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion in process j during year

$FC_{i,j,y}$ Quantity of fuel type i combusted in process j during year y [Mass or volume unit/yr] is 8.03t;

$COEF_{i,y}$ CO₂ emission coefficient of fuel type i in year y [tCO₂/mass or volume unit] is 3.24/t;

$$PE_{FC,j,y} = 27 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$$

$$COEF_{i,y} = NCV_{i,y} \times EF_{CO2,i,y}$$

Where

$COEF_{i,y}$ CO₂ emission coefficient of fuel type i in year y [tCO₂/mass or volume unit];

$NCV_{i,y}$ Weighted average net calorific value of the fuel type i year y [GJ/mass or volume unit] is 0.0433 TJ/t;

$EF_{j,y}$ Weighted average CO₂ emission factor of fuel type i in year y [tCO₂/TJ] 74.8tCO₂/TJ;

i Fuel types combusted in process j during year y is standard diesel.

The verification team has determined whether the registered monitoring plan in the VCS PD and CDM PDD /B04/ has been properly implemented and followed by the PP and whether all parameters fixed ex-ante for emission reduction calculation are as per the registered PDD /B04/. The verification team's assessment of each data and parameter fixed ex-ante is provided below:

Parameter	Description	Value	Unit	Source	Assessment
GWP_{CH4}	Global Warming Potential of methane	28	tCO ₂ e/tCH ₄	IPCC (Fifth Assessment Report)	The parameter is used for the global warming potential of methane and used for calculation of emission reductions. The parameter value is based on the GWP available in the IPCC fifth Assessment report/B05-2/. The value is consistent with registered CDM PDD and VCS PD/B04/ and fixed ex-ante for the project activity.
EF_{EL} or $EF_{grid, CM, y}$	Combined margin emission factor for	0.9647	tCO ₂ e/MWh	Calculated using TOOL07 "Tool to calculate the emission	The parameter is used for the ex-ante calculation of the emission factor for the project activity. The emission factor is fixed ex-

	the grid in year y			factor for an electricity system" version 07.0	ante. The value is consistent with registered CDM PDD and VCS PD/B04/ and fixed ex-ante for the project activity.
Φ_{default}	Default value for the model correction factor to account for model	0.75	-	Methodological tool: Emissions from solid waste disposal sites, Version 08.0	The parameter is used for calculation of the baseline emissions. The value is consistent with registered CDM PDD and VCS PD/B04/ and fixed ex-ante for the project activity.
OX	Oxidation factor (reflecting the amount of methane from SWDS that is oxidized in the soil or other material covering the waste)	0.1	-	Methodological tool: Emissions from solid waste disposal sites, Version 08.0	The parameter is used for calculation of the baseline emissions. The value is consistent with registered CDM PDD and VCS PD/B04/ and fixed ex-ante for the project activity.
F	Fraction of methane in the SWDS gas (volume fraction)	0.5	-	Methodological tool: Emissions from solid waste disposal sites, Version 08.0	The parameter is used as an input for calculation of the project emissions. The value is consistent with registered CDM PDD and VCS PD/B04/ and fixed ex-ante for the project activity.
DOC _f	Fraction of degradable organic carbon (DOC) that can decompose	0.5	-	IPCC 2006 Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories	The parameter is used as an input for calculation of the baseline emissions. The value is consistent with registered CDM PDD and VCS PD/B04/ and fixed ex-ante for the project activity.
MCF	Methane Correction Factor	1.0	-	Methodological tool: Emissions from solid waste disposal sites, Version 08.0	The parameter is used as an input for calculation of the baseline emissions. The value is consistent with registered CDM PDD and VCS PD/B04/ and fixed ex-ante for the project activity.

DOC _j	Fraction of degradable organic carbon (by weight) in the waste type j.	Table provided in the MR/02/ and PDD/B04/	-	Methodological tool04: Emissions from solid waste disposal sites, Version 08.0	The parameter is used as an input for calculation of the baseline emissions. The value is consistent with registered CDM PDD and VCS PD/B04/ and fixed ex-ante for the project activity. <table><tr><td>Wood and wood products</td><td>43</td></tr><tr><td>Pulp, paper and cardboard (other than sludge)</td><td>40</td></tr><tr><td>Food, food waste, beverages and tobacco (other than sludge)</td><td>15</td></tr><tr><td>Textiles</td><td>24</td></tr><tr><td>Garden, yard and park waste</td><td>20</td></tr><tr><td>Glass, plastic, metal, other inert waste</td><td>0</td></tr></table>	Wood and wood products	43	Pulp, paper and cardboard (other than sludge)	40	Food, food waste, beverages and tobacco (other than sludge)	15	Textiles	24	Garden, yard and park waste	20	Glass, plastic, metal, other inert waste	0																				
Wood and wood products	43																																				
Pulp, paper and cardboard (other than sludge)	40																																				
Food, food waste, beverages and tobacco (other than sludge)	15																																				
Textiles	24																																				
Garden, yard and park waste	20																																				
Glass, plastic, metal, other inert waste	0																																				
k _j	Decay rate for the waste type j	Table provided in the MR/02/ and PDD/B04/	-	Methodological tool04: Emissions from solid waste disposal sites, Version 08.0	The parameter is used as an input for calculation of the baseline emissions. The value is consistent with registered CDM PDD and VCS PD/B04/ and fixed ex-ante for the project activity. <table><tr><th rowspan="2">Waste type j</th><th colspan="2">Boreal and Temperate (MAT≤20°C)</th><th colspan="2">Tropical (MAT>20°C)</th></tr><tr><th>Dry (MAP/PET <1)</th><th>Wet (MAP/PET >1)</th><th>Dry (MAP<1000mm)</th><th>Wet (MAP>1000mm)</th></tr><tr><td rowspan="2">Slowly degrading</td><td>Pulp, paper, cardboard (other than sludge), textiles</td><td>0.04</td><td>0.06</td><td>0.045</td><td>0.07</td></tr><tr><td>Wood, wood products and straw</td><td>0.02</td><td>0.03</td><td>0.025</td><td>0.035</td></tr><tr><td>Moderately degrading</td><td>Other (non-food) organic putrescible garden and park waste</td><td>0.05</td><td>0.10</td><td>0.065</td><td>0.17</td></tr><tr><td>Rapidly degrading</td><td>Food, food waste, sewage sludge, beverages and tobacco</td><td>0.06</td><td>0.185</td><td>0.085</td><td>0.40</td></tr></table>	Waste type j	Boreal and Temperate (MAT≤20°C)		Tropical (MAT>20°C)		Dry (MAP/PET <1)	Wet (MAP/PET >1)	Dry (MAP<1000mm)	Wet (MAP>1000mm)	Slowly degrading	Pulp, paper, cardboard (other than sludge), textiles	0.04	0.06	0.045	0.07	Wood, wood products and straw	0.02	0.03	0.025	0.035	Moderately degrading	Other (non-food) organic putrescible garden and park waste	0.05	0.10	0.065	0.17	Rapidly degrading	Food, food waste, sewage sludge, beverages and tobacco	0.06	0.185	0.085	0.40
Waste type j	Boreal and Temperate (MAT≤20°C)		Tropical (MAT>20°C)																																		
	Dry (MAP/PET <1)	Wet (MAP/PET >1)	Dry (MAP<1000mm)	Wet (MAP>1000mm)																																	
Slowly degrading	Pulp, paper, cardboard (other than sludge), textiles	0.04	0.06	0.045	0.07																																
	Wood, wood products and straw	0.02	0.03	0.025	0.035																																
Moderately degrading	Other (non-food) organic putrescible garden and park waste	0.05	0.10	0.065	0.17																																
Rapidly degrading	Food, food waste, sewage sludge, beverages and tobacco	0.06	0.185	0.085	0.40																																
f _y	Fraction of methane captured at the SWDS and flared, combusted or used in	0	-	Methodological tool04: Emissions from solid waste disposal sites, Version 08.0	The parameter is used as an input for calculation of the baseline emissions. The value is consistent with registered CDM PDD and VCS PD/B04/ and fixed ex-ante for the project activity.																																

	another manner				
W_x	Total amount of organic waste in year x (tons)	Please refer to calculation spreadsheet ¹	Tonnes	Landfill Operator	The parameter is used as an input for calculation of the baseline emissions. The parameter is used to estimate ex-ante emission reductions based on the waste profile. The value is consistent with registered CDM PDD and VCS PD/B04/ and fixed ex-ante for the project activity.
$NCV_{i,y}$	Weighted average net calorific value of fuel type i in the year y	0.0433	TJ/t	IPCC default values as provided in Table 1.2 of Chapter 1 of Vol. 2 (Energy) of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines on National GHG Inventories.	The parameter is used as an input for calculation of the project emissions. The parameter is used in case of fossil fuel consumption (diesel in this case). The value is consistent with registered CDM PDD and VCS PD/B04/ and fixed ex-ante for the project activity.
$EFCO_{2,i,y}$	Weighted average CO ₂ emission factor of fuel type i in the year y	74.8 tCO ₂ /TJ	tCO ₂ /GJ	IPCC default values as provided in Table 1.2 of Chapter 1 of Vol. 2 (Energy) of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines on National GHG Inventories.	The parameter is used as an input for calculation of the project emissions. The parameter is used in case of fossil fuel consumption (diesel). The value is consistent with registered CDM PDD and VCS PD/B04/ and fixed ex-ante for the project activity.
η_{PJ}	Efficiency of the LFG capture system that will be installed in the project activity	0.5	-	ACM0001 version 19	The parameter is used as an input for calculation of the baseline emissions. Since the technical specifications are not available for the LFG capture system, a default value of 50% is applied for the purposes of ex-ante emissions estimation. The

¹ Ex-ante ER calculation spreadsheet.

					value is consistent with registered CDM PDD and VCS PD/B04/ and fixed ex-ante for the project activity.
SPEC _{flare}	Manufacturer's flare specifications for temperature, flow rate and maintenance schedule.	Temperature (°C) Min - 700°C Max - 1,200°C Flow rate or heat flux (kg/h or m³/h) Min - 400 m³/h Max - 2,000 m³/h Maintenance schedule (N° of days) The maintenance schedule is not required if Option A (default flare efficiency option specified in the tool titled 'Project emissions from flaring, v3') is	Temperature (°C) Flow rate or heat flux (kg/h or m³/h) Maintenance schedule (N° of days)	Manufacturer's flare specifications for temperature, flow rate and maintenance schedule.	The parameter is used as an input for calculation of the baseline emissions. The parameter is based on the manufacturer specifications on the flare. The value is consistent with registered CDM PDD and VCS PD/B04/ and fixed ex-ante for the project activity. Maintenance schedule is not required as Option A has been selected from the tool Project emissions from flaring, v3.

		selected to determine flare efficiency of an enclosed flare			
R_u	Universal ideal gases constant	8.314	$\text{Pa.m}^3/\text{kmol.k}$	“Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream”, Version 03.0	The parameter is used as an input for calculation of the baseline emissions. The parameter is based on the default provided in the tool. The value is consistent with registered CDM PDD and VCS PD/B04/ and fixed ex-ante for the project activity.
MM_i	Molecular mass of greenhouse gas i	Methane: 16.04 Nitrogen: 28.01	Kg/kmol	“Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream”, Version 03.0	The parameter is used as an input for calculation of the baseline emissions. The parameter is based on the default provided in the tool. The value is consistent with registered CDM PDD and VCS PD/B04/ and fixed ex-ante for the project activity.
P_n	Total pressure at normal conditions	101,325 Pa	Pa	“Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream”, Version 03.0	The parameter is used as an input for calculation of the baseline emissions. The parameter is based on the default provided in the tool. The value is consistent with registered CDM PDD and VCS PD/B04/ and fixed ex-ante for the project activity.
T_n	Temperature at normal conditions	273.15 K	K	“Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream”, Version 03.0	The parameter is used as an input for calculation of the baseline emissions. The parameter is based on the default provided in the tool. The value is consistent with registered CDM PDD and VCS PD/B04/ and fixed ex-ante for the project activity.

$\eta_{\text{flare},m}$	Flare efficiency for the minute m	0.8	-	Methodological Tool "Project emissions from flaring" Version 02.0.0	The parameter is used as an input for calculation of the baseline emissions. The parameter is based on the default provided in the tool. The value is consistent with registered CDM PDD and VCS PD/B04/ and fixed ex-ante for the project activity.
-------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----	---	---	--

The values are consistent with the registered VCS PD/B04/ and defined fixed ex-ante during crediting period of the project activity. The fixed ex-ante data and parameter have been listed in the monitoring report/02/ and confirmed by the verification team as correct and consistent with that stated in the registered VCS PD/B04/. The verification team confirms that the MR/02/ and the ER calculation spreadsheet/04/ have considered the parameters fixed ex-ante correctly.

4.5 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions and Removals

CCIPL was able to confirm that the calculations are based on authentic data. The spreadsheets/04/ used to calculate the VCUs calculations and all figures were tracked, cross checked with actual reported data from the CEB invoices and found to be consistent.

The quality of supporting evidence submitted to the VVB for verification is adequate and found to be verifiable. The transfer of carbon rights and other supporting documents related to quality and maintenance were checked by the verification team during the remote audit to confirm the authenticity of the documents and to check the correctness of the calculation.

When verifying the reported emission reductions, CCIPL ensured that there was a clear audit trail that contained the evidence and records that validate the stated figures. All source documents that form the basis for assumptions and other information underlying the GHG data were checked by the verification team.

When assessing the audit trails, CCIPL also examined:

1. Whether sufficient evidence was available, both in terms of frequency and in covering the full monitoring period
2. The source and nature of the evidence
3. If comparable information was available from sources other than that used in the monitoring report, CCIPL cross-checked the monitoring report against the other sources to confirm that the stated figures were correct.

CCIPL also assessed that the data collection system met the requirements of the monitoring plan as per the applied methodology.

Proper data management inclusive of data acquisition and aggregation, data management system is being followed for the project activity.

The monitoring personnel at site are well trained and follow reproducible routines. Thus, they are competent to carry out the relevant tasks with sufficient accuracy.

Monitored Parameters

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the DOE
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan of PDD):	Management of SWDS (Management of SWDS)
Data Unit	-
Reported Values	Annual
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Annual
Reporting frequency:	Annual
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Details of monitoring equipment:	The waste management license is granted by a governmental department (3rd party). The waste management licenses are valid for the sites in operation/24/.
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Calibration frequency /interval: Is it monitoring methodology /CDM EB guidance / local or national standards / manufacturers specification	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration (internal or external calibration):	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Verification team has compared and checked the waste management licenses/24/ for the landfill sites.

How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Verification team has verified the waste management licenses/24/ for the landfill sites. The waste management licenses are valid for the sites in operation/24/ during the monitoring period.
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	The necessary QA/QC procedures for this parameter are in place as provided in monitoring report /02/.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	Full set of data has been provided for the monitoring period.

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the DOE
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan of PDD):	Operation of the equipment that consumes the LFG (Op _{j,h})
Data Unit	-
Reported Values	N/A
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Hourly
Reporting frequency:	Hourly
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Details of monitoring equipment:	Flare program logic controller
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Calibration frequency /interval: Is it monitoring methodology /CDM EB guidance / local or national standards / manufacturers specification	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the frequency of	NA

calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	
Company performing the calibration (internal or external calibration):	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Verification team has compared and checked the values provided in ER sheet /04/ with the monthly raw data as provided in the workbooks for each month provided in the ER sheet/04/.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	Verification team has compared and checked the values provided in ER sheet /04/ with the monthly raw data as provided in the workbooks for each month provided in the ER sheet/04/.
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	The necessary QA/QC procedures for this parameter are in place as provided in monitoring report /02/.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA. Full set of data has been provided for the monitoring period.

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the DOE
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan of PDD):	Amount of electricity generated using LFG by the project activity in year y ($EG_{PJ,y}$)
Data Unit	MWh
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Continuously
Reporting frequency:	Aggregated monthly and yearly
Values:	Robinson Deep 23,197.6 MWh Marie Louise 12,543.9 MWh Goudkoppies 6,843.2 MWh Total 42,584.7 MWh

Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes, the measuring and reporting frequency is in accordance with the monitoring plan/B04/ and the monitoring methodology, ACM0001, version 11/B02/			
Details of monitoring equipment:	Elster A1700 Electricity meter/08/			
		Site 1 (Robinson Deep)	Site 2 (Marie Louise)	Site 3 (Goudkoppies)
	Serial Number	351421105891	351421100020	351441128474 (01/02/2019 onwards)
	Accuracy	0.20	0.50	0.50
	Calibration Frequency	10 years in accordance with manufacturer specifications and communication /08-6//15/	10 years in accordance with manufacturer specifications and communication /08-6//15/	10 years in accordance with manufacturer specifications and communication /08-6//15/
	Last calibration	01/03/2016 /19/	25/01/2016 /19/	12/06/2018 /19/
	Calibration	28/02/2026	24/01/2026	11/06/2028/19/
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	The registered PDD provides an accuracy class of 0.5 and the installed meters are of accuracy class 0.5 (for Marie Louise and Goudkoppies) or better than that 0.5 (for Robinson Deep).			
Calibration frequency /interval: Is it monitoring methodology /CDM EB guidance / local or national standards / manufacturers specification	10 years. Calibration frequency is not provided in the registered PD/B04/, the calibration frequency is in accordance with the OEM specification, which guarantees the units for a period of 10 years which is in line with SANAS guidelines.			
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	The calibration interval is not provided in the PD/B04/, however the frequency provided is in accordance with the SANAS guidelines/B05-3/.			
Company performing the calibration (internal or external calibration):	External Calibration by Honeywell/19/			
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	Yes, the calibration confirmed the proper functioning of the monitoring equipment/19/.			

Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	Yes, the calibration is valid for the whole reporting period/19/.
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	The reported data in the ER sheet/04/ has been cross-checked with generation data and the invoices/10/.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The values were verified with the ER sheet/04/ and cross-checked with generation data and the invoices/10/.
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	The necessary QA/QC procedures for this parameter are in place as provided in monitoring report /02/ /B04/.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA. Full set of data has been provided for the monitoring period.

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the DOE
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan of PDD):	Average technical transmission and distribution losses for providing electricity (TDL _y)
Data Unit	%
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Annual
Reporting frequency:	Annual
Values:	2021 - 11.78% 2022 - 11.43%
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes, the measuring and reporting frequency is in accordance with the monitoring plan/B04/ and the monitoring methodology, ACM0001, version 11/B02/
Details of monitoring equipment:	NA
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA

Is it monitoring methodology /CDM EB guidance / local or national standards / manufacturers specification	
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration (internal or external calibration):	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	The reported data in the ER sheet/04/ has been cross-checked with Eskom Annual Reports/16/.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The reported data in the ER sheet/04/ has been cross-checked with Eskom Annual Reports/16/.
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	The necessary QA/QC procedures for this parameter are in place as provided in monitoring report /02/ /B04/.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA. Full set of data has been provided for the monitoring period.

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the DOE
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan of PDD):	Temperature in the exhaust gas of the enclosed flare in minute m (TEG _m)
Data Unit	°C
Reported Values	Average for Robinson Deep T _{flare} = 924.39 °C Average for Goudkoppies T _{flare} = 803.94 °C Average for Marie Louise T _{flare} = 904.07 °C

Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Continuously			
Reporting frequency:	Continuously			
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes			
Details of monitoring equipment:	Make-WIKA N-Type Thermocouple/08-4/			
		Site 1 (Robinson Deep)	Site 2 (Marie Louise)	Site 3 (Goudkoppies)
	Serial Number	NA	NA	NA
	Equipment Tag NO/ Part Number.	T1TECNSX60	T1TECNSX60	T1TECNSX60
	Accuracy	+0.75% (333 °C- 1200 °C) /08-4/	+0.75% (333 °C- 1200 °C) /08-4/	+0.75% (333 °C- 1200 °C) /08-4/
	Range	333°C to +1300°C /08-4/	333°C to +1300°C /08-4/	333°C to +1300°C /08-4/
		It was confirmed through onsite visit that it is used to determine operational checks and determine the values for the Flare temperature parameter. A second thermocouple (Top thermocouple) higher up in the flare exhaust stack is used as a check on the combustion temperature.		
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	The accuracy of the monitoring equipment is +-0.75% for both sites and the full scale as per manufacturer specifications/08-4/. This represents a good monitoring practise.			
Calibration frequency /interval: Is it monitoring methodology /CDM EB guidance / local or national standards / manufacturers specification	Calibration frequency (Functionality checks) is on an annual basis. Calibration frequency meets the requirements of manufacturer specifications/08-4/ and the registered PDD/B04/.			
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	Yes, the calibration interval is in line with the monitoring plan of the PD/B04/.			
Company performing the calibration (internal or external calibration):	Internal functionality checks are done using a portable temperature probe and monitor.			

Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	Yes. The dates of functionality checks are provided below: Marie Louise 18/02/2021 19/05/2021 18/08/2021 21/12/2021 24/03/2022 30/06/2022 13/09/2022 Goudkoppies 04/02/2021 10/05/2021 24/08/2021 29/11/2021 15/02/2022 15/05/2022 23/08/2022 19/11/2022 Robinson Deep 23/04/2021 14/07/2021 13/10/2021 02/02/2022 11/05/2022 22/08/2022 17/11/2022
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	Yes
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	The reported data has been compared with functionality check sheets /20/ and also confirmed during the remote interviews/ video calls.

How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The values in the monitoring report/02/ were verified and compared with the continuous and monthly data provided in the ER sheet /04/.
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	The necessary QA/QC procedures for this parameter are in place as provided in PD /B04/.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA. Full set of data has been provided for the monitoring period.

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the DOE			
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan of PDD):	Quantity of electricity consumed by the project electricity consumption source in year y ($EC_{PJ,I,y}$)			
Data Unit	MWh/y			
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Continuous			
Reporting frequency	Annually			
reported Values	Robinson Deep = 257 MWh ² Goudkoppies = 0 MWh Marie Louise = 241 MWh Total = 498 MWh			
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Electricity meter			
Details of monitoring equipment:		Site 1 (Robinson Deep)	Site 2 (Marie Louise)	Site 3 (Goudkoppies)
	Serial Number/ Part No	CBI- EC330CM	DEM024SJ	351441128474

² The parameter was not monitored during the period 01/07/2021 to 13/10/2021 and thus a methodology deviation has been applied.

	Accuracy	class 1	class B	0.50
	Calibration Frequency	NA	NA	10 years
	Calibration valid from	NA	NA	12/06/2018 to 11/06/2028 (35144112847 4)
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	The accuracy of the gas analyser is class 1, class B and 0.50 for all the sites/02/. This represents a good monitoring practise.			
Calibration frequency /interval: Is it monitoring methodology /CDM EB guidance / local or national standards / manufacturers specification	NA			
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	Yes			
Company performing the calibration (internal or external calibration):	NA			
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA			
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	Yes			
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	The reported data has been cross checked with the electricity invoices /10/.			
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The reported data has been cross checked with the electricity invoices /10/.			
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	The necessary QA/QC procedures for this parameter are in place as provided in the registered PD /B04/.			
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered	NA.			

monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	Full set of data was not available for the monitoring period during 01/07/2021 to 13/10/2021 and thus a methodology deviation has been applied.
---	---

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the DOE
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan of PDD):	Quantity of fuel type i combusted in process j during the year y ($FC_{i,j,y}$)
Data Unit	Mass or volume unit per year (e.g. ton/yr or m3/yr)
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Continuously
Reporting frequency	Continuously
reported Values	Robinson Deep 2288.93 Lt Marie Louise 2112.05 Lt Goudkoppies 5160.74 Lt Total 9561.72 Lt Density used 0.84 kg/lit/B05-4/
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes, the measuring and reporting frequency is in accordance with the monitoring plan/B04/ and monitoring methodology/B02/.
Details of monitoring equipment:	The monitoring is being done by ruler gauges in the Volvo 105I (Diesel Tank level indicator)/13/ at Robinson Deep and Goudkoppies site and using Cummins 175I (Diesel Tank level indicator) at Marie Louise site. Robinson Deep: Type: Volvo 105I (Diesel Tank level indicator) Sl. No.: FE3095S Marie Louise: Type: Cummins 175I (Diesel Tank level indicator) Sl. No.: AK16080689-A Goudkoppies: Type: Volvo 105I (Diesel Tank level indicator) Sl. No.: FE0686S
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the	The accuracy for the ruler gauge is +3.0 litre/13/. The accuracy of the instruments is in accordance with the registered PDD/B04/.

monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	
Calibration frequency /interval: Is it monitoring methodology /CDM EB guidance / local or national standards / manufacturers specification	Annual. Calibration undertaken on 28/04/2021 Calibration undertaken on 27/05/2022 A delay in calibration has been applied to the values provided in accordance with the Appendix of the VVS for project activities, v3/B01-1/ as the calibration has been done after a period of annual frequency. The calibration reports a 95.45% confidence index for the accuracy and thus more conservative of +/-3 litre and 95.45% from the calibration reports is used for the correction factor for delay in calibration.
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	Calibration interval is annual as per the PD/B04/. The calibration interval is determined in accordance with the manufacturer specifications/13/.
Company performing the calibration (internal or external calibration):	Calibrate@pjb (External)
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	Yes.
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	The calibration is delayed and accordingly procedure provided in the Appendix of the VVS for project activities, version 03/B01-2/ has been applied. The calibration reports a 95.45% confidence index for the accuracy and thus more conservative of +/-3 litre and 95.45% from the calibration reports is used for the correction factor for delay in calibration.
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	The reported data has been cross-checked with the fuel purchase receipts/13-3/.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The values in the monitoring report were verified through the review of the volume records for the fuel consumption/13-1/.
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes, the data management ensures correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most	NA.

conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	Full set of data has been provided for the monitoring period.
---	---

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the DOE			
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan of PDD):	Volumetric fraction of greenhouse gas i in a time interval t on a wet basis ($V_{i,t,wb}$)			
Data Unit	m³ gas i/m³ wet gas			
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Measurements are logged once every minute			
Reporting frequency:/	Measurements are logged once every minute			
Values for CH4	Average for Robinson Deep	52.8%		
	Average for Marie Louise	55.4%		
	Average for Goudkoppies	51.6%		
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes			
Details of monitoring equipment:	Make- Edinburgh Instruments-Guardian NG Infrared Gas Monitor/08-1/ and Siemens Ultramat 23/08-1/			
		Site 1 (Robinson Deep)	Site 2 (Marie Louise)	Site 2 (Goudkoppies)
	Serial Number	14406; 17270; 17269; 13983; 21824; 21823	10733; 17269	N1H3191
	Accuracy	< 2% of full scale	< 2% of full scale	+/-1%
	Calibration Frequency	Yearly/06/	Yearly/06/	12 months/06/
	Last calibration	25/11/2022/06/	25/11/2022/06/	25/11/2022/06/
	Calibration valid till	24/11/2023/06/	24/11/2023/06/	24/11/2023/06/
	Replaced on	20/12/2019 24/08/2021 02/11/2021 29/11/2021 23/02/2022 04/07/2022	04/10/2022	NA
	Serial Number	21823	10733	--
	Accuracy	< 2 % of full	< 2% of full	--

	Calibration Frequency	Yearly	Yearly	--
	Last calibration (All calibration dates provided in the row below)	25/11/2022	25/11/2022	--
	Calibration valid till	24/11/2023	24/11/2023	--
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	The accuracy of the gas analyser has been provided for each site and each analyser/14//08/. This represents a good monitoring practise.			
Calibration frequency /interval: Is it monitoring methodology /CDM EB guidance / local or national standards / manufacturers specification	Yearly. Calibration frequency is 12 months as per manufacturer specifications for Edinburgh Instruments-Guardian NG Infrared Gas Monitor and 12 months for Siemens Ultramat /14//06/. Goudkoppies calibration dates: 08/01/21; 15/01/21; 22/01/21; 29/01/21; 05/02/21; 12/02/21; 19/02/21; 26/02/21; 05/03/21; 12/03/21; 19/03/21; 26/03/21; 01/04/21; 09/04/21; 16/04/21; 23/04/21; 30/04/21; 07/05/21; 14/05/21; 21/05/21; 28/05/21; 04/06/21; 11/06/21; 18/06/21; 25/06/21; 02/07/21; 09/07/21; 16/07/21; 23/07/21; 30/07/21; 06/08/21; 13/08/21; 03/09/21; 10/09/21; 17/09/21; 23/09/21; 01/10/21; 08/10/21; 15/10/21; 22/10/21; 29/10/21; 05/11/21; 12/11/21; 19/11/21; 26/11/21; 03/12/21; 10/12/21; 17/12/21; 24/12/21; 31/12/21; 07/01/22; 14/01/22; 21/01/22; 28/01/22; 04/02/22; 11/02/22; 18/02/22; 11/03/22; 18/03/22; 25/03/22; 01/04/22; 08/04/22; 14/04/22; 22/04/22; 29/04/22; 06/05/22; 13/05/22; 20/05/22; 27/05/22; 03/06/22; 10/06/22; 17/06/22; 24/06/22; 01/07/22; 08/07/22; 15/07/22; 22/07/22; 29/07/22; 05/08/22; 12/08/22; 19/08/22; 26/08/22; 02/09/22; 09/09/22; 16/09/22; 23/09/22; 30/09/22; 07/10/22; 14/10/22; 21/10/22; 28/10/22; 04/11/22; 11/11/22; 18/11/22; 25/11/22 Marie Louise calibration dates: 08/01/2021; 15/01/2021; 22/01/2021; 29/01/2021; 05/02/2021; 12/02/2021; 19/02/2021; 26/02/2021; 05/03/2021;			

	12/03/2021; 19/03/2021; 26/03/2021; 01/04/2021; 09/04/2021; 16/04/2021; 23/04/2021; 30/04/2021; 07/05/2021; 14/05/2021; 21/05/2021; 28/05/2021; 04/06/2021; 11/06/2021; 18/06/2021; 25/06/2021; 02/07/2021; 09/07/2021; 16/07/2021; 23/07/2021; 30/07/2021; 06/08/2021; 13/08/2021; 20/08/2021; 27/08/2021; 03/09/2021; 10/09/2021; 17/09/2021; 23/09/2021; 01/10/2021; 08/10/2021; 15/10/2021; 22/10/2021; 29/10/2021; 05/11/2021; 12/11/2021; 29/11/2021; 26/11/2021; 03/12/2021; 10/12/2021; 17/12/2021; 24/12/2021; 31/12/2021; 07/01/22; 14/01/22; 21/01/22; 28/01/22; 04/02/22; 11/02/22; 18/02/22; 25/02/22; 04/03/22; 11/03/22; 18/03/22; 25/03/22; 01/04/22; 08/04/22; 14/04/22; 22/04/22; 29/04/22; 06/05/22; 13/05/22; 20/05/22; 27/05/22; 03/06/22; 10/06/22; 17/06/22; 24/06/22; 01/07/22; 08/07/22; 15/07/22; 22/07/22; 29/07/22; 05/08/22; 12/08/22; 19/08/22; 26/08/22; 02/09/22; 09/09/22; 16/09/22; 23/09/22; 30/09/22; 07/10/22; 14/10/22; 21/10/22; 28/10/22; 04/11/22; 11/11/22; 18/11/22; 25/11/22 Robinson Deep calibration dates: 08/01/21; 15/01/21; 22/01/21; 29/01/21; 05/02/21; 12/02/21; 19/02/21; 26/02/21; 05/03/21; 12/03/21; 19/03/21; 26/03/21; 01/04/21; 09/04/21; 16/04/21; 23/04/21; 30/04/21; 07/05/21; 14/05/21; 21/05/21; 28/05/21; 04/06/21; 11/06/21; 18/06/21; 25/06/21; 02/07/21; 09/07/21; 16/07/21; 23/07/21; 30/07/21; 06/08/21; 13/08/21; 20/08/21; 27/08/21; 03/09/21; 10/09/21; 17/09/21; 23/09/21; 01/10/21; 08/10/21; 15/10/21; 22/10/21; 29/10/21; 05/11/21; 12/11/21; 19/11/21; 26/11/21; 03/12/21; 10/12/21; 17/12/21; 24/12/21; 31/12/21; 07/01/22; 14/01/22; 21/01/22; 28/01/22; 04/02/22; 11/02/22; 18/02/22; 25/02/22; 04/03/22; 11/03/22; 18/03/22; 25/03/22; 01/04/22; 08/04/22; 14/04/22; 22/04/22; 29/04/22; 06/05/22; 13/05/22; 20/05/22; 27/05/22; 03/06/22; 10/06/22; 17/06/22; 24/06/22; 01/07/22; 08/07/22; 15/07/22; 22/07/22; 29/07/22; 05/08/22; 12/08/22; 19/08/22; 26/08/22; 02/09/22; 09/09/22; 16/09/22; 23/09/22; 30/09/22; 07/10/22; 14/10/22; 21/10/22; 28/10/22; 04/11/22; 11/11/22; 18/11/22; 25/11/22
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected	Yes.

frequency represent good monitoring practise?	
Company performing the calibration (internal or external calibration):	Internal with a span gas cylinder in accordance with the work instructions/10 (c)/,/18(c)/ The Span gas used for these calibrations has been calibrated according to ISO/IEC 17025:2005 standards. For Robison Deep site: (S. No. 4685); (S. No. 199836); (S. No. 199906); For Marie Louise site: (S. No. 4657); (S. No. 199774); (S. No. 199914); For Goudkoppies site: (S. No. 4683); (S. No. 199779); (S. No. 199785); For Robison Deep site: Span Gas Traceability Cert.CAN 4635 valid from 10/09/2019-30/09/2021 Span Gas Traceability Cert/Can.199836 Valid from 31/08/2021 to 31/08/2022 Span Gas Traceability Cert/Can.199906 Valid from 30/06/2022 to 30/06/2023 For Marie Louise site: Span Gas Traceability Cert.CAN 4657 valid from 10/09/2019-30/09/2021 Span Gas Traceability Cert/CAN 199914 valid from 31/08/2021-31/08/2022 Span Gas Traceability Cert/CAN 199774 valid from 30/06/2022-30/06/2023 For Goudkoppies site: Span Gas Traceability Cert.CAN 4683 valid from 10/09/2019-30/09/2021 Span Gas Traceability Cert/CAN 199779 valid from 31/08/2021-31/08/2022 Span Gas Traceability Cert/CAN 199785

	valid from 30/06/2022-30/06/2023
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	Yes. Calibration report for working Gas Analyser is available /10/ /18/.
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	Yes
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	The reported data has been cross checked with the raw data /06/ at the site during OSV.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The reported data has been cross checked with the raw data /06/ at the site during OSV.
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	The necessary QA/QC procedures for this parameter are in place as provided in monitoring report /02/ /B04/.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA. Full set of data has been provided for the monitoring period.

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the DOE
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan of PDD):	Mass flow of the gaseous stream in time interval t on a wet basis ($M_{t,wb}$)
Data Unit	Kg/h
Reported Values	Robinson Deep Average 1132.7 Kg/h Marie Louise Average 632.3 Kg/h Goudkoppies Average 431.7 Kg/h
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Continuously
Reporting frequency:	Recorded every minute
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Details of monitoring equipment:	Make-Thermal mass flow meter (Endress+ Hauser/Proline t-mass 65I) /08/

	Total Flow meter			
		Site 1 (Robinson Deep)	Site 2 (Marie Louise)	Site 3 (Goudkoppies)
	Serial Number	A309FB02000 (Valid from 10/12/2020 to 09/12/2023)	L5003702000 (05/02/2021 to 04/02/2024)	N8103702000 (Valid from 08/10/2019 to 07/10/2022) 99047602000 (Valid from 06/10/2021 to 05/10/2024)
	Accuracy	<3%	<3%	<3%
	Calibration Frequency	3 years	3 years	3 years
	Calibration date ³	20/08/2020	19/08/2020	28/08/2018 (for N8103702000) 29/07/2022 (for 99047602000)
	Flare flow meter			
		Site 1 (Robinson Deep)	Site 2 (Marie Louise)	Site 3 (Goudkoppies)
	Serial Number	E2110D02000 (Valid from	A309F902000 (Valid from	E704AF02000 (Valid from

³ The calibration of the flow meters is valid from the date of installation in accordance with the letter from the manufacturer/18/.

		13/10/2020 to 12/10/2023)	12/12/2019 to 11/12/2022) 9904750200 (Valid from 08/12/2022 to 07/12/2023)	12/04/2021 to 11/04/2024)
	Accuracy	<3%	<3%	<3%
	Calibration Frequency	3 years /08-2/	3 years /08-2/	3 years /08-2/
	Calibration date	18/06/2020	02/10/2019 (for A309F902000) 18/08/2022 (for 99047502000)	17/06/2020
	Electricity Flow meter			
		Site 1 (Robinson Deep)	Site 2 (Marie Louise)	Site 3 (Goudkoppies)
	Serial Number	A309FA02000 (Valid from 13/10/2020 to 12/10/2023)	N8103802000 (Valid from 30/04/2019 to 29/04/2022) 99047702000 (Valid from 30/06/2022 to 29/06/2025)	C6031202000 (Valid from 12/04/2021 to 11/04/2024)
	Accuracy	<3%	<3%	<3%
	Calibration Frequency	3 years /08-2/	3 years /08-2/	3 years /08-2/

	Calibration date	19/08/2020	29/08/2018 (for N8103802000) 08/06/2022 (for 99047702000)	30/10/2020
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes, the accuracy of the monitoring equipment is as stated in the PDD/B04/.			
Calibration frequency /interval: Is it monitoring methodology /CDM EB guidance / local or national standards / manufacturers specification	3 years. Calibration frequency meets the requirements of manufacturer specifications /08-2/, /18/.			
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	Yes.			
Company performing the calibration (internal or external calibration):	Endress + Hauser (External) Endress + Hauser is the manufacturer and the laboratory is accredited to undertake calibration.			
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	Yes. Calibration report for the flow meters are available /18/ /05/.			
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	Yes			
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Verification team has compared and checked the values provided in ER sheet /04/ with the monthly raw data as provided in the workbooks for each month provided in the ER sheet/04/.			
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The values for the parameter are monitored continuously and then through the telemetry every 30 minutes data is sent to network server central database.			
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission	The necessary QA/QC procedures for this parameter are in place as provided in monitoring report /02/.			

reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA. Full set of data has been provided for the monitoring period.

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the DOE
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan of PDD):	Flame detection of flare in the minute m (Flame _m)
Data Unit	Flame on or Flame off
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Continuous
Reporting frequency:/	recorded once every minute
Values	Detection of flame recorded as a minute that the flame was on, otherwise recorded as a minute that the flame was off
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes, the measuring and recording frequency is in accordance with the registered PD/B04/
Details of monitoring equipment:	Krom Schroder UV Sensor/08/ Robinson Deep Tested Dates 23/04/2021 14/07/2021 Marie Louise Tested Dates 18/02/2021 19/05/2021 Goudkoppies Tested Dates 04/02/2021 10/05/2021

Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	Yes, the sensors were tested in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications.
Calibration frequency /interval: Is it monitoring methodology /CDM EB guidance / local or national standards / manufacturers specification	The sensors are replaced and tested along with the thermocouples.
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the PDD? If the PDD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	Yes.
Company performing the calibration (internal or external calibration):	
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	Yes.
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	Yes
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	The reported data has been cross checked with the raw data /06/ at the site during OSV.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	The reported data has been cross checked with the raw data /06/ at the site during OSV.
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	The necessary QA/QC procedures for this parameter are in place as provided in monitoring report /02/ /B04/.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA. Full set of data has been provided for the monitoring period.

The verification team can confirm that sufficient evidence is available for the whole monitoring period, a methodology deviation has also been applied for the period the electricity consumption was not monitored for Robinson Deep landfill site and the same is verifiable and that the data

collection system meets the requirements of the monitoring plan and the applied methodology according to the assessment carried out during the remote audit and in the document review.

Verification team confirms that the quality of evidence to determine the GHG reductions and removals produced was found satisfactory. The detailed information flow with the roles and responsibilities of the individuals and the monitoring system have been provided in the VCS-MR/02/.

4.6 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

Not applicable.

5 VERIFICATION OPINION

Carbon Check (India) Private Limited has performed the verification of the project activity “Joburg Landfill Gas to Energy Project” in South Africa, with regards to the relevant requirements for VCS project activities.

The conclusions can be summarised as follows:

- The project is implemented and installed as planned and described in the registered VCS PD/B04/ and the project activity confirms with the verification criteria for project and their GHG emission reductions or removals set out in the VCS rules.
- The monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied approved methodology, i.e. ACM0001, version 19/B02/ and monitoring plan as sought out in the registered VCS-PD/B04/.
- The monitoring system is in place and functional. The project has generated verifiable GHG emission reductions.

As the result of the verification of project activities, the verifier confirms that the GHG emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements in a conservative and appropriate manner. Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd. herewith confirms that the project has achieved emission reductions in the below mentioned reporting period as follows. The project complies with the verification criteria for projects and their GHG emissions reductions or removals set out in VCS rules. The GHG statement provided herein is the responsibility of the project proponent and project conforms with the verification criteria for projects and their GHG emission reductions or removals set out in VCS Standard Version 4.4/B01-1/. The project has been implemented in accordance with the project description and subsequently validated variations (project instance inclusions and project description deviations). In the course of the verification process 05 CARs, 06 CLs and 00 FARs were raised, all the CARs and CLs are closed. No FARs were raised during the course of verification.

For the project description deviation included in the project activity, the project conforms with the validation criteria for projects set out in VCS Version 4.4/B01-1/.

The level of assurance of the verification report falls under reasonable assurance engagements as selected by the Client. The verification team verified the monitoring data for all the parameters of the monitoring plan based on the sampling measures used by the project proponent and confirms that the reported emission reductions are free from any type of material errors.

Verification period: From 27-May-2021 to 31-December-2022 (both days inclusive)

Verified GHG emission reductions and removals in the above verification period, broken down by calendar year:

Year	Baseline emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Net GHG emission reductions or removals (tCO ₂ e)
Year 2021 (27-May-2021-- 31-December-2021)	130,349	122	0	130 227
Year 2022 (01-January-2022-- 31-December-2022)	196,721	440	0	196 280
Total	327,070	562	0	326 507

The summary of emission reductions for each vintage with the comparison of values reported in the ex-ante estimates is provided below:

Year	Ex-ante emissions reductions /removals	Achieved emissions reductions/r emovals	Percent difference	Justification for the difference
Year 2021 (27-May-2021-- 31-December -2021)	205,813	130,227	37%	The value is lower than the ex-ante estimates compared to the low collection efficiency as the ex-ante estimates are based on the first order decay model and there are chances of differences. However, the values are not higher than the ex-ante estimates.
Year 2022 (01-January-2022-- 31-December -2022)	588,920	196,280	67%	The value is lower than the ex-ante estimates compared to the low collection efficiency as the ex-ante estimates are based on the first order decay model and there are chances of differences. However, the values are not higher than the ex-ante estimates.
Total	795,733	326,507	58.6 %	The value is lower than the ex-ante estimates compared to the low

				collection efficiency as the ex-ante estimates are based on the first order decay model and there are chances of differences. However, the values are not higher than the ex-ante estimates.
--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX 1: REFERENCES

S. No.	Document
/01/	Monitoring report version 1, dated 22/03/2023
/02/	Monitoring Report (final) version 1.3, dated 05/06/2023
/03/	ER spread sheet v1 corresponding to /01/
/04/	ER spread sheet v2.1 corresponding to /02/ Copy of Consolodated ER Sheet 27 May 2021 to 31 December 2022 V2.1
/05/	Flow meter Calibration data for the year 2021 & 2022 done by Energy Systems. Details are provided in section 4.5 of this report. 1. Robinson Deep Landfill 2. Marie Louise Landfill 3. Goudkoppies landfill
/06/	Gas analyser calibration data for the year 2021 & 2022 done by Energy Systems. Details are provided in section 4.5 of this report. 1. Robinson Deep Landfill 2. Marie Louise Landfill 3. Goudkoppies landfill
/07/	Span Gas calibration of gas cylinder issued by CGE SA: 1. Robinson Deep Landfill 2. Marie Louise Landfill 3. Goudkoppies landfill
/08/	Equipment Manuals for: 1. Gas Analyser 2. E&H Proline t-mass 65 Manual 3. Flare Operations Manual 4. Thermocouple Manual 5. Hour Meter Manual 6. Electricity Meters Manual 7. UV Sensor Manual
/09/	Training Certificates and records for Erick Ramalebane, Elick Mkhari (Engine Awareness Course, Gas Field Course, Analyser operation, Flare Operation)
/10/	Electricity Generation Data with the sales records for the monitoring period 27/05/2021 to 31/12/2022 1. Robinson Deep Landfill 2. Marie Louise Landfill 3. Goudkoppies landfill
/11/	Flare Trip Logs for the monitoring period 27/05/2021 to 31/12/2022 1. Robinson Deep Landfill 2. Marie Louise Landfill 3. Goudkoppies landfill
/12/	Flare Maintenance Data for the monitoring period 27/05/2021 to 31/12/2022 1. Robinson Deep Landfill 2. Marie Louise Landfill

	3. Goudkoppies landfill
/13/	Standby Generator Records for the monitoring period 27/05/2021 to 31/12/2022: 1. Diesel Volume Records and diesel tank specifications 2. Fuel purchase receipts
/14/	Span Gas Validity Letter: Speciality Gases (Pty) Ltd dated 06/02/2019
/15/	Electricity Meter: Clarification Email from Honeywell Elster for the calibration requirements dated 24/01/2019
/16/	Transmission and Distribution Losses: Eskom Annual Reports 2021 and 2022
/17/	Commissioning Certificates for the electricity generators at the landfill sites: 1. Goudkoppies landfill dated 25/04/2017 by Eskom 2. Marie Louise landfill dated 25/01/2018 by Eskom 3. Robinson Deep landfill dated 28/11/2016 by Eskom
/18/	Letter from Endress + Hauser for validity of calibration of Flow meters dated 21/11/2008
/19/	Electricity Meters Calibration for the sites (Refer §4.5 of the VR for details):: 1. Robinson Deep issued by Sanas Calibration Laboratory Elster Solutions (Pty)Ltd 2. Marie Louise issued by Sanas Calibration Laboratory Elster Solutions (Pty)Ltd & LCS Engineering (Pty)Ltd 3. Goudkoppies issued by Honeywell & LCS Engineering (Pty)Ltd
/20/	Thermocouple Functionality Checks (Details are provided in section 4.5 of this report):: 1. Robinson Deep 2. Marie Louise 3. Goudkoppies
/21/	Equipment Installation and Replacement Records (Details are provided in section 4.5 of this report): 1. Flow meter 2. Thermocouple 3. Electricity meter (Goudkoppies)
/22/	Clarification letter on the actual capacity of 3 MW for Robinson Deep landfill site issued by the Utility company for South Africa (Eskom) dated 28/11/2016
/23/	Hour Meter Data
/24/	Waste Management Licences for the landfill sites: 1. Ennerdale Permit Number Gaut 002/09-10/W0030 2. Goudkoppies Permit Number 16/2/7/C221/D11/Z1 3. Linbro Park Permit Number 16/2/7/A210/D173/Z1/P1 4. Marie Louise permit number 16/2/7/C221/D11/Z3/P65 5. Robinson Deep permit number 16/2/7/C221/D11/Z2
/25/	1. Declaration from City of Joburg and PickItUp confirming ENERGY Joburg RF (PTY) Limited's sole rights on the carbon credits generated dated 19/05/2023 2. Email sent to Eskom notifying sole right on the VCU's generated dated 03/05/2023

/26/	Declaration by PP on no claim from any other Carbon Program dated 05/06/2023
/27/	Community Engagement Activities: 1. Attendance Sheet 2. Minutes of meeting 3. Agenda for Minutes of Meeting
/28/	1. Service Maintenance Sheets from 02/02/2021 to 08/12/2022; 05/01/2023 2. Oil Collection receipts 01/04/2021, 13/01/2020, 08/03/2022, 26/05/2023, 24/02/2023, 04/11/2022
/B01/	1. VCS Standard, version 04.4 2. VCS Program Guide version 04.3 3. VCS Validation and Verification Manual, version 03.2 4. Registration and Issuance Process v4.3 5. VCS Program Definitions version 04.3
/B02/	Large Scale CDM Methodology ACM0001: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources, Version 19.0
/B03/	1. VCS MR Template version 4.2
/B04/	1. Registered CDM PDD (version 12 dated 26/09/2020 and the corresponding Validation Report 2. VCS PD (version 09 dated 03/03/2023) and the corresponding Validation Report
/B05/	Websites: 1. http://cdm.unfccc.int/ 2. www.ipcc.ch 3. https://www.sanas.co.za 4. https://www.ipu.co.uk/en590/

APPENDIX 2: ABBREVIATIONS

BAU	Business As Usual
CA	Corrective Action / Clarification Action
CER	Certified Emission Reduction
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CC IPL	Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd.
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CEB	Central Electricity Board
CER	Certified Emission Reduction
CL	Clarification Request
CO₂	Carbon Dioxide
CO_{2e}	Carbon Dioxide Equivalent
DOE	Designated Operational Entities
DVR	Draft Validation Report
EB	CDM Executive Board
EF	Emission Factor
FA	Final Approval
FAR	Forward Action Request
FVR	Final validation Report
GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
GK	Goudkoppies Landfill Site
GWh	Giga Watt Hour
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LFG	Landfill Gas
ML	Marie Louise Landfill site
MW	Megawatts
MWh	Mega Watt Hour
OSV	On Site Visit
QC/QA	Quality control/ Quality assurance
RD	Robinson Deep Landfill site
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
TA	Technical Area
TR	Technical Review
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNPA	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change CDM Project Activity

VER	Verified Emission Reduction
VCS	Verified Carbon Standard
VCU	Verified Carbon Units
VVB	Validation / Verification Body

APPENDIX 3: COMPETENCY CERTIFICATE



Carbon Check (India) Private Limited

Certificate of Competency

Mr. Anubhav Dimri

has been qualified as per CCIPL's internal qualification procedures in accordance with the requirements of CDM AS (V7.0), ISO/IEC 14065:2020, ISO/IEC 17029:2019 and other applicable GHG programs:

for the following functions and requirements:

☒ Validator	☒ Verifier	☒ Team Leader	☒ Technical Expert
☒ Technical Reviewer	☐ Health Expert	☐ Gender Expert	☐ Plastic Waste Expert
☒ SDG+	☒ Social no-harm(S+)	☒ Environment no-harm(E+)	☐ CCB Expert
☒ Financial Expert	☒ Local Expert for India, South Africa and Spanish speaking countries		

in the following Technical Areas:

☒ TA 1.1	☒ TA 1.2	☐ TA 2.1	☒ TA 3.1	☐ TA 4.1
☐ TA 4. n	☐ TA 5.1	☐ TA 5.2	☐ TA 7.1	☒ TA 8.1
☐ TA 9.1	☐ TA 9.2	☐ TA 10.1	☒ TA 13.1	☐ TA 13.2
☐ TA 14.1	☐ TA 15.1			

Issue Date

1st January 2023

Expiry Date

31st December 2023



Mr. Vikash Kumar Singh
Compliance Officer



Mr. Amit Anand
CEO

CCIPL_FM 7.9 Certificate of Competency_V2.1_012023



Carbon Check (India) Private Limited

Certificate of Competency

Mr. Rohit Singh

has been qualified as per CCIPL's internal qualification procedures in accordance with the requirements of CDM AS (V7.0), ISO/IEC 14065:2020, ISO/IEC 17029:2019 and other applicable GHG programs:

for the following functions and requirements:

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| ☐ Validator | ☐ Verifier | ☐ Team Leader | ☒ Technical Expert |
| ☐ Technical Reviewer | ☐ Health Expert | ☐ Gender Expert | ☐ Plastic Waste Expert |
| ☐ SDG+ | ☐ Social no-harm(S+) | ☐ Environment no-harm(E+) | ☐ CCB Expert |
| ☐ Financial Expert | ☒ Local Expert for India | | |

in the following Technical Areas:

- | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| ☐ TA 1.1 | ☐ TA 1.2 | ☐ TA 2.1 | ☐ TA 3.1 | ☐ TA 4.1 |
| ☐ TA 4. n | ☐ TA 5.1 | ☐ TA 5.2 | ☐ TA 7.1 | ☐ TA 8.1 |
| ☐ TA 9.1 | ☐ TA 9.2 | ☐ TA 10.1 | ☒ TA 13.1 | ☐ TA 13.2 |
| ☐ TA 14.1 | ☐ TA 15.1 | | | |

Issue Date

25th April 2023

Expiry Date

24th April 2024



Mr. Vikash Kumar Singh
Compliance Officer



Mr. Amit Anand
CEO



Carbon Check (India) Private Limited

Certificate of Competency

Mr. S. Ranganathan

has been qualified as per CCIPL's internal qualification procedures in accordance with the requirements of CDM AS (V7.0), ISO/IEC 14065:2020, ISO/IEC 17029:2019 and other applicable GHG programs:

for the following functions and requirements:

- | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| ☒ Validator | ☒ Verifier | ☒ Team Leader | ☒ Technical Expert |
| ☒ Technical Reviewer | ☐ Health Expert | ☐ Gender Expert | ☐ Plastic Waste Expert |
| ☒ SDG+ | ☒ Social no-harm(S+) | ☒ Environment no-harm(E+) | ☐ CCB Expert |
| ☒ Financial Expert | ☒ Local Expert for India | | |

in the following Technical Areas:

- | | | | | |
|--|--|----------------------------------|---|---|
| ☒ TA 1.1 | ☒ TA 1.2 | ☐ TA 2.1 | ☒ TA 3.1 | ☐ TA 4.1 |
| ☐ TA 4. n | ☒ TA 5.1 | ☐ TA 5.2 | ☐ TA 7.1 | ☐ TA 8.1 |
| ☐ TA 9.1 | ☐ TA 9.2 | ☐ TA 10.1 | ☒ TA 13.1 | ☒ TA 13.2 |
| ☐ TA 14.1 | ☐ TA 15.1 | | | |

Issue Date

1st January 2023

Expiry Date

31st December 2023



Mr. Vikash Kumar Singh
Compliance Officer



Mr. Amit Anand
CEO

APPENDIX 4: LIST OF FINDINGS

TABLE 1: CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUESTS (CARs) AND CLARIFICATION REQUESTS (CLs)

Finding	CAR 01		
Classification	☒ CAR	☐ CL	☐ FAR
Description of finding (VVB)	In accordance with the requirements of the §3.5.4 of the VCS Standard, version 4.4, PP has not used the latest version of the form for the monitoring report.		
Corrective Action or clarification #1 (PP shall write a detailed and clear corrective action or further information for clarification as per finding)	The latest version of the MR namely V4.2 has been used and the information transferred from the submitted MR to the latest version.		
VVB Assessment #1 The assessment shall encompass all open issues in the finding. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and VVB assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.	The MR has been updated to the latest available version of the MR, i.e. version 4.2. CAR01 is closed.		
Conclusion Tick the appropriate checkbox	☐ To be checked during the next periodic verification ☐ Outstanding finding (not closed) ☒ The finding is closed		

Finding	CAR 02		
Classification	☒ CAR	☐ CL	☐ FAR
Description of finding (VVB)	In accordance with the requirements of the §3.23.7 to §3.23.9 of the VCS Standard, version 4.4, PP shall provide the supply chain emissions in the revised MR template.		
Corrective Action or clarification #1 (PP shall write a detailed and clear corrective action or further information for clarification as per finding)	The PP produced electricity that forms part of Scope 2 emissions for the end user. None the less the PP has sent an email to the buyer as required in terms of §3.23.9 of the VCS Standard. The buyer is the national utility that aggregates the electricity across all the users in South Africa. As we do not know the end users we are not able to comply with §3.23.7. The electricity produced forms part of scope 2 emissions for all users in South Africa.		

	We would note that the renewable electricity that is supplied to Eskom reduces the Grid Emission Factor and in turn reduces the quantum claimable for Grid Displaced ERs. Ultimately if all the electrical power was produced from renewables then the Grid Emission factor would be zero and the end user would not be able offset these emission by any other means. The PP has noted the number ER's in MR that are subject to the above. These are limited to the grid displacement ERs.
VVB Assessment #1 The assessment shall encompass all open issues in the finding. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and VVB assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.	PP has provided an email sent to the Eskom for the electricity sold from the project activity. The confirmation from Eskom has not been provided. Furthermore, such confirmations from other participants in the supply chain and that may have a claim in the emission reductions such as City of Joburg, PickItUp etc. are not provided. CAR02 remains open.
Corrective Action or clarification #2 (PP shall write a detailed and clear corrective action or further information for clarification as per finding)	Please find attached letter from the Environment Infrastructure and Services Department (EISD) within the City Of Joburg. This department within the City is responsible for oversight and management of Pickup and with whom ENERGY Joburg have the gas rights contract to utilise the landfill gas from the landfill sites owned by the City. They have signed a letter acknowledging that the City and Pickup will not claim any environmental benefits from the project activities and they approve that the emission reduction be issued to ENERGY Joburg. This is in line with the contract in place between the parties.
VVB Assessment #2 The assessment shall encompass all open issues in the finding. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and VVB assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.	PP has provided a letter by City of Joburg confirming that City of Joburg and Pickup will not claim any environmental benefits from the project activities and they approve that the emission reduction be issued to ENERGY Joburg. Based on the letter it is confirmed that the project activity complies with the §3.23.7 to §3.23.9 of the VCS Standard, version 4.4. CAR02 is closed.
Conclusion Tick the appropriate checkbox	☐ To be checked during the next periodic verification ☐ Outstanding finding (not closed) ☒ The finding is closed

Finding	CAR 03		
Classification	☒ CAR	☐ CL	☐ FAR

Description of finding (VVB)	In accordance with the §3.18.5 of the VCS Standard, version 4.4, PP shall provide the details of the ongoing communication in the section 2.2 of the MR. This shall include the comments received during the monitoring period and the resolution provided for the same.
Corrective Action or clarification #1 (PP shall write a detailed and clear corrective action or further information for clarification as per finding)	The PP have included details of the meetings that have been held and outlined the types of comments and or queries that have been received in the updated MR.
VVB Assessment #1 The assessment shall encompass all open issues in the finding. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and VVB assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.	PP has included the details of the meeting that have been held during the monitoring period and confirmed that no comments have been received from the local stakeholders. The attendance sheet and minutes as mentioned in the section 2.2 of the MR have not been provided to the verification team. CAR03 remains open.
Corrective Action or clarification #2 (PP shall write a detailed and clear corrective action or further information for clarification as per finding)	These have been provided in the folder titled Public Engagement. In the folder is the following: The Agenda for the EMC 24 February 2023 (Environmental Monitoring Committee) Minutes of EMC 24 February 2023 (includes attendance register) Minutes of EMC 18 November 2022 (includes attendance register)
VVB Assessment #2 The assessment shall encompass all open issues in the finding. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and VVB assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.	Based on the minutes of meeting submitted for the local stakeholder meetings during the monitoring period, it is confirmed that no comments have been received from the local stakeholders. CAR03 is closed.
Conclusion Tick the appropriate checkbox	☐ To be checked during the next periodic verification ☐ Outstanding finding (not closed) ☒ The finding is closed

Finding	CAR 04		
Classification	☒ CAR	☐ CL	☐ FAR

Description of finding (VVB)	1. In section 4.2 of the MR and the ER sheet, for the parameter, $EG_{PJ,y}$, PP has provided the generation data based on the full month of May 2021 instead of 27 May 2021 onwards. 2. The electricity consumption formula in the Project emissions workbook of the ER sheet, does not take into account consumption for the month of May 2021 as the formula deducts May 2021 number from December 2022.
Corrective Action or clarification #1 (PP shall write a detailed and clear corrective action or further information for clarification as per finding)	1- This error has been corrected. The correction was to divide the total by 31 days for number of days in May and multiplied by 5 days to only account for the days from 27th May to the end of the month. The values have been adjusted throughout the document. 2- This has been corrected from Robinson Deep by adding the April reading and calculating the consumption from the 27th May 2021 to the end of May 2021 and adding this to the total. For Marie Louise the utility bill for June runs from 5 May 2021 to 6 June 2021 so we have used this value to calculate the portion from the 27 May to the end of May and corrected the total formula to account for the changes. All values through the document have been adjusted.
VVB Assessment #1 The assessment shall encompass all open issues in the finding. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and VVB assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.	1. PP has clarified that the error was rectified by adjusting the data for 5 days from the total of 31 days. PP shall provide the calculations based on the daily monitored data. CAR04.1 remains open. 2. PP has clarified that the formula has been corrected in the ER sheet based on the days of consumption. PP shall provide the calculations based on the daily monitored data. CAR04.2 remains open.
Corrective Action or clarification #2 (PP shall write a detailed and clear corrective action or further information for clarification as per finding)	-1 The calculation has been changed to the sum of the hourly export readings from the 27th to the 31 May 2021. The data is reflected in the payment certificate for each site on an hourly basis and can be extracted from the payment certificates and included in the ER calculation sheet. The values have been adjusted throughout the document. -2 Unlike the above export meter the import meters are three phase simple display meters and do not provide downloaded data. These readings are taken manually on a monthly basis and or supplied by the utility in the form of a bill. As such we are only able to

	use the monthly data reading. We have taken the electricity consumed for the month and divided it by the number of days in the month and allocated the consumption for the period from the 27 May to 31 May 2021.
VVB Assessment #2 The assessment shall encompass all open issues in the finding. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and VVB assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.	1. PP has updated the calculations based on the hourly export readings from 27/05/2021 to 31/05/2021. CAR04.1 is closed. 2. PP has clarified that the data for the import meters is not available on daily/ hourly basis and thus monthly data has been used. PP shall justify the accuracy and conservativeness of the value used for the days, if the values are not available on a daily basis. CAR04.2 remains open.
Corrective Action or clarification #3 (PP shall write a detailed and clear corrective action or further information for clarification as per finding)	2. The PD notes in the QC section that the meters are not serviceable units as per OEM specifications so the accuracy of the meters is not in question. In order to be conservative we have taken the weighted average and added 50% onto this parameter. We have adjusted the MR and ER calculation sheet accordingly.
VVB Assessment #3 The assessment shall encompass all open issues in the finding. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and VVB assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.	1. Closed. 2. PP has provided the electricity consumption data based on the monthly consumption and apportioned the value across the days of the month along with allocating conservative estimate of 50% added to the value. Since, the monitoring frequency of the parameter is annual, the approach is acceptable to the verification team as it gives conservative estimate. CAR04.2 is closed.
Conclusion Tick the appropriate checkbox	☐ To be checked during the next periodic verification ☐ Outstanding finding (not closed) ☒ The finding is closed

Finding	CAR 05		
Classification	☒ CAR	☐ CL	☐ FAR
Description of finding (VVB)	1. In section 4.1 and 4.2 of the MR, the subscripts have not been provided for the ex-ante and monitored parameters such as GWP_{CH4}, EF_{EL} or $EF_{grid, CM, y}$ etc. 2. In section 4.2 of the MR, the value of the parameter TDL_y is not provided in internationally recognizable format. PP shall ensure that all the values provided in the MR		

	are in accordance with the format required as per the MR template.
Corrective Action or clarification #1 (PP shall write a detailed and clear corrective action or further information for clarification as per finding)	1- Section 4.1 and 4.2 have been corrected to correctly reflect the subscripts throughout. 2- The format of the parameter has been corrected by removing the (,) and inserting (.).
VVB Assessment #1 The assessment shall encompass all open issues in the finding. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and VVB assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.	1. The notations for the parameters have been rectified in the section 4.1 and 4.2 of the MR. CAR05.1 is closed. 2. The format of the numbers has been rectified in the section 4.2 of the MR. CAR05.2 is closed.
Conclusion Tick the appropriate checkbox	☐ To be checked during the next periodic verification ☐ Outstanding finding (not closed) ☒ The finding is closed

Finding	CL 01
Classification	☐ CAR ☒ CL ☐ FAR
Description of finding (VVB)	1. In section 1.9 of the MR, the monitoring period 27 May 2021 to 31 December 2022 has been provided under CDM. PP shall clarify if the double counting across CDM and VCS has been done for the project activity for the same monitoring period. 2. PP shall provide a declaration confirming that PP is not claiming emission reductions from the same project activity across different carbon programs.
Corrective Action or clarification #1 (PP shall write a detailed and clear corrective action or further information for clarification as per finding)	1- This volume noted in the last line is for this MR and not for CDM, we have added wording to the introduction to reflect that this is for both UNFCCC and VERRA issuance applications. 2- This declaration is contained in the VCS ISSUANCE DEED OF REPRESENTATION Please find the above attached to this response and the declaration is contained section 2.2.4 of the deed.
VVB Assessment #1 The assessment shall encompass all open issues in the finding. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action	1. The statement has been revised in the section 1.9 of the MR. However, it is still confusing. PP shall clearly provide the monitoring periods under CDM and VERRA separately. CL01.1 remains open.

and VVB assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.	2. The issuance deed has been provided by the project activity however, declaration confirming that emission reductions are not claimed under any other standard during the same monitoring period is not provided. CL01.2 remains open.
Corrective Action or clarification #2 (PP shall write a detailed and clear corrective action or further information for clarification as per finding)	-1 we have added the issuance registry next each issuance batch to remove any confusion. -2 Please read clause 2.2.4 of the of the VCS ISSUANCE DEED OF REPRESENTATION as it specifically states: “2.2.4 I have not submitted, sought, requested or received any recognition of the Reductions generated by the Project during the Verification Period and for which I am requesting VCU issuance from any GHG Program other than under the VCS Program or as any other form of GHG- or renewable energy-related environmental credit”. The above statement in the deed covers that the ERs for this monitoring period (same as verification period) will not be submitted to any other GHG Program or any other form thereof. If this is acceptable to VERRA it should acceptable for the purpose of the audit.
VVB Assessment #2 The assessment shall encompass all open issues in the finding. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and VVB assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.	1. PP has provided the different vintages of emission reductions claimed in different GHG Programs for the project activity in the section 1.9 of the MR. CL01.1 is closed. 2. PP shall submit a separate declaration as has been requested by Verra for other projects as well that are registered with other GHG schemes in addition to VCS. CL01.2 remains open.
Corrective Action or clarification #3 (PP shall write a detailed and clear corrective action or further information for clarification as per finding)	2. Please find an additional declaration attached with this report.
VVB Assessment #3 The assessment shall encompass all open issues in the finding. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and VVB assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.	1. Closed. 2. PP has provided a declaration confirming that the project is not claiming emission reductions from any other program than VCS. CL01.2 is closed.

Conclusion Tick the appropriate checkbox	☐ To be checked during the next periodic verification ☐ Outstanding finding (not closed) ☒ The finding is closed
--	--

Finding	CL 02
Classification	☐ CAR ☒ CL ☐ FAR
Description of finding (VVB)	1. In section 1.11 of the MR, the Table 1 has not been completed in accordance with the SDG Metadata for the SDGs. 2. In accordance with the §3.17.1 of the VCS Standard, version 4.4, PP shall demonstrate that the project activity complies with at least 3 SDGs.
Corrective Action or clarification #1 (PP shall write a detailed and clear corrective action or further information for clarification as per finding)	1- These have been updated with required data. 2- The PP has added an additional SDG to the table as reflected in the PD with the current values.
VVB Assessment #1 The assessment shall encompass all open issues in the finding. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and VVB assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.	1. The SDGs have been revised in accordance with the registered PD. CL02.1 is closed. 2. The SDGs have been aligned with the registered PD. CL02.2 is closed.
Conclusion Tick the appropriate checkbox	☐ To be checked during the next periodic verification ☐ Outstanding finding (not closed) ☒ The finding is closed

Finding	CL 03
Classification	☐ CAR ☒ CL ☐ FAR
Description of finding (VVB)	In section 2.1 of the MR, PP shall provide the No Net Harm analysis in accordance with the registered PD.
Corrective Action or clarification #1 (PP shall write a detailed and clear corrective action or further information for clarification as per finding)	The text from the PD was copied into section 2.1 of the MR.

VVB Assessment #1 The assessment shall encompass all open issues in the finding. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and VVB assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.	The DNH assessment in the section 2.1 of the MR has been revised in accordance with the registered PD. CL03 is closed.
Conclusion Tick the appropriate checkbox	☐ To be checked during the next periodic verification ☐ Outstanding finding (not closed) ☒ The finding is closed

Finding	CL 04
Classification	☐ CAR ☒ CL ☐ FAR
Description of finding (VVB)	In section 4.2 of the MR, PP has provided the Waste Management Licenses for Ennerdale, Goudkoppies, Robinson Deep and Marie Louise landfills. The Waste Management License for Linbro Park site has not been provided.
Corrective Action or clarification #1 (PP shall write a detailed and clear corrective action or further information for clarification as per finding)	This has now been provided and included in the supporting documents and permit number included in MR.
VVB Assessment #1 The assessment shall encompass all open issues in the finding. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and VVB assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.	The Waste Management License for Linbro Park has been provided and the details have been updated in the section 4.2 of the MR. CL04 is closed.
Conclusion Tick the appropriate checkbox	☐ To be checked during the next periodic verification ☐ Outstanding finding (not closed) ☒ The finding is closed

Finding	CL 05
Classification	☐ CAR ☒ CL ☐ FAR
Description of finding (VVB)	- In section 4.2 of the MR, for parameter $EG_{PJ,y}$, the meter for Goudkoppies site was removed for calibration. PP shall clarify how the consumption data was recorded during the replacement. - In section 4.2 of the MR, for parameter $TEG_{,m}$ 'Description of measurement methods and

	procedures to be applied' shall be provided in accordance with the registered PD. 3. The functionality checks provided for the parameter TEG_m do not comply with the 3 monthly requirement as per the PD. 4. In section 4.2 of the MR, for parameter $EC_{PJ,j,y}$, consumption data is not available for RD in the month of October 2021. Also, there is no change in consumption data for RD from July 2021 to September 2021. 5. In section 4.2 of the MR, for parameter $EC_{PJ,j,y}$, the calibration was done during the monitoring period at Goudkoppies site and the meter was removed on 23/08/2022. PP shall clarify how the electricity data was recorded during the period. 6. The flow rate for flare of Goudkoppies spiked suddenly in the month of October 2022. PP shall provide the reason for the same. 7. In section 4.2 of the MR, for parameter $FC_{i,j,y}$, the calibration was carried out on 28/04/2021 and 27/05/2022. PP shall clarify the validity of the calibration as the frequency of calibration is annual as per the registered PD. 8. In section 4.2 of the MR, for parameter $v_{i,t,wb}$, Gas analyzer with serial number 17269 has been used at RD and ML locations. PP shall clarify if the same analyzer has been installed at both the locations. 9. In section 4.2 of the MR, for parameter $v_{i,t,wb}$, the last calibrations have been done on 25/11/2022 during the monitoring period for RD, ML and GK. PP shall clarify how the calibrations meet the requirements for the whole monitoring period. 10. In section 4.2 of the MR, for parameter $M_{t,wb}$, the calibration validity is 3 years. However, for meter with serial number 99047602000, the validity period is 4 years. 11. In section 4.2 of the MR, for parameter $Flame_m$, the testing frequency is not provided.
Corrective Action or clarification #1 (PP shall write a detailed and clear corrective action or further information for clarification as per finding)	1- The GK site uses net metering and uses its own generated power for site load. This site does not have a separate power supply for consumption. For exported power we used the Buyers check meter to supply the data for the period that the main meter was in for calibration. 2- This has been corrected to match the wording in PD.

	3- The wording of this parameter has been corrected to reflect that the functionality test is conducted every three months. 4- The electricity meter was faulty and was the replaced. I have taken the consumption value for the month of December and added it to the period from July to September in order to account for consumption and to be conservative 5- Please see the response to item 1 above as this is the same meter. 6- We cannot see a spike in overall flow but these was a period where the flare ran for a longer period that is normal. This would have been due to a problem with the generation plant and it not being able to run and this flags a high flare flow as all the gas is then burned by the flare. 7- This was a delayed calibration as the service provider was not available within the time frame required. The delay period is just under a month. However the volume of the FC used is cross checked with the fuel slips from the supplier so the values used as conservative. 8- This analyser was installed on the 2/11/2021 and taken out on the 29/11/2021 and returned to the supplier as it was reading out of range. The supplier provided a service report for the unit on the 30/05/2022. Copy attached with this response. We received the unit back into stores shortly after. The serviced unit was then installed at Marie Louise on the 4/10/2022. Hence the same serial number. 9- We have added the data up to and including the first week in January as cover the full period. The MR states that the calibration is done monthly when in fact we do this weekly to ensure compliance. 10- This has been corrected in the MR to 2024 and not 2025. 11- The PD does not provide a test frequency. We test the parameter every three months with the Thermocouple functionality test. We only started recording these tests in 2022 when the new PD was finalized. It is important to note that the flare program will not start or run if the UV sensor doe not work correctly.
VVB Assessment #1 The assessment shall encompass all open issues in the finding. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action	1. PP has clarified that the data for the GK site is based on the backup meter installed by the buyer. PP shall also provide the calibration details for the backup meter to the verification team. CL05.1 remains open.

and VVB assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.	2. 'Description of measurement methods and procedures to be applied' has been updated for TEG_m parameter in the section 4.2 of the MR. CL05.2 is closed. 3. The calibration requirements for the functionality checks have been revised in the section 4.2 of the MR. CL05.3 is closed. 4. PP shall clarify how the approach meets the requirements of the methodology and can be considered conservative. CL05.4 remains open. 5. PP has provided a clarification in the response for item 1. CL05.5 is closed. 6. PP has provided a clarification that the spike was noticed in the overall flow and thus is accepted by the verification team. CL05.6 is closed. 7. PP shall refer Appendix of the VVS for project activities, v3 for the delay in calibration. CL05.7 remains open. 8. PP has clarified that the meter was replaced from RD and calibrated by the manufacturer and then installed at ML. CL05.8 is closed. 9. PP has clarified that the calibration frequency is monthly. However, the last calibration was done on 25/11/2022 and the next one on 06/01/2023. PP shall clarify, how the calibration meets the required frequency. Furthermore, the calibration records for GK site have not been provided. CL05.9 remains open. 10. The calibration period has been revised in the MR. CL05.10 is closed. 11. PP has clarified that the thermocouple functionality test are conducted every three months. For, UV sensors, PP has clarified that they have been installed in 2022. However, PP shall also clarify how the project adheres to the requirement prior to that. Also, PP shall provide the calibration/ testing requirements for sensor in accordance with the manufacturer specifications. CL05.11 remains open.
Corrective Action or clarification #2 (PP shall write a detailed and clear corrective action or further information for clarification as per finding)	1. Please find attached herewith the meter details, on page 175 of the specification document it states that the meter does not require recalibration after procurement and also states the meters compliance with various international standards. Please note that the test only took the meter out of use for two days and the reading of the meter are always compared to the buyers check meter.

	4. The consumption value has been adjusted by a factor of 1.5 times (150%) the normal consumption rate to ensure conservatism. This value has been applied for the entire period and values adjusted in the MR. 7. The accuracy of the ruler yielded a 95.45 % confidence reading for the first calibration and 95.45% for the second calibration. The values for the period of April and May were increased by multiplying them by 1/95.45 in order to be conservative as this is maximum potential error. Values corrected through the MR and ER calculation sheet. 9. Please note that the PD does not state a frequency for calibration using span gas. As such we use the OEM requirements as a guideline. For the Guardian Units the recommended frequency by the manufacturer is every 12 months. We however adopted a more stringent program and test on a weekly basis. The break in December is due to the annual leave taken by staff over this period. This in no way impacts the validity of the calibration frequency and or accuracy of the instrument as the calibration is still well within the recommended frequency by the OEM standards. For Goudkoppies the site used a Siemens instrument that has a self-calibrating function and only requires an annual service calibration intervention. This is reflected in the EOM manual and as such there are no records for calibration for this site other than the annual service and calibration sheet. This instrument was changed out after the end of the monitoring period but before the audit. During the site visit you would have seen the replacement instrument which is the Guardian unit which is the same as the other plants. 11. The parameter Flame_m is only applicable to the UV sensor. Please note that the plant has always had the UV sensors as this safety function as the flare plant cannot run if it does not see a flame using the UV sensor. This is covered in the OEM manual. We have always tested this along with the thermocouples but we do not document this. We have corrected the MR to align with the PD and added the
--	--

	dates on which the UV sensors have been replaced.
VVB Assessment #2 The assessment shall encompass all open issues in the finding. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and VVB assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.	1. PP has provided the manufacturer specifications for the backup meter to clarify that the backup meter doesn't require recalibration. CL05.1 is closed. 2. Closed. 3. Closed. 4. PP shall apply appropriate deviation in case of any changes in the monitoring plan. CL05.2 remains open. 5. Closed. 6. Closed. 7. PP has applied measures as provided in the Appendix of the VVS for project activities, v3 for the delay in calibration. CL05.7 is closed. 8. Closed. 9. PP shall provide the reference document for the calibration frequency requirement for the Guardian Gas Analyzer units. CL05.9 remains open. 10. Closed. 11. PP has clarified that the UV sensors for the flame detection were always in place and replacement logs during the monitoring period have been provided in the MR. CL05.11 is closed.
Corrective Action or clarification #3 (PP shall write a detailed and clear corrective action or further information for clarification as per finding)	4. We have noted the temporary deviation for this parameter in section 3.2.1 of the MR and adopted a conservative calculation of the project emissions by adding an additional 50% onto the average consumption values after the deviation was over. This is in line with section 3.19.1 of the standard. 9. Please find the operations manual for the guardian units attached and reference page 23. We have attached the extract below for convenience. "The Guardian NG is inherently stable and will maintain its calibration over extended periods with minimal maintenance. In normal use, the calibration should be checked every 12 months. Any adjustment should be small."

VVB Assessment #3 The assessment shall encompass all open issues in the finding. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and VVB assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.	1. Closed. 2. Closed. 3. Closed. 4. PP has applied a methodology deviation to the project activity in accordance with the §3.19.1 of the VCS Standard, v4.4. CL05.4 is closed. 5. Closed. 6. Closed. 7. Closed. 8. Closed. 9. PP has provided the operations manual of the guardian Gas analyzer units to clarify that the calibration should be checked for the units every 12 months. Since, the calibration frequency is not provided in the PD, the applied calibration is acceptable to the verification team. CL05.9 is closed. 10. Closed. 11. Closed.
Conclusion Tick the appropriate checkbox	☐ To be checked during the next periodic verification ☐ Outstanding finding (not closed) ☒ The finding is closed

Finding	CL 06
Classification	☐ CAR ☒ CL ☐ FAR
Description of finding (VVB)	1. In section 5.4 of the MR, for the year 2022, PP shall also provide the applicable dates during the monitoring period. 2. In section 5.4 of the MR, the table with comparison of values reported in the ex-ante estimates is not provided.
Corrective Action or clarification #1 (PP shall write a detailed and clear corrective action or further information for clarification as per finding)	1- This has been added to the MR. 2- The table was included in the updated version 4.2 of the MR and completed accordingly.
VVB Assessment #1 The assessment shall encompass all open issues in the finding. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and VVB assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.	1. The dates for the year 2022 have been provided in the section 5.4 of the MR. CL06.1 is closed. 2. The table for comparison with ex-ante estimates is provided in the section 5.4 of the MR. CL06.2 is closed.

Conclusion Tick the appropriate checkbox	☐ To be checked during the next periodic verification
	☐ Outstanding finding (not closed)
	☒ The finding is closed

TABLE 2: FORWARD ACTION REQUESTS

No FAR has been raised in this monitoring period.

Finding	FAR xx		
Classification	☐ CAR	☐ CL	☐ FAR
Description of finding (VVB)			
Corrective Action or clarification #1 (PP shall write a detailed and clear corrective action or further information for clarification as per finding)			
VVB Assessment #1 The assessment shall encompass all open issues in the finding. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and VVB assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.			
Conclusion Tick the appropriate checkbox	☐ To be checked during the next periodic verification ☐ Outstanding finding (not closed) ☐ The finding is closed		