



Industrie Service

Choose certainty.
Add value.

Determination Report

DETERMINATION OF THE JI TRACK-1 PROJECT:
“NITROPOROS NITROUS OXIDE ABATEMENT
PROJECT”

REPORT No. 600500172

30 August 2011

TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH
Carbon Management Service
Westendstr. 199 - 80686 Munich – GERMANY



Report No.	Date of first issue	Revision No.	Date of this revision	Certificate No.
600500172	27/06/2011	4.0	30/08/2011	-

Subject: Determination of a JI track-1 project		
Accredited TÜV SÜD Unit: TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH Certification Body "climate and energy" Westendstr. 199 80686 Munich Germany		TÜV SÜD Contract Partner: TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH Certification Body "climate and energy" Westendstr. 199 80686 Munich Germany
Project Participants: InterAgro - S.C. Nitroporos S.R.L.		Project Site(s): City of Fagaras, County of Brasov, Romania
Project title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project		
Applied methodology / Version:	JI specific approach based on AM0034 / version 05.1.0	Scope(s): 5 TA(s): 5.1 and 5.2
First PDD Version: Date of issuance: 01/12/2010 Version No.: 01 Publishing date: 25/03/2011		Final PDD version: Date of issuance: 29/08/2011 Version No.: 2.2
Estimated Annual Emission Reduction:		172,732 tCO ₂ e (average over 1,5 years within the first commitment period)
Assessment Team Leader: Olena Maslova		Further Assessment Team Members: Constantin Zaharia
Summary of the Determination Opinion:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of all stated criteria. In our opinion, the project meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the JI as well as all the requirements set by host country (Romania) for approving projects under JI track 1. Hence, TÜV SÜD will recommend the project for further approval and registration by the DFP of Romania. <input type="checkbox"/> The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have not provided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of all stated criteria. Hence, TÜV SÜD will not recommend the project for registration by the DFP of the host country as a JI track-1 project and will inform the project participants and the Romanian DFP on this decision.		



Abbreviations

AM	Approved Methodology
AOR	Ammonia Oxidation Reactor
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CL	Clarification Request
DFP	Designated Focal Point
DVM	Determination and Verification Manual
EF	Emission Factor
EIA / EA	Environmental Impact Assessment / Environmental Assessment
ER	Emission Reduction
ERUs	Emission Reduction Unit(s)
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Greenhouse gas(s)
GWP	Global Warming Potential
Heraeus	W.C. Heraeus GmbH
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IRL	Information Reference List
JI	Joint Implementation
JISC	Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee
KP	Kyoto Protocol
MMP	Ministry of Environment and Forestry of Romania
MP	Monitoring Plan
NDIR	Non-Dispersive Infrared Spectroscopy
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
PDD	Project Design Document
PP	Project Participant
TÜV SÜD	TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change



Table of Contents		Page
1	INTRODUCTION	5
1.1	Objective	5
1.2	Scope	5
2	METHODOLOGY	6
2.1	Appointment of the Assessment Team	7
2.2	Review of Documents	8
2.3	Follow-up Interviews.....	8
2.4	Cross-check	9
2.5	Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests	9
2.6	Internal Quality Control.....	9
3	SUMMARY	10
3.1	Approval	10
3.2	Participation.....	10
3.3	Project design document.....	10
3.4	Project description.....	10
3.5	Baseline and monitoring methodology	12
3.5.1	Applicability of the selected methodology.....	12
3.5.2	Project boundary.....	12
3.5.3	Baseline identification	12
3.5.4	Algorithm and/or formulae used to determine emission reductions.....	13
3.6	Additionality	16
3.7	Monitoring plan.....	16
3.8	Local stakeholder consultation	17
3.9	Environmental impacts.....	17
4	COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOS	18
5	DETERMINATION OPINION.....	19

Annex 1: Determination Protocol

Annex 2: Information Reference List

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

The determination objective is an independent assessment by a Third Party (Accredited Independent Entity, AIE) of a proposed project activity against all defined criteria set for the registration under the Joint Implementation scheme (JI).

The assessment involves the evaluation of the project basis and design identified in the Project Design Document (PDD) using the defined criteria outlined by the registration under the Joint Implementation scheme (JI). Determination is part of the JI project cycle and results in a conclusion by the executing AIE on whether or not a project activity is valid to be submitted for approval to the Designated Focal Point DFP of the host country. The ultimate decision on the registration of a proposed project activity rests with the Parties involved.

The project activity discussed by this determination report has been submitted under the project title: *Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project*.

1.2 Scope

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

- The Kyoto Protocol, in particular § 6
- Decision 2/CMP1 and Decision 3/CMP.1 (Marrakech Accords)
- Further COP/MOP decisions with reference to the JI (e.g. decisions 9/CMP.1)
- Decisions by the JISC published under <http://ji.unfccc.int>
- Specific guidance by the JISC published under <http://ji.unfccc.int>
- Guidelines for Completing the Project Design Document (JI-PDD)
- The applied approved CDM methodology(s)
- The technical environment of the project (technical scope)
- Internal and national standards on monitoring and QA/QC
- Technical guideline and information on best practice

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

Once TÜV SÜD receives an initial PDD version, it is made publicly available on TÜV SÜD's website, which initiates a 30 day global stakeholder consultation process. In case of any request a PDD might be revised and the final PDD will form the basis for the final evaluation as presented in this report. Information on the initial and on the final PDD version is presented on page 1.

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

2 METHODOLOGY

The project assessment applies standard auditing techniques to assess the correctness of the information provided by the PPs. The assessment is based on the latest version of Joint Implementation Determination and Verification Manual. The work starts with appointment of team covering the technical scope(s), sectoral scope(s) and relevant host country experience for evaluating the JI project activity. Once the project is made public available, members of the team carry out the desk review, follow-up actions, resolution of issues identified and finally preparation of the determination report. The prepared determination report and other supporting documents then undergo an internal quality control by the CB “climate and energy” before submission to the DFP of the host country.

In order to ensure transparency, assumptions must be clear and stated explicitly and background material must also be referenced. TÜV SÜD has developed a methodology-specific protocol customized for the project. The protocol demonstrates, in a transparent manner, the project criteria (requirements), discussion on each criterion by the assessment team, and the results from determining the identified criteria.

The determination protocol serves the following purposes:

- To organize the details and provision of clarifications on the requirements of which a JI project is expected to meet
- To elucidate how a particular requirement has been determined as well as to document the results of the determination and any adjustments made to the project design document.

The determination protocol consists of three tables. The different columns in these tables are described in the figure below. The completed determination protocol is enclosed in Annex 1 to this report.

Determination Protocol Table 1: Conformity of Project activity and PDD				
Checklist Topic Question /	Reference	Comments	Initial PDD (published version)	Final PDD
<i>The checklist is organised in sections following the arrangement of the applied PDD version. Each section is then further sub-divided. The lowest level constitutes a checklist question / criterion.</i>	<i>Gives reference to documents where the answer to the checklist question or item is found in case the comment refers to documents other than the PDD.</i>	<i>The section is used to elaborate and discuss the checklist question and/or the conformance to the question. It is further used to explain the conclusions reached. In some cases sub-checklist are applied indicating yes/no decisions on the compliance with the stated criterion. Any Request has to be substantiated within this column.</i>	<i>Conclusions are presented based on the assessment of the first PDD version. This is either acceptable based on evidence provided (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>), or a Corrective Action Request (CAR) due to non-compliance with the checklist question (see below). Clarification Request (CL) is used when the determination team has identified a need for further clarification. Forward action request (FAR) to highlight issues related to project implementation that require review during the first verification.</i>	<i>Conclusions are presented in the same manner based on the assessment of the final PDD version and further documents including assumptions presented in the documentation.</i>

Determination Protocol Table 2: Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests			
Clarifications and corrective action requests	Ref. to table 1	Summary of project owner response	Determination team conclusion
<p><i>If the conclusions from table 1 are either a Corrective Action, a Clarification or a Forward action Request*, these should be listed in this section.</i></p> <p><i>* In the latest revision of this Report Table 2 serves for summarising of Forward Action Requests that require review during the first verification.</i></p>	<p><i>Reference to the checklist question number in Table 1 where the issue is explained.</i></p>	<p><i>The responses given by the client or other project participants during the communications with the determination team should be summarised in this section.</i></p>	<p><i>This section should summarise the discussion on and revision to project documentation together with the determination team’s responses and final conclusions. The conclusions should be reflected in Table 1, under “Final PDD”.</i></p>

If any forward action request (FAR) rose they are stated in table 2. FARs highlight issues related to project implementation that require review during the first verification

Determination Protocol Table 2: Forward action request		
Forward action request Id. of FAR 1	Ref. to table 1	Explanation
<p><i>Request has to be substantiated within this column</i></p>	<p><i>Reference to the checklist question number in Table 1 where the issue is explained.</i></p>	<p><i>If necessary this section should present a detail explanation..</i></p>

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

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

2.1 Appointment of the Assessment Team

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

- Assessment Team Leader (ATL)
- Greenhouse Gas Determiner / Verifier (GHG-DET / GHG-V)
- Greenhouse Gas Determiner, Trainee (T)
- Technical Experts (E)

It is required that the sectorial scope and technical area linked to the methodology as well as host country expertise are covered by the assessment team.

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

Name	Qualification	Coverage of technical scope	Coverage of technical area	Host country experience
Olena Maslova	ATL	☑	☑	☑
Constantin Zaharia	GHG-V	☑	☑	☑

Olena Maslova is assessment team leader and GHG auditor (Determiner/Validator/Verifier) in the “Carbon Management Service” department of TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH in Munich, Germany. She is chemical engineer and focal point for projects in Eastern Europe. Due to her further master degree at the university of applied science in the Federal Republic of Germany she is also familiar with Germany’s current environmental legislation. Olena Maslova is specializing in the assessment of CDM / JI projects in the sector of chemical industries and waste handling and disposal. In this project she functioned as project manager and lead auditor.

Constantin Zaharia is environmental engineer and is working as GHG Verifier in the supra regional unit of the scope management for industrial gases in the Carbon Management Service Department of TÜD SÜD Industry Service GmbH, Germany. He has several years of experience in JI/CDM projects with special focus on industrial gases

2.2 Review of Documents

A first version of the PDD was submitted to the AIE in late December 2010. The PDD and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline were reviewed to verify the correctness, credibility and interpretation of the presented information, furthermore a cross-check between information provided and information from other sources have been done as initial step of the determination process. A complete list of all documents and proofs reviewed is attached as Annex 2 to this report.

2.3 Follow-up Interviews

On March 15-16, 2011 TÜV SÜD performed interviews and physical site inspection with project stakeholders to confirm relevant information and to resolve issues identified in the first document review. The table below provides a list of all persons interviewed in this context:

Name	Organisation
Mr. Gheorghe Ion	Nitroporos, General Manager
Mr. Costache Marius	Nitroporos, Chief of Technical Department
Mr. Pop-Coman Mihai	Nitroporos, Chief of Technical Department, Nitric Acid Plant
Ms. Rotariu Lucica	Nitroporos, Chief of Environment and Quality Department



Mr. Constantin Neagoe	Nitroporos, Deputy General Manager
Mr. Baciú Dan	Nitroporos, Technical Manager
Ms. Olivia Ticleanu	INTERAGRO, Counsellor
Mr. Ioana Iulian	Nitroporos, Engineer
Ms Sergey Klibus	MGM, Senior Technical Expert
Mr Floare Alexandru	Nitroporos, Engineer

2.4 Cross-check

During the determination process, the team has made reference to the available information related to similar projects or technologies as the proposed JI track-1 project activity. Project documentation has also been reviewed against the approved methodology applied to confirm the appropriateness of formulae and correctness of calculations.

2.5 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the determination is to resolve the requests for corrective actions, clarifications, and any other outstanding issues which need to be clarified for TÜV SÜD's conclusion on the project design. The CARs and CLs raised by TÜV SÜD are resolved during communication between the client and TÜV SÜD. To guarantee the transparency of the determination process, the concerns raised and responses that have been given are documented in more detail in the determination protocol in Annex 1.

The final PDD version 2.2 dated 29/08/2011 serves as the basis for the final assessment presented.

2.6 Internal Quality Control

Internal quality control is the final step of the determination process and is conducted by the CB “climate and energy” who checks the final documentation, which includes the determination report and annexes. The completion of the quality control indicates that each report submitted has been approved either by the head of the CB or the deputy (a veto person is used if necessary). In projects where either the Head of the CB or his/her deputy is part of the assessment team, the approval is given by the one not serving on the project team.

After confirmation by the PP, the determination opinion and relevant documents are to be submitted to the DFP of host country by the client for approval according to the JI track 1 procedure.

3 SUMMARY

The assessment work and the main results are described below in accordance with the DVM reporting requirements. The reference documents indicated in this section and Annex 1 are stated in Annex 2.

3.1 Approval

The dedicated project participants are S.C. Nitroporos S.R.L. from Romania, and MGM Worldwide, S.a.r.l from Sweden. The host Party Romania and Investor Party Sweden meet the requirements to participate in the JI.

The Romanian DFP - issued a LoE (IRL8) on 29/09/2009 authorizing S.C. Nitroporos S.R.L as a project participant. TÜV SÜD received this letter directly from the PP and considers the provided letter as authentic. TÜV SÜD confirms that the letter refers precisely to the proposed JI project activity, i.e. the title is in line with the title in the PDD.

Romania and Sweden have its officially published national guidelines and procedures for the approval of JI projects.

The PPs are going to apply for LoAs from the Host and Investor parties on the basis of the TÜV SÜD's determination opinion in accordance with the Host and Investor parties' procedures for approving of JI projects (refer to FAR1).

3.2 Participation

The dedicated project participants are S.C. Nitroporos S.R.L. from Romania, and MGM Worldwide, S.a.r.l from Sweden. The participation of both project proponents as well as their roles in this JI project is confirmed with JI project Master Agreement (IRL 9).

3.3 Project design document

The PDD is compliant with relevant form and guidance as provided by the UNFCCC JISC.

TÜV SÜD concludes that the guidelines for the completion of the PDD in their most recent version have been followed. Relevant information has been provided by the PP in the applying PDD sections. Completeness was assessed through the checklist included to Annex 1.

3.4 Project description

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

S.C. Nitroporos S.R.L. operates a single line dual pressure plant (medium pressure in AOR - 2.5-3.2 bars, high pressure in Absorption tower – 7.0-8.0 bars) plant for the industrial manufacture of nitric acid at City of Fagaras, County of Brasov. The nitric acid plant consists of a weak acid plant ($\text{HNO}_3 < 70\%$). The following processes based on the Ostwald process take place:

Ammonia is passed through a pipeline from the ammonia plant to the operating unit and transferred to an evaporation system. The evaporated ammonia is heated and conveyed to the ammonia-air-mixer. The mixture formed, which has an ammonia content of about 10% by volume, is oxidized on the platinum rhodium catalyst to nitrogen oxide in the combustion elements, consisting of three AORs, at a temperature of around 850°C. The NO formed is further oxidized to NO₂ with the addition of atmospheric oxygen. The nitrous gases formed are absorbed in water with the formation of weak acid.



The project activity aims at GHG emissions reduction of nitrous oxide, N₂O, which is an unwanted by-product by the industrial production of nitric acid and at the same time is a green house gas with GWP of 310.

In particular, the installation of the secondary N₂O abatement catalyst system directly in the ammonia oxidation reactors (AORs) underneath the ammonia oxidation catalyst (Pt-Rh catalyst gauze) is envisaged. A secondary catalyst is employed which has an expected abatement efficiency of about 83% (IRL 29).

In order to implement the project, Nitroporos will be equipped with a state of the art AMS according to DIN EN 14181 for continuous monitoring of the project key parameters.

The information presented in the PDD on the technical design is consistent with the actual planning and implementation of the project activity as confirmed by:

- Review of data and information (see annex 2) using sectoral knowledge and expertise of the assessment team, cross check the same with other sources available in the respective technical literature, official publications, etc.
- The on-site visit has been performed and relevant stakeholders and personnel with knowledge of the project were interviewed, in case of doubt further cross checks through additional interviews have been done.
- Finally information related to similar technologies or projects as the JI project activity have been used if available to confirm the accuracy and completeness of the project description.

In light of the above, TÜV SÜD confirms that the project description as included to the PDD is sufficiently accurate and complete in order to comply with the requirements of the JI Track-1.

3.5 Baseline and monitoring methodology

3.5.1 Applicability of the selected methodology

It should be highlighted here that PPs have defined a project specific methodological approach (JI-approach) in accordance with Appendix B of the JI guidelines using selected elements of approved CDM methodology AM0034 version 05.1.0.

The applicability assessment was carried out for each applicability criterion according to AM0034 version 05.1.0 and included, among other checks, a compliance check of the local project setting with the applicability conditions in regard to baseline setting and eligible project measures. This assessment also included the review of secondary sources to demonstrate the compliance with applicability conditions.

The methodology-specific protocol, included in Annex 1, documents the assessment process. The results of the compliance check as well as relevant evidence are detailed in the protocol and the information reference list.

TÜV SÜD confirms that the chosen baseline and monitoring methodology is applicable to the project activity.

Emission sources, not addressed by the applied methodology and expected to contribute more than 1% of the overall expected average annual emission reductions, have not been identified.

3.5.2 Project boundary

The project boundary was assessed considering information gathered from the physical site inspection, interviews, and secondary evidence received on the design of the project.

Project boundary set in PDD is in accordance with CDM methodology AM0034, version 05.1.0.

Conforming to AM0034, Nitroporos plant industrial process covered by the project activity is nitric acid production serving by the existing AORs. The project boundary comprises the complete production process from the inlet to the AORs to the stack, including all compressors and SCR DeNOx unit and covers the shop of non-concentrated nitric acid production with 1 production line.

Description of emission sources including justification of gases included/excluded in/from the project boundaries is provided in appropriate manner, and can be considered as complete and correct.

The most relevant documentation assessed in order to confirm the project boundary is the following: Elementary diagram of non-concentrated nitric acid production in the plant (IRL 10).

The same have been validated during the determination process using standard audit techniques. For further details on TÜV SÜD observations on-site refer to the Annexes 1 and 2.

Hence, TÜV SÜD confirms that the identified boundary and the selected sources and gases as documented in the PDD are justified for the project activity.

3.5.3 Baseline identification

The AM0034 refers to the procedure for identification of the baseline scenario described the version 05.1.0 of the approved methodology AM0028“Catalytic N₂O destruction in the tail gas of nitric acid plants”. This procedure is applied in the PDD and provides for a step-wise approach to identify the baseline scenario.

The list of plausible alternative scenarios to the project activity is complete and no reasonable alternative scenarios have been excluded.

As a result of the baseline identification procedure provided in the final PDD the baseline scenario has been defined as “status quo”- the continuation of the current situation, where there will be no installation of technology for the destruction or abatement of N₂O.

The information presented in the PDD has been determined by a first document review of all the data, further confirmation based on the on-site visit and a final step by cross checking the information with similar relevant projects and/or technologies. The sources referenced in the PDD have been quoted correctly.

Transparent and documented evidences were provided to assessment team within on-site visit. Based on conservative interpretation of collected audit evidences, TÜV SÜD considers that the identified baseline scenario is reasonable.

TÜV SÜD confirms that all relevant JI requirements, including relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances, have been identified correctly taken into account in the definition of the baseline scenario.

A verifiable description of the baseline scenario has been included to the PDD.

In conclusion TÜV SÜD confirms that:

1. All the assumptions and data used by the project participants are listed in the PDD, including their references and sources;
2. All documentation used is relevant for establishing the baseline scenario and correctly quoted and interpreted in the PDD;
3. Assumptions and data used in the identification of the baseline scenario are justified appropriately, supported by evidence and can be deemed reasonable;
4. Relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances are considered and listed in the PDD;
5. The approved baseline methodology has been correctly applied to identify the most reasonable baseline scenario and the identified baseline scenario reasonably represents what would occur in the absence of the proposed JI project activity.

3.5.4 Algorithm and/or formulae used to determine emission reductions

TÜV SÜD has assessed the calculations of project emissions, baseline emissions and emission reductions. There are no leakage emissions. Corresponding calculations were carried out based on calculation spreadsheets as presented via Emissions reductions calculation sheet (IRL 31).

The parameters and equations presented in the PDD and further documentation have been compared with the information and requirements presented in the methodology and respective tools. The equation comparison has been made explicitly following all the formulae presented in the calculation files.

The values presented in the PDD are considered reasonable based on the documentation and references reviewed, as well as, the result of the interviews. Detailed information on the verification of the parameters used in the equations can be found in Annex 1. The algorithms for the determination of the baseline, project, and leakage are discussed in the following sections.

3.5.4.1 Baseline Emissions

As correctly justified and described in the PDD the project is deviating from methodology in determining the baseline emission factor. Baseline campaign approach is not applicable for the purposes of this JI project. Instead, a system of emission factor benchmarks proposed by IPCC is applied: default emission factor for N₂O emissions from medium pressure nitric acid plants, i.e., 7 ± 20% kg

N₂O/tHNO₃ ("V3_3_Ch3_Chemical_Industry - IPCC", page 3.23, table 3.3), http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/pdf/3_Volume3/V3_3_Ch3_Chemical_Industry.pdf.

To ensure the conservativeness and to confirm the applicability of a benchmark, actual N₂O emissions will be measured and actual emissions factor will be calculated during the production of minimum 5000 tons of 100% nitric acid before the installation of the secondary catalyst (so called baseline monitoring period). The Romanian DFP- Environmental Ministry- in its letter (IRL 22) officially confirmed the EF_{BL}, calculated with IPCC benchmark as mentioned above. The amount of minimum 5000 tons nitric acid to be produced at the baseline period has been chosen due to low production level during the last years, e.g. 2009 and 2010 (IRL 14) and thus is acceptable.

According to the DFP's official letter, the calculated baseline emission factor, based on the results of the baseline monitoring period (at least 5000 t of nitric acid production) and on IPCC benchmark, will be:

- If $EF_{BP} > 7.7$ kg N₂O/tHNO₃ $EF_{BL} = 7$ kg N₂O/tHNO₃
- If $6.3 < EF_{BP} < 7.7$ kg N₂O/tHNO₃ $EF_{BL} = 5.6$ kg N₂O/tHNO₃
- If $EF_{BP} < 6.3$ kg N₂O/tHNO₃ $EF_{BL} = 4.5$ kg N₂O/tHNO₃

Where EF_{BP} is the baseline emission factor obtained from the baseline monitoring period.

Permitted ranges of operational parameters are established for the period of measuring the actual N₂O emissions before secondary catalyst installation.

For avoidance of the possibility to modify the operating conditions of the nitric acid plant in such way that increases N₂O generation during the baseline campaign, the normal ranges for operating conditions shall be determined as follow:

- For oxidation temperature: historical data are used using OT values of 3 reactors separately and similar during the baseline period, control of OT will be performed for each of 3 reactors separately.
- For oxidation pressure: values from plant design diagram and internal production manual are applied, since no historic data is available.
- For AFR and AIFR: historical data will be applied

The baseline emissions were estimated ex-ante in accordance with formulae set defined in the approved CDM methodology AM0034. For this estimation following conservative assumptions have been made:

- the IPCC lower limit default emission factor for N₂O emissions from medium pressure nitric acid plants, i.e., 7 kg N₂O/tHNO₃ is applied;
- Nitroporos plant road map figures for nitric acid production are applied: 2011 - 70,000 t/year, 2012 - 115,000 t/year, 2013 - 154,000 t/year, 2014 - 168,000 t/year, 2015 - 175,000 t/year, 2016-2020 - 218,000 t/year

The estimated baseline emissions can be confirmed, as the same have been replicated by the audit team using the information provided (IRL 19, IRL 22, IRL 27, IRL 31).

Regarding the cap on baseline campaign length, since the baseline measurement is done over the fixed period that is not linked to gauze replacement schedule, this rule is not applicable for this JI project.

The defined normal operating conditions will be available at the first periodic verification and have to be verified by the verifying AIE.

The TÜV SÜD assessment team considered the approach proposed by PPs is correct, reasonable and applicable to the specific project case on the basis of the reviewed documentation, further references and the result of the interviews.

Detailed information on the verification of the project specific methodology can be found in the Annex 1 to this report.

3.5.4.2 Project emissions

Due to the partial primary gauzes replacement in the ammonia oxidation reactors during the historical nitric acid production, it is not possible to define the production campaign. Thus the campaign approach is not applicable to the project at hand and the project emissions will be obtained based on the verification periods instead of the project campaigns. This is acceptable as the project specific approach.

The project emissions were estimated ex-ante in accordance with formulae set defined in the approved CDM methodology AM0034. For this estimation following conservative assumptions have been made:

- the IPCC upper limit default emission factor for N₂O emissions from medium pressure nitric acid plants, i.e., 8,4 kg N₂O/tHNO₃ is applied for the estimation of the project emissions;
- the guaranteed BASF's secondary catalyst abatement efficiency of 83% is used (IRL 26);
- Nitroporos plant road map figures for nitric acid production are applied: 2011 - 70,000 t/year, 2012 – 115,000 t/year, 2013 – 154,000 t/year, 2014 – 168,000 t/year, 2015 – 175,000 t/year, 2016-2020 – 218,000 t/year

The estimated project emissions can be confirmed, as the same have been replicated by the audit team using the information provided (IRL 19, IRL 22, IRL 27, IRL 31). Detailed information on the verification of the parameters used in the equations can be found in the Annex 1.

3.5.4.3 Leakage

The project specific approach does not deviate in respect of leakage emissions from approved CDM methodology AM0034 version 05.1.0. Hence, no leakages are identified.

3.5.4.4 Emission Reductions

The calculation of the baseline emissions, project emissions, and the emission reductions, respectively, can be considered as correct. The baseline and project emissions are calculated in the PDD in transparent manner and using conservative assumptions.

Therefore based on the calculations in the project documentation it is expected that the project activity will lead to a reduction of GHG emissions of 259,098 tCO₂e in the period from 2011 until 2012.

In order to set a cap on the annual emissions reductions which can be claimed for by the project, the methodology applied requires an indication of a design (or nameplate) production capacity of the nitric acid plant. By nameplate implies the total yearly capacity (considering 365 days of operation per year) as per the documentation of the plant technology provider.

Since the annual capacity is not specified in the plant design documents, it is established based on the daily design capacity of the plant, which is multiplied by the number of operating days per year. In the PDD the production values after modernization in accordance with design IITPICCh (National Institute for Chemical Engineering) 425.5.0/A developed in 1982 are applied (IRL 11). The plant design documents show the daily design capacity of 750 metric tons of HNO₃ after the modernization in 1982 providing the possibility of using 3 or 4 ammonia oxidation reactors (AORs). In order to maintain the same capacity with only 3 AORs, the plant increased the speed of the gases to/out of the reactors: from 30/15 m/s (with 4 AOR) to 20/40 m/s (3 AOR) – IRL (32). And some auxiliary measures for heat recovery boiler: recirculate water from 162.5 m³/h (4 AOR) to 216.66 m³/h (3 AOR) – IRL 32).

To ensure the conservativeness, it is assumed that the plant operates 330 days per year. This gives the annual capacity of 247,500 t.

3.6 Additionality

Simple cost analysis has been used for demonstrating additionality according to the “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality” (Version 05.2) as it is clearly shown that there is no economical benefit by the reduction of the nitrous oxide concentration other than the JI revenues. The costs associated with the project activity are summarized in Annex 4 of the final PDD.

The approach used in the PDD has been assessed based on a document review and interviews on-site with plant representatives (for details see Annex 2). All audit evidences have been checked using sectorial knowledge and expertise as well as public available information published in the internet.

Based on this determination steps, the AIE can confirm that the documentation assessed is appropriate for this project.

3.7 Monitoring plan

The assessment team has checked all the parameters presented in the MP against the requirements of the methodology. The monitoring plan (MP) presented in the PDD complies with the requirements of the methodology updated to the project case (JI approach). There are following project specific modification:

- The project is not based on measurement of a baseline campaign and determination of a baseline emission factor as it is required by the CDM methodology AM0034. Rather a default value will be used for calculation of the ERUs. The emission factor for the baseline as accepted by DFP in the recommendation letter is $7 \text{ kg} \pm 20\% \text{ N}_2\text{O}/\text{tHNO}_3$. The applicability of the benchmark will be ensured by conducting continuous real time measurements of the N₂O emissions during the production of at least 5000 tons of 100% nitric acid. The production figure is considered acceptable taking into account the current production amounts at the plant (27343 t for 2009 and 2010, IRL 14). The permitted ranges of the operating parameters will be monitored and cross checked against the normal ranges in order to ensure the validity of the baseline emissions data during this period.
- To ensure the conservativeness following specific provisions are described in the PDD:
 - If calculated emission factor is equal or higher than 7.7 kg (medium pressure IPCC factor +10%) $\text{N}_2\text{O}/\text{tHNO}_3$, default medium pressure IPCC emission factor 7kg $\text{N}_2\text{O}/\text{tHNO}_3$ is used.
 - If calculated emission factor is equal or higher than 6.3 kg $\text{N}_2\text{O}/\text{tHNO}_3$ (lower limit of medium pressure IPCC factor +10%), then the lower end of the uncertainty range will be used, which is 5.6 kg $\text{N}_2\text{O}/\text{tHNO}_3$.
 - Otherwise, the lowest default emission factor for nitric acid plants that do not have N_2O abatement system or NSCR of 4.5 kg $\text{N}_2\text{O}/\text{tHNO}_3$ shall be applied.
- Ammonia oxidation reactors at Nitroporos use 3 layers of platinum gauzes that are replaced consecutively (one or two gauzes per stop). At the end of operational life the oldest gauze(s) layer is replaced by a new one. The other two (or one) gauze layers remain in the reactor and are moved down to lower positions, whereas the new gauze layer is installed at the top. The same procedure is performed at all 3 reactors simultaneously, so 3 or 6 gauze layers are replaced during one maintenance stop (1-2 gauze layers in each reactor). The composition of old and new gauzes in all reactors is the same. The baseline period measurements shall be performed when at least 3 of 9 gauzes are in the first part their life. The project period could start immediately after the end of the baseline period.
Due to this partial primary gauzes replacement in the ammonia oxidation reactors during the historical nitric acid production, it is not possible to define the production campaign.

Thus the campaign approach is not applicable to the project at hand and the following parameters can be omitted: Baseline campaign length (CL_{BL}), normal campaign length (CL_{normal}), project campaign length (CL_n). This is acceptable as the project specific approach.

The quality assurance procedures have been audited by the assessment team through document review and interviews with the relevant personnel; this information together with a physical inspection allows the assessment team to confirm that the proposed MP is feasible within the project design. The major parameters to be monitored have been discussed with the PPs especially regarding the location of the meters, the data management, and in general the quality assurance and quality control procedures to be implemented in the context of the project.

Due to importance of the quality assurance and quality control procedure for the future data quality, the project proponents agreed to implement a so called “JI Manual” which will comprise description of the work scope as well as tasks of responsible personnel, qualification requirements and continuous training for responsible staff, procedures on the data treatment acc. to AM0034 rules and requirements (e.g. downtime of AMS), QAL 3 procedures, JI project related documentation procedures, troubleshooting procedures, etc. (refer to FAR 2). During the first periodic verification the PPs will provide the JI Manual to a verifying AIE.

All the audit evidences proving the appropriateness of monitoring provisions undertaken by the PPs were provided to the AIE and have been considered as sufficient. For details please refer to Annex 2 of this report.

Hence, it is expected that the PPs will be able to implement the monitoring plan and the emission reductions achieved can be reported ex-post and verified.

3.8 Local stakeholder consultation

The statement has been provided in the final PDD, chapter G. The DFP (host) and the local authority confirmed a simplified approval procedure for this project due to its obviously positive environmental effects. According to this, the project can be approved without invitation of further local stakeholders.

This fact has also been verified with information obtained during interviews.

3.9 Environmental impacts

In accordance with Government Decision no. 445/2009 on the environmental impact assessment of certain public and private projects, it is not necessary to perform an EIA for this JI project. It is confirmed by Sibiu Regional environmental agency decision N5242/15.12.201. No contaminants are released during the operation of the project activity so no negative environmental impacts occur. The BREF (IRL 31) also confirms this view by stating that catalytic N_2O decomposition does not induce cross-media effects.

Nevertheless, for Nitroporos an environmental impact study was voluntarily carried out by SC IPROCHIM SA Bucharest in November 2010 (Nr of project MD 1002.04). As a general conclusion, following the analysis of the evaluation report on the impact on the environment based on the data provided by the company, the impact is placed at an insignificant level.

TÜV SÜD assessment team remarks that the project has a strong positive environmental impact, since the primary object of the project is reduction of N_2O emissions.

4 COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOs

TÜV SÜD published the project documents on TÜV SÜD’s own website and invited comments by the Parties, stakeholders and non-governmental organisations during a period of 30 days.

The following table presents all key information on this process:

Webpage: http://www.netinform.net/KE/Wegweiser/Guide22.aspx?ID=7148&Ebene1_ID=50&Ebene2_ID=2390&mode=5	
Starting date of the stakeholder consultation process: 2011-03-25	
Comment submitted by: - (no comments received)	Issues raised: -
Response by TÜV SÜD: -	



5 DETERMINATION OPINION

TÜV SÜD has performed a determination of the following proposed JI project activity:

"Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project"

Standard auditing techniques have been used for the determination of the project. Methodology-specific checklists and protocol customised for the project have been prepared to carry out the audit and present the outcome in a transparent and comprehensive manner.

The review of the project design documentation, and further audit evidences and references, as well as subsequent follow-up interviews have provided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of stated criteria in the protocol. In our opinion, the project meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the JI as well as all the requirements set by host country (Romania) for approving projects under JI Track 1. Hence, TÜV SÜD will recommend the project for further approval and registration by the DFP of the host country.

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

The determination is based on the information made available to TÜV SÜD, as well as the engagement conditions detailed in this report. The determination has been performed following the JI requirements. The only purpose of this report is its use during the registration process as part of the JI Track 1 project cycle. TÜV SÜD cannot be held liable by any party for decisions made, or not made, based on the determination opinion beyond this purpose.

Munich, 30/08/2011

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Thomas Kleiser', written over a horizontal line.

Thomas Kleiser
Certification Body "climate and energy"
TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH

Munich, 30/08/2011

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Olena Maslova', written over a horizontal line.

Olena Maslova
Assessment Team Leader

Determination of the JI Track 1 project:
“Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project”



Industrie Service

Annex 1: Determination Protocol

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Pub- lished PDD	Final PDD
A. General description of project activity				
A.1. Title of the project activity				
A.1.1. Does the used project title clearly enable identification of the unique JI activity?	2	The project title clearly enables the identification of the JI activity. No second JI activity exists with a similar title or at the same site.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.1.2. Are the sectoral scope(s) to which the project pertains clearly identified? Is this information consistent with further chapters of the PDD?	2	Yes it is. The sectoral scope is identified to be scope 5 (Chemical industry).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.1.3. Are there any indication concerning the revision number and the date of the revision?	2	The revision number and the date of the issuance of this revision is correctly indicated PDD version 2.0 dated May 26, 2011	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.1.4. Is this consistent with the time line of the project's history?	2, 16	<p>Yes, it is. The date of the issuance is consistent with the time line of project's history, however see CR below.</p> <p>The Letter of Endorsement for the project was issued at September 29, 2009, the starting day of project activity is January 01, 2011 and the starting date of the crediting period is stated to be March 01, 20110.</p> <p><u>Corrective Action Request No.1.</u></p> <p>Chapter A.2 of the PDD has to indicate the expected outcome of project scenario and briefly summarize the history of the project including information about implementation schedule of the project according to requirements of the Guidelines for users of the JI PDD form, version 3. Thus please describe the project implementation history in a more traceable way (a table for eg.) starting with early JI consideration, contract with the PDD developer, PIN, LoE, AMS acquisition and installation etc. A graphical representation of the time milestones (historical campaign – baseline – AMS instal-</p>	CL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
		lation – project starting date) can be included. In addition JI project implementation plan has to be provided. In order to demonstrate the early JI consideration, please provide the directorate decision concerning the proposed JI project (minutes of the meeting etc.).		
A.2. Description of the project activity				
A.2.1. Is the description delivering a transparent overview of the project activities?	2	Yes, it is. The description is delivering a transparent overview of the project activities however please refer to CL above.	CL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.2.2. What proofs are available demonstrating that the project description is in compliance with the actual situation or planning?	2, 11, 32, 10, 13, 18	<p>For demonstrating that the project description is in compliance with the actual situation or planning the following proofs have been provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design documents for non-concentrated nitric acid production including last modernization works performed (IRL 32, 11); - Operating Permit (IRL 15); - Elementary diagram of non-concentrated nitric acid production (IRL 10); - Technical regulations of non-concentrated nitric acid production (operating Manual) (IRL 13) - JI project implementation plan (IRL 16); - AMS specifications including QAL 1;(IRL 25) - Techno-commercial proposal for supplying of the secondary catalyst (IRL 26). - Road map demonstrating the nitric acid production plan (IRL 19) - Secondary cat supplier confirmation on the warranted N2O abatement efficiency and safety data sheet (IRL 26, 29) 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Valid IPPC permit indicating the N2O and NOx limit values and actions the Nitroporos plant has to undertake in order to comply with Romanian N2O and NOx regulations (IRL 18). - Summary of the project implementation costs and respective evidence (for the confidential insight of the assessment team only) (IRL 26, 2 		
A.2.3. Is the information provided by these proofs consistent with the information provided by the PDD?	2	Yes, all information provided by these proofs consistent with the information provided by the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.2.4. Is all information presented consistent with details provided by further chapters of the PDD?	2	Yes, all information presented is consistent with details provided by further chapters of the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.3. Project participants and project approvals by Parties involved				
A.3.1. Is the form required for the indication of project participants correctly applied?	2, 9	Yes, the form is correctly applied.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.3.2. Is the participation of the listed entities or Parties confirmed by each one of them?	9	Clarification Request No. 1. S.C. Nitroporos S.R.L. (Romania) and MGM Worldwide, S.a.r.l (Sweden) are the project participants. To confirm this fact the Emission Reduction Units Purchase Agreement (ERPA) between the project participants have to be submitted to the audit team.	CL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.3.3. Is all information on participants / Parties provided in consistency with details provided by further chapters of the PDD (in particular annex 1)?	2	Yes, the information on PPs is consistent throughout the PDD and Annex 1.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.3.4. Is each of the legal entities listed as project participants in the PDD authorized by a	8	The Letter of Endorsement for the project was issued by Ministry of Environmental Protection of Romania in September 29, 2009.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
Party involved, which is also listed in the PDD, through: - A written project approval by a Party involved, explicitly indicating the name of the legal entity? Or - Any other form of project participant authorization in writing, explicitly indicating the name of the legal entity?		The LoE have been submitted to the audit team. Letter of Approvals from the host and investment parties will be applied for after the determination of the project will be finalized.		
A.3.5. Have the DFPs of all parties listed as involved in the PDD provided written project approvals?	8	Please refer to (A.3.2 and A.3.4.).	CL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.3.6. Does the PDD identify at least the host Party as a "Party involved"?	2,8	Yes, the host party- Romania- is identified in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.3.7. Has the DFP of the host Party issued a written project approval?	8	Please refer to (A.3.4.).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.3.8. Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved unconditional?		The LoA will be issued after the successful determination of the project by TÜV SÜD. <u>Forward Action Request No.1</u> The LoAs should be submitted to AIE at least at the moment at the first periodic verification.	FAR	FAR
A.4. Technical description of the project activity				
A.4.1. Location of the project activity				
A.4.1.1. Does the information provided on the location of the project activity allow for a clear identification of the site(s)?	2	Yes, it does. The information provided on the location of the project activity allows for a clear identification of the site.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
A.4.1.2. How is it ensured and/or demonstrated, that the project proponents can implement the project at this site (ownership, licenses, contracts etc.)?	15, 29	It is ensured by means of the following docs to be provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • License on the ammonia (nitric acid) production (IRL 15); • Nitroporos' state registration certificate (IRL 15); 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4.2. Technology(ies) to be employed, or measures, operations or actions to be implemented by the project activity				
A.4.2.1. Does the technical design of the project activity reflect current good practices?	2	Yes, it does.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4.2.2. Does the description of the technology to be applied provide sufficient and transparent input/ information to evaluate its impact on the greenhouse gas balance?	2, 28, 26	<p>Yes, it does. The project activity aims to reduce the amount of N₂O emitted by catalytically decomposing the N₂O produced in the undesired side reaction during ammonia oxidation.</p> <p>Nitroporos is planning to install a secondary catalyst type supplied by the BASF SE. This type of secondary catalyst does not require additional heat or other energy input (electricity, steam etc.). During on-site audit Nitroporos submitted the BASF's techno-commercial proposal with description of the secondary catalyst which confirms that no additional greenhouse gases produced during the N₂O decomposition as well as it does not affect the HNO₃ production level and not increase NO_x emissions. Furthermore material safety data sheet for the secondary catalyst has been provided. See A.4.2.4.</p> <p><u>Corrective Action Request No.2.</u></p> <p>According to the preliminary contract between BASF and Interagro, the efficiency of the secondary catalyst will be 83% instead of 80% as considered in ERU estimation. Revision of PDD and Excel calculation is necessary.</p> <p>Please also refer to CL (A.2.1).</p>	CAR CL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
A.4.2.3. Does the implementation of the project activity require any technology transfer from annex-I-countries to the host country(s)?	2, 26	Yes, the implementation of the project activity requires technology transfer from Annex-I-countries and includes secondary catalyst system and monitoring equipment.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4.2.4. Is the technology implemented by the project activity environmentally safe?	28	According to information provided by the BASF company (Material safety data sheet for secondary catalyst and the techno-commercial proposal) the additional catalyst is made of non-precious metals and does not create significant negative environmental effect. The obsolete catalyst will be recycled according to the prevailing EU standards.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4.2.5. Is the information provided in compliance with actual situation or planning?	2	Yes it is.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4.2.6. Does the project use state of the art technology and / or does the technology result in a significantly better performance than any commonly used technologies in the host country?	2, 29	Yes, it is a state of art technology providing significant N ₂ O emission abatement.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4.2.7. Is the project technology likely to be substituted by other or more efficient technologies within the project period?	2	Currently there is no reason for PPs to substitute project technology by any other more efficient technology.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4.2.8. Does the project require extensive initial training and maintenance efforts in order to be carried out as scheduled during the project period?	34	Yes, it does. Every need for training and maintenance efforts will be followed and ABB, the supplier of AMS, is responsible for these. The extensive training is required in the context of monitoring system, data acquisition and reporting. Records of the trainings conducted by the AFRISO as well as list of attended personnel have been provided to the assessment team.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
A.4.2.9. Is information available on the demand and requirements for training and maintenance?		See above.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4.2.10. Is a schedule available for the implementation of the project and are there any risks for delays?	2, 19	See also CAR (A.1.4). Clarification Request No. 2. The secondary catalyst supplier's approval and delivery contract signed (according to project implementation plan) should be provided to the confidential insight of the assessment team. Pls. refer to FAR3.	CAR CL	FAR
A.4.3. Brief Explanation of how the anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases by sources are to be reduced by the proposed JI project, including why the emission reduction would not occur in the absence of the proposed project, taking into account national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances				
A.4.3.1. Is there a brief explanation of how the anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases by sources are to be reduced by the proposed JI project, including why the emission reduction would not occur in the absence of the proposed project, taking into account national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances?	1, 2	Yes, a brief explanation on how the anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases by sources are to be reduced by the proposed JI project is presented in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4.3.2. Is the explanation transparent, feasible and – if based on calculations – mathematical correct calculated?	2	Yes, the explanation is transparent and the calculations are correct. However, though conservative, the use of different emission factors in calculation of PE (8.4 kg CO _{2eq} /t HNO ₃) and BE (7.0 kg CO _{2eq} /t HNO ₃) shall be clarified. Clarification Request No. 3. Please clarify the use of different benchmark emission factors for PE and BE calculation. Please revise PDD and Excel file, if necessary.	CL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
A.4.4. Estimated amount of emission reductions over the chosen crediting period				
A.4.4.1. Is the form required for the indication of projected emission reductions correctly applied?	2	<u>Corrective Action Request No.3.</u> The crediting period lasts until the end of 2012. Whether the end of the crediting period can be after 2012 subject to the approval by the host Party. Thus please split the table with the ERs estimates presented in chapter A.4.3.1 and provide the estimates for the first commitment period in complete manner (years of the crediting period, total estimated ERs, annual average of estimated ERs over the crediting period) as required by Guidelines for users of JI PDD Form v.04. Furthermore please refer to CL (A.4.3.2).	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4.4.2. Are the figures provided consistent with other data presented in the PDD?	2	All figures which are presented in the PDD are consistent with other data. However refer to the CLs and CARs above.	CAR CL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
A.4.4.3. Is the annual average of estimated emission reductions calculated by dividing the total estimated emission reductions over the crediting period by the total months of the crediting period and multiplying by twelve?	2	Yes, the annual average of estimated emission reductions presented in the PDD is calculated by dividing the total estimated emission reductions over the crediting period by the total months of the crediting period and multiplying by twelve. However see CAR above in A.4.4.1.	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B. Baseline				
B.1. Description and justification of the baseline chosen				
B.1.1. Does the PDD explicitly indicate which of the following approaches is used for indentifying the baseline? - JI specific approach - Approved CDM methodology approach	2	The first version of the PDD mentions the approved CDM methodology AM0034 v. 03.4 to be used as a basis for this project activity. AM0034 is solely addressing the destruction of nitrous oxide by secondary measures. Hence it is considered that AM0034 is the appropriate choice for this project activity fitting to the baseline and project scenario of this project. Nevertheless it is not directly applicable due to various distinctions between the assumptions of	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Pub- lished PDD	Final PDD
		<p>the methodology and the real situation at Nitroporos plant.</p> <p><u>Corrective Action Request No.4.</u></p> <p>In order to clearly demonstrate all the deviations from the methodology AM0034, a detailed description of the project specific approach has to be included in revised PDD according to the Guidelines for users of JI PDD form, version 04. In doing so the latest version of AM0034 should be used. A description using a table format with the first column the requirement of the AM0034 and the second one the specific JI approach of this project would be helpful. Furthermore the starting date of the Baseline/Project in terms of primary catalyst age/composition should be included in the revised PDD.</p>		
B.1.2. If JI specific approach is used, does the PDD provide a detailed theoretical description and justification of the baseline chosen in a complete and transparent manner taking into account §23 of DVM v.1?	2	Yes, the PDD provides a detailed theoretical description and justification of the baseline chosen in complete and transparent manner taking into account the DVM requirements. The identification of the baseline scenario was conducted acc. to AM0028 as suggested by the AM0034. However see CAR in B.1.1 above.	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.3. If selected elements or combinations of approved CDM methodologies or methodological tools for baseline setting are used, are the selected elements supplementary developed by the project proponents in line with §23 of DVM v.1?	1, 2	Yes, the selected elements of the AM0034 applied are developed in line with DVM requirements (e.g. § 23 DVM v.1).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.4. Does the PDD provide a justification of the applicability of the methodological approach chosen with a clear and transparent description?	2	Yes, the PDD provides a justification of the applicability of the methodological approach chosen (the selected elements of AM0034) with a clear and transparent description. However please refer to sections B.1.12. - B.1.19. below in this checklist.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Date of completion of the application of the baseline study and monitoring methodology and the name of the responsible per-				

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
son(s)/entity(ies)				
B.1.5. Is there any indication of a date when the baseline was determined?	2	<u>Corrective Action Request No.5.</u> The date of the baseline setting is mentioned in the PDD to be the November 2010. However please amend this date taking into account the format requirements of the guidelines for users of JI PDD form v. 4. The baseline for the project activity has not been set yet. The PDD under determination presents preliminary estimates of the baseline and project emissions.	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.6. Is this consistent with the time line of the PDD history?	2	Please refer to comment above.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.7. Is the information on the person(s) / entity (ies) responsible for the application of the baseline and monitoring methodology provided consistent with the actual situation?	2	Yes, it is. The information is consistent with the actual situation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.8. Is information provided whether this person / entity is also considered a project participant?	2	The baseline study and monitoring methodology was applied by MGM International Group LLC project developer team. The PDD indicated in section D.4 that MGM International Group LLC is not project participant.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Approved CDM methodology : justification of the choice of the methodology and why it is applicable to the project activity				
B.1.9. Are reference number, version number, and title of the baseline and monitoring methodology clearly indicated?	2	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.10. Is the applied version the most recent one and / or is this version still applicable (within the grace period) when the PDD is submitted for publication?	2	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD								
B.1.11. Does the PDD provide a description of why the approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?	2	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>								
Integrate the required amount of sub-checklists on the applicability criteria as given by the applied methodology and comment on at least every line answered with "No";												
<p>B.1.12. Criterion 1: The applicability is limited to the existing production capacity measured in tonnes of nitric acid, where the commercial production had began no later than 31 December 2005. Definition of "existing" production capacity is applied for the process with the existing ammonia oxidization reactor where N₂O is generated and not for the process with new ammonia oxidizer. Existing production "capacity" is defined as the designed capacity, measured in tons of nitric acid per year.</p>	2	<table border="1" data-bbox="1010 663 1771 855"> <thead> <tr> <th>Applicability checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Criterion discussed in the PDD?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Compliance provable?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Compliance verified?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The plant operation history still has to be described in the PDD in a transparent manner, refer to CAR in A.1.4 of this checklist. According to the information provided at the on-site visit, the plant was commissioned in 1980, the last modifications have been conducted in 1982. The annual production capacity of the plant was calculated 247 500 tHNO₃/yr taking into account 330 days of operation pro year and the documented daily capacity of 750 tHNO₃/d.</p>	Applicability checklist	Yes / No	Criterion discussed in the PDD?	Yes	Compliance provable?	Yes	Compliance verified?	Yes	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Applicability checklist	Yes / No											
Criterion discussed in the PDD?	Yes											
Compliance provable?	Yes											
Compliance verified?	Yes											
<p>B.1.13. Criterion 2: The project activity will not result in the shutdown of any existing N₂O destruction or abatement facility or equipment in the plant.</p>	2	<table border="1" data-bbox="1010 1203 1771 1394"> <thead> <tr> <th>Applicability checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Criterion discussed in the PDD?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Compliance provable?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Compliance verified?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>As there's no N₂O abatement unit in the plant, the project activity will not result in the shutdown of any existing N₂O destruction or</p>	Applicability checklist	Yes / No	Criterion discussed in the PDD?	Yes	Compliance provable?	Yes	Compliance verified?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Applicability checklist	Yes / No											
Criterion discussed in the PDD?	Yes											
Compliance provable?	Yes											
Compliance verified?	Yes											

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD								
		abatement facility or any further emission reduction equipment in the plant.										
B.1.14. Criterion 3: The project activity shall not affect the level of nitric acid production	2	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Applicability checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Criterion discussed in the PDD?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Compliance provable?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Compliance verified?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The secondary catalyst applied does not have any impact to level of NO yield.</p>	Applicability checklist	Yes / No	Criterion discussed in the PDD?	Yes	Compliance provable?	Yes	Compliance verified?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Applicability checklist	Yes / No											
Criterion discussed in the PDD?	Yes											
Compliance provable?	Yes											
Compliance verified?	Yes											
B.1.15. Criterion 4: There are currently no regulatory requirements or incentives to reduce levels of N ₂ O emissions from nitric acid plants in the host country.	2, 18	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Applicability checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Criterion discussed in the PDD?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Compliance provable?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Compliance verified?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>During on-site visit, it has to be discussed and confirmed that there are currently no regulatory requirements or incentives to reduce levels of N₂O emissions from HNO₃ plants in Romania. This was confirmed at the meeting with Romanian DFP.</p>	Applicability checklist	Yes / No	Criterion discussed in the PDD?	Yes	Compliance provable?	Yes	Compliance verified?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Applicability checklist	Yes / No											
Criterion discussed in the PDD?	Yes											
Compliance provable?	Yes											
Compliance verified?	Yes											
B.1.16. Criterion 5: The project activity will not increase NO _x emissions.	2	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Applicability checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Criterion discussed in the PDD?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Compliance provable?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Compliance verified?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Applicability checklist	Yes / No	Criterion discussed in the PDD?	Yes	Compliance provable?	Yes	Compliance verified?	Yes	CL	FAR
Applicability checklist	Yes / No											
Criterion discussed in the PDD?	Yes											
Compliance provable?	Yes											
Compliance verified?	Yes											

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD								
		<p>The BREF (August 2007, p. 124) confirms that NO yields for the ammonia oxidation reaction remain unchanged when operating secondary N₂O abatement catalysts.</p> <p>NO_x is a regulated gas in the Romania and it is monitored in the stack gas. The limits on the NO_x emissions provided by the plant's valid IPPC permit have been checked.</p> <p>Clarification Request No. 4.</p> <p>According to technical specifications of DeNO_x unit, contract Steuler – Nitroporos (IRL 17), the NO_x outlet concentration could not be less than 200 ppm, but – as set in the IPPC Permit, the plant should comply with a threshold of 150 ppm.</p> <p>A clarification how this DeNO_x unit will ensure the plant environmental compliance is needed.</p> <p>Pls. refer to FAR4.</p>										
<p>B.1.17. Criterion 6: NO_x abatement catalyst installed, if any, prior to the start of the project activity is not a Non-Selective Catalytic Reduction (NSCR) DeNO_x unit.</p>	2, 17	<table border="1" data-bbox="1010 997 1771 1189"> <tr> <td>Applicability checklist</td> <td>Yes / No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Criterion discussed in the PDD?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Compliance provable?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Compliance verified?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </table> <p>During on-site visit, the project participants confirmed that a De-NO_x unit has been ordered and will be installed once delivered. According to the technical specifications stated in the contract with DeNO_x supplier, this DeNO_x is a Selective Catalytic Reduction unit. However see CL above.</p>	Applicability checklist	Yes / No	Criterion discussed in the PDD?	Yes	Compliance provable?	Yes	Compliance verified?	Yes	CL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Applicability checklist	Yes / No											
Criterion discussed in the PDD?	Yes											
Compliance provable?	Yes											
Compliance verified?	Yes											
<p>B.1.18. Criterion 7: Operation of the secondary N₂O abatement</p>	2	<table border="1" data-bbox="1010 1428 1771 1460"> <tr> <td>Applicability checklist</td> <td>Yes / No</td> </tr> </table>	Applicability checklist	Yes / No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
Applicability checklist	Yes / No											

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD								
catalyst installed under the project activity does not lead to any process emissions of greenhouse gases, directly or indirectly.		<table border="1" data-bbox="1010 419 1771 571"> <tr> <td>Criterion discussed in the PDD?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Compliance provable?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Compliance verified?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </table> <p>There is no further impact on greenhouse gas emissions by this kind of technology. According to the BREF issued by IPPC on August 2007 the application of secondary N₂O catalyst does generally not lead to any process emissions of GHG – direct or indirect.</p>	Criterion discussed in the PDD?	Yes	Compliance provable?	Yes	Compliance verified?	Yes				
Criterion discussed in the PDD?	Yes											
Compliance provable?	Yes											
Compliance verified?	Yes											
<p>B.1.19. Criterion 8: Continuous real-time measurements of N₂O concentration and total gas volume flow can be carried out in the stack: - Prior to the installation of the secondary catalyst for one campaign, and - After the installation of the secondary catalyst throughout the chosen crediting period of the project activity</p>	2, 24	<table border="1" data-bbox="1010 807 1771 999"> <tr> <td>Applicability checklist</td> <td>Yes / No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Criterion discussed in the PDD?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Compliance provable?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Compliance verified?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </table> <p>During on-site visit the representatives of Nitroporos were interviewed by the audit team and they confirmed that continuous real-time measurements of N₂O concentration and total gas volume flow can be carried out in the stack prior to and after the installation of the secondary catalyst. Furthermore preliminary N₂O measurements and consultancy regarding the appropriate measuring points for AMS was conducted by the SGS. The SGS report provided to the assessment team confirms the PPs statement..</p>	Applicability checklist	Yes / No	Criterion discussed in the PDD?	Yes	Compliance provable?	Yes	Compliance verified?	Yes	☑	☑
Applicability checklist	Yes / No											
Criterion discussed in the PDD?	Yes											
Compliance provable?	Yes											
Compliance verified?	Yes											
<p>The baseline scenario shall be identified using procedure for Identification of the baseline scenario described in the approved methodology AM0028 “Catalytic N₂O destruction in the tail gas of Nitric Acid Plants” version 05.</p>												
B.1.20. Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses pertaining to the baseline in the PDD	2	As mentioned above this project activity is based on the selected elements of the approved CDM methodology AM0034. The identi-	☑	☑								

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
made in accordance with the referenced approved CDM methodology?		fication of the baseline scenario therefore was conducted according to the baseline identification procedure described in the latest version of AM0028 as required by the AM0034. Hence following checklist's questions are also relevant for this project.		
B.1.21. Have all technically feasible baseline scenario alternatives (at least all scenarios listed under step 1a in AM0028, vers.5) to the project activity been identified and discussed by the PDD? Why can this list be considered as being complete?	2	Yes, all technically feasible baseline scenario alternatives been identified and discussed in the PDD version 1. The list can be considered as being complete because all options available from known methodologies have been reviewed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.22. Have all technically feasible alternatives (at least all scenarios listed under step 1b in AM0028, vers.4.2) to handle NOx emissions been identified and discussed by the PDD?	2	Yes, all technically feasible alternatives (at least all scenarios listed under step 1a in AM0028, vers.04.2) to handle NOx emissions been identified and discussed in the PDD. The list was reviewed and can be considered as being complete.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.23. Does the project identify correctly and exclude those options not in line with regulatory or legal requirements (Step 2)?	2	Yes, it does.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.24. Have applicable regulatory or legal requirements been identified?	2, 18	The existing regulation in Romania does not require implementation any technologies for N ₂ O abatement. The plant's valid IPPC permit does not include any limits on N ₂ O emissions. There are no subsidies or other support available for such technologies. Hence, the installation of different N ₂ O abatement technologies is not feasible as any of the existing N ₂ O abatement technologies imply additional costs and no revenues outside the JI mechanism.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.25. Is a complete list of barriers developed that prevent alternatives to occur (step 3a)?	2	Yes, it does. A complete list of barriers was developed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.26. Is transparent and documented evi-	2	Yes, it does. The existence and significance of these barriers is	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
ence provided on the existence and significance of these barriers?		discussed in the PDD in transparent manner.		
B.1.27. Is it transparently shown that at least one of the alternatives (except the proposed JI project activity) is not prevented by the identified barriers (step 3b)?	2	Yes, it is. Continuation of the status quo, installation of a secondary catalytic DeN2O and new SCR DeNOx are not prevented by the identified barriers.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.28. Does the PDD include an appropriate discussion if and how any alternatives generate financial or economic benefits (step 4)?	2	Yes, it does. There is an appropriate discussion on this question. It can be concluded that no alternatives would generate financial or economic benefits. <u>Clarification Request No. 5.</u> An alternative is discussed at step 4 of the baseline identification which seems to have been eliminated at the step 3 already (tertiary DeNOx/DeN2O abatement technology), this should be clarified; the PDD should be corrected if necessary. Furthermore several editorial corrections should be conducted in the PDD (replace CDM with JI, correct data units, correct wording used in B.2, parameter tables seem to be doubled in chapter D.1.1 and B.1, the responsibilities diagram on p. 63 mentions JISC while the project is Track 1 one etc.).	CL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.29. In case of Option I: Is the least costly alternative clearly identified?	2	The continuation of of the status quo is clearly identified as the least costly option.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.30. In case of Option II: Is the most suitable financial indicator clearly identified?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.31. In case of Option II: Is the calculation of financial figures for this indicator correctly done for all remaining alternatives?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
B.1.32. In case of Option II: Is the investment analysis presented in a transparent manner providing public available proofs for data?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.33. In case of Option II: Is the sensitivity analysis evidencing the robustness of the financial attractiveness of the selected baseline scenario?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.34. In case of Option II: Have reasonable variations been applied in critical assumptions?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.35. In case of a re-assessment in the course of the project's lifetime: Are there any new or modified NOx-emission regulations, which may address the project baseline?	2, 18	In case of new or modified NOx or N ₂ O emission regulations a re-assessment of the baseline scenario should be executed as established in AM0028 (Step 5a: New or modified NOx emission regulations, and Step 5b: New or modified N ₂ O regulation).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.36. In case of a re-assessment in the course of the project's lifetime: Have new base-line scenarios been properly discussed reflecting the altered situation?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.37. In case of a re-assessment in the course of the project's lifetime: Are there any new or modified N ₂ O-emission regulations, which may address the project baseline?	2	In case of new or modified NOx or N ₂ O emission regulations a re-assessment of the baseline scenario should be executed as established in AM0028 (Step 5a: New or modified NOx emission regulations, and Step 5b: New or modified N ₂ O regulation).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.38. In case of a re-assessment in the course of the project's lifetime: Have new base-line scenarios been properly discussed reflecting the altered situation?	2	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.1.39. Is the baseline identified appropriately	2	Yes, the baseline scenario- the continuation of N ₂ O emission to the atmosphere (without the installation of N ₂ O destruction or	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
as a result?		abatement technologies and technologies that indirectly reduce N ₂ O emissions) and installation of a new SCR DeNOx unit- is identified appropriately as a result.		
B.2. Description of how the anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases by sources are reduced below those that would have occurred in the absence of the JI project (assessment and demonstration of additionality):				
<p>B.2.1. Does the PDD indicate which of the following approaches for demonstrating additionality is used?</p> <p>a) Provision of traceable and transparent information showing the baseline was identified on the basis of conservative assumptions, that the project scenario is not part of the identified baseline scenario and that the project will lead to ERs;</p> <p>b) Provision of traceable and transparent information that an AIE has already positively determined that a comparable project (to be) implemented under comparable circumstances has additionality;</p> <p>c) Application of the most recent version of the “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality” or any other method for proving additionality approved by the CDM Executive Board.</p>	2	The additionality of the project activity is demonstrated and assessed using the “Tool for demonstration and assessment of additionality” version 5.2.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2.2. Does the PDD provide a justification of the applicability of the approach with a clear and transparent description?	2	Yes, it does. Furthermore the AM0034, which elements have been applied in this project activity, requires using the additionality tool for additionality assessment and demonstration.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2.3. If the approach (c) was chosen (additionality tool), are all explanations, descriptions	2	Because of the similarity of both approaches used to determine the baseline scenario and the additionality tool, Step 1 of the “Tool	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
and analyses made in accordance with the selected tool/method?		for the demonstration and assessment of additionality” was omitted while assessing the additionality. Consistency was ensured between the determination of the baseline scenario and the demonstration of additionality. Furthermore acc. to AM0034 the baseline scenario alternative selected in the previous section shall be used when applying Steps 2 to 5 of the “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality”.		
B.2.4. In case of applying step 2 / investment analysis of the additionality tool: Is the analysis method identified appropriately (step 2a)?	2	As in chapter B.2 the investment analysis has been selected as the appropriate choice of possible methods.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2.5. In case of Option I (simple cost analysis): Is it demonstrated that the activity produces no economic benefits other than JI income?	2	It is clearly shown that there is no economical benefit by the reduction of N ₂ O concentration other than the JI revenues. <u>Corrective Action Request No.6.</u> According to the additionality tool the costs related to the JI project have to be documented and clearly listed in the PDD. Please amend the PDD accordingly.	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2.6. In case of Option II (investment comparison analysis): Is the most suitable financial indicator clearly identified (IRR, NPV, cost benefit ratio, or (levelized) unit cost)?	2	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2.7. In case of Option III (benchmark analysis): Is the most suitable financial indicator clearly identified (IRR, NPV, cost benefit ratio, or (levelized) unit cost)?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2.8. In case of Option II or Option III: Is the calculation of financial figures for this indicator correctly done for all alternatives and the project activity?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
B.2.9. In case of Option II or Option III: Is the analysis presented in a transparent manner including publicly available proofs for the utilized data?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2.10. In case of applying step 3 (barrier analysis) of the additionality tool: Is a complete list of barriers developed that prevent the different alternatives to occur?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2.11. In case of applying step 3 (barrier analysis): Is transparent and documented evidence provided on the existence and significance of these barriers?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2.12. In case of applying step 3 (barrier analysis): Is it transparently shown that the execution of at least one of the alternatives is not prevented by the identified barriers?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2.13. Have other activities in the host country / region similar to the project activity been identified and are these activities appropriately analyzed by the PDD ?	2	Yes, other N ₂ O similar JI projects in Romania are AzoMures and DonauChem.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2.14. If similar activities are occurring: Is it demonstrated that in spite of these similarities the project activity would not be implemented without the JI component (step 4b)?	2	Yes, the project would not be implemented without JI component because there are no legal requirements for reduction of N ₂ O emissions and there are no other revenues except JI.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.2.15. Is it appropriately explained how the approval of the project activity will help to overcome the economic and financial hurdles or other identified barriers (step 5)?	2	As there is no other incentive than the JI this criterion is fulfilled.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD															
B.2.16. Are sufficient additionality proofs provided?	2	Sufficient proofs have been provided to justify the simple cost analysis conducted in order to demonstrate additionality. However see CAR in B.2.5.	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>															
B.2.17. Is the additionality demonstrated appropriately as a result?	2	Yes, additionality was demonstrated appropriately as a result.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>															
B.3. Description of how the definition of the project boundary is applied to the project																			
Integrate the required amount of sub-checklists for sources and gases as given by the methodology applied and comment on at least every line answered with "No"																			
B.3.1. If the JI specific approach is used: Does the project boundary defined in the PDD encompass all anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs that are: a) Under the control of the project participants? b) Reasonably attributable to the project? c) Significant?	2	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Boundary checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Source and gas(es) discussed in the PDD?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Is a definition of the boundary based on case-by-case assessment acc. to §32 (a) of DVM?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Is the delineation of the boundary described by using a figure/flow chart?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Inclusion / exclusion justified?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Explanation / Justification sufficient?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Consistency with monitoring plan?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Boundary checklist	Yes / No	Source and gas(es) discussed in the PDD?	Yes	Is a definition of the boundary based on case-by-case assessment acc. to §32 (a) of DVM?	Yes	Is the delineation of the boundary described by using a figure/flow chart?	No	Inclusion / exclusion justified?	Yes	Explanation / Justification sufficient?	No	Consistency with monitoring plan?	Yes	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Boundary checklist	Yes / No																
		Source and gas(es) discussed in the PDD?	Yes																
		Is a definition of the boundary based on case-by-case assessment acc. to §32 (a) of DVM?	Yes																
		Is the delineation of the boundary described by using a figure/flow chart?	No																
		Inclusion / exclusion justified?	Yes																
		Explanation / Justification sufficient?	No																
		Consistency with monitoring plan?	Yes																
Please refer to the CAR (B.3.4).																			
B.3.2. If the approved CDM methodology is used: Is the project boundary defined in ac-	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>															

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD										
cordance with the approved CDM methodology?														
<p>B.3.3. Source: Waste stream exiting the stack of the Nitric Acid plant (Burner inlet to stack) Gas(es): N2O Type: Baseline Emissions and Project Emissions</p>	2	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Boundary checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Source and gas(es) discussed in the PDD?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Inclusion / exclusion justified?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Explanation / Justification sufficient?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Consistency with monitoring plan?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Boundary checklist	Yes / No	Source and gas(es) discussed in the PDD?	Yes	Inclusion / exclusion justified?	Yes	Explanation / Justification sufficient?	Yes	Consistency with monitoring plan?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Boundary checklist	Yes / No													
Source and gas(es) discussed in the PDD?	Yes													
Inclusion / exclusion justified?	Yes													
Explanation / Justification sufficient?	Yes													
Consistency with monitoring plan?	Yes													
<p>B.3.4. Do the spatial and technological boundaries as verified on-site comply with the discussion provided by / indication included to the PDD (plant specific flow diagram)?</p>	2	<p>Yes, they do.</p> <p>The boundaries as verified on-site are in compliance with the discussion in the PDD. The project boundary covers the shop of non-concentrated nitric acid production from the inlet to the AORs until monitoring points after recovery boilers. There is one stack.</p> <p><u>Corrective Action Request No.7.</u></p> <p>In order to demonstrate project boundary clearly and transparently revised PDD has to be amended by including a plant specific flow diagram. Or at least JI related measuring points/equipment shall be identified on the diagram presented in Figure 4 from PDD. Furthermore please include a statement on the project operation with 3 AORs vs. 4 AORs.</p>	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>										

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
B.4. Further baseline information, including the date of baseline setting and the name(s) of the person(s)/entity(ies) setting the baseline:				
B.4.1. Are the name(s) of the person(s)/entity(ies) whom setting the baseline available?	2	Yes, the names of the persons and entity that set the baseline emission are available.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B.4.2. Is the date of baseline setting available?	2	Yes, November 2010. See CAR in B.1.5.	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C. Duration of the project activity / crediting period				
C.1. Starting date of the project:				
C.1.1. Is the project's starting date clearly defined in the PDD and reasonable?	2	Yes, the project starting date is identified in the PDD, 21/04/2008, the date of the signature of the contract with the project developer.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C.1.2. Is the starting date of the project after the beginning of 2000?	2	Yes, the project started after the beginning of 2000 (the starting date of the project is April 24 th 2008).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C.2. Expected operational lifetime of the project:				
C.2.1. Is the expected operational lifetime of the project clearly defined in the PDD in years and months and reasonable?	2	The expected operational lifetime of the project is 10 years.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C.3. Length of the crediting period:				
C.3.1. Is the assumed crediting period clearly defined in the PDD in years and months and reasonable?	2	The length of crediting period has been set 10 years and starting date is March 1, 2011. However please refer to CAR below. <u>Corrective Action Request No.8.</u> Please set the length of crediting period in years and months as required by the Guidelines for users of the JI PDD form, version 3.	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
C.3.2. Is the starting date of the crediting period on or after the date of the first emission reductions generated by the project?	2	Yes, the starting date of the crediting period March 1 st , 2011, when the secondary catalyst is planned to be installed and the project is expected to generate the first emission reductions.		
C.3.3. Does the PDD state that the crediting period for issuance of ERUs starts only after the beginning of 2008 and doesn't extend beyond the operational lifetime of the project?	2	Yes, it is clearly stated in the section C of the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C.3.4. If the crediting period extends beyond 2012, does the PDD state that the extension is subject to the host Party approval? Are the estimates of ERs presented separately for those until 2012 and those after 2012?	2	Yes, it is clearly stated in the section C.3 of the PDD. The estimates of emission reductions are presented separately for those until and those after 2012 in section A.4.3.1. of the PDD..	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D. Monitoring plan				
D.1. Description of monitoring plan chosen:				
D.1.1. Does the PDD explicitly indicate which of the following approaches is used? - JI specific approach - Approved CDM methodology approach	2	The first version of the PDD mentions the approved CDM methodology AM0034 to be used as a basis for this project activity. AM0034 is solely addressing the destruction of nitrous oxide by secondary measures. Hence it is considered that AM0034 is the appropriate choice for this project activity fitting to the baseline and project scenario of this project. Nevertheless it is not directly applicable due to various distinctions between the assumptions of the methodology and the real situation at Nitroporos plant. Please refer to CAR in section B.1.1 and other CRs and CARs in section B of this checklist.	CAR CL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.2. If the monitoring plan indicates overlapping monitoring periods during the crediting period, is the underlying project composed of	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Pub- lished PDD	Final PDD
clearly identifiable components for which emission reductions can be calculated independently?				
D.1.3. If the monitoring plan indicates overlapping monitoring period during the crediting period, can monitoring be performed independently for each of these components (i.e. the data/parameters monitored for one component are not dependent on/effect data/parameters to be monitored for another component)?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.4. If the monitoring plan indicates overlapping monitoring periods during the crediting period, does the monitoring plan ensure that monitoring is performed for all components and that in these cases all the requirements of the JI guidelines and further guidance by the JISC regarding monitoring are met?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.5. If the monitoring plan indicates overlapping monitoring period during the crediting period, does the monitoring plan explicitly provide for overlapping monitoring periods of clearly defined project components, justify its need and state how the conditions mentioned above are met?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.6. Is the uncertainty of key parameters described and, where possible, is in uncertainty range at 95% confidence level for key	2, 27	The uncertainty of the key parameters is clearly described in the PDD. In doing so the PDD explicitly follows the AM0034 (UNC of the AMS, calculation of the 95% confidence level for the meas-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
parameters for the calculation of ERs provided?		ured values etc.).		
D.1.7. Does the monitoring plan identify a national or international monitoring standard incl. a reference to its detailed description, if such applied to the project?	2	Yes, the monitoring plan identifies all applicable national and international monitoring standards (section D of the PDD) incl. a detailed description (Annex 3).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.8. Are the statistical techniques used in a conservative manner?	2, 27	The statistical techniques used explicitly follow the approved CDM methodology AM0034.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.9. Does the monitoring plan present the QA/QC procedures for the monitoring process (e.g. QA for AMS acc. to EN14181)?	2	<p>On the day of plant inspection the AMS was installed on-site. ABB's declaration of conformity for the gas analyzer of AMS, according to requirements of EN 14956 and QAL1 according to EN 14181 has been submitted to the audit team (IRL 25).</p> <p>Also according to the JI project implementation plan the QAL2 is planned by PPs after installation of AMS.</p> <p><u>Forward Action Request No.2</u></p> <p>During the on-site visit the quality assurance and quality control procedure have been discussed while TÜV SÜD assessment team underlined the importance of such procedures for the future data quality. The project proponents provided a draft version of a so called "JI Manual" which comprises description of the work scope as well as tasks of responsible personnel. The project manager agreed to amend the existing JI Manual by including further information on qualification requirements and continuous training for responsible staff, procedures on the data treatment acc. to AM0034 rules and requirements (e.g. downtime of AMS), QAL 3 procedures, JI project related documentation procedures, troubleshooting procedures, list of the spare equipment, provisions for the data quality in case of data recording in the hand written logbooks and manual data transfer etc.</p>	FAR	FAR

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
		During the first periodic verification the PPs will provide the JI Manual to a verifying entity.		
D.1.10. Does the monitoring plan clearly identify the responsibilities and the authority regarding the monitoring activities?	2	The PDD (section D.3) provides the operational and management structure as to the proposed JI project. See also the FAR above.	FAR	FAR
D.1.11. Is the inclusion of external accredited services providers for calibration and function tests foreseen in the planning of the project?	2	The inclusion of external accredited services providers for calibration and function tests according to the EN14181 is foreseen in the planning of the project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.12. Are the specific performance characteristics of the monitoring system chosen by the project listed in the PDD	2	The specific performance characteristics of the monitoring system chosen by the PPs are listed in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.13. Does the monitoring plan, on the whole, reflect good monitoring practices appropriate to the project type?	2	Yes, the monitoring plan provides current good monitoring practice. However please also refer to CAR (B.1.1.).	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.14. Does the monitoring plan provide, in tabular form, a complete compilation of the data to be collected for its application incl. data that are measured / sampled and data collected from other sources, but not including data that are calculated with equations?	2	Yes the monitoring plan provided the relevant data in tabular form (section D of the PDD), however please refer to the CARs below in this checklist.	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.15. Does the monitoring plan indicate that the data monitored and required for verification are to be kept for two years after the last transfer of ERUs for the project?	2	Yes, the monitoring plan indicates that the data monitored and required for verification are to be kept for two years after the last transfer of ERUs for the project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
JI specific approach (<i>project specific methodology or selected elements or combinations of approved CDM methodologies or methodological tools</i>)				

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
D.1.16. Does the monitoring plan describe all relevant factors/ key characteristics to be monitored, all decisive factors for the control and reporting of project performance and the period in which they will be monitored?	2	Yes, the monitoring plan describes all relevant factors/ key characteristics to be monitored, all decisive factors for the control and reporting of project performance and the period in which they will be monitored. However please refer to the CARs below in this checklist.	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.17. If default values are used: - Are accuracy and reasonableness carefully balanced in their selection? - Do the default values originate from recognized sources? - Are the default values supported by statistical analyses providing reasonable confidence levels? - Are the default values presented in a transparent manner?	2	The PDD demonstrates clearly, transparently and in accordance with AM0034 the provisions for any default values which are applied during the crediting period. However see CARs above (A.4.3.2, B.1.1 etc.).	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.18. For those default values that are to be provided by the project participants, does the monitoring plan clearly indicate how the values are to be selected and justified?	2	The PDD clearly specify EFreg- emissions level set by incoming policies or regulations- to be monitored prior to the preparation of each monitoring report, updated every time if new regulations come into force and archive the data during project crediting period. However, see CAR above for the EF for the baseline (A.4.3.2).	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.19. For other default values: - Does the monitoring plan clearly indicate the precise references from which these values are taken? - Is the conservativeness of the values provided justified?	2	See above.	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.20. For all data sources, does the monitoring plan specify the procedures to be followed	2	See FAR in D.1.9.	FAR	FAR

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
if expected data are unavailable?				
D.1.21. Does the monitoring plan draw on the list of standard variables contained in appendix B of "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring"?	2	Yes, it does.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.22. Does the monitoring plan explicitly and clearly distinguish: a) Data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period, but are determined only once and thus remain fixed throughout the crediting period, and that are available already at the stage of determination? b) Data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period, but are determined only once (and thus remain fixed throughout the crediting period), but that are not already available at the stage of determination? c) Data and parameters that are monitored throughout the crediting period?	2	Yes, it does. The monitoring plan explicitly and clearly distinguishes such data and parameter as required by the AM0034 which elements have been applied.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.23. Does the monitoring plan describe the methods employed for data monitoring (incl. its frequency) and recording?	2	Yes, the monitoring plan describes the monitoring methods, frequency and recording in complete manner. However pls. see CAR below: <u>Corrective Action Request No.9.</u> At page 50 from the PDD it is specified that the OT is the result of average of three measurements (for each AOR) and at page 54 (PDD) the same parameter is the median of 4 measurements in each AOR. Please clarify and correct.	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
D.1.24. Is information on the margins of errors and the cumulative error for the complete measurement system provided in the PDD?	2	As AMS has not been performed yet the QAL 2 test, the PDD, version 1, provides preliminary typical measurement uncertainty of the monitoring system required for ex-ante estimation of base-line emissions. Please refer to CAR in B.1.1.	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.25. Are the requirements on the treatment of downtime of the AMS clearly reflected in the envisioned calculation routines?	2	<u>Corrective Action Request No.10.</u> The PDD should be amended by including information on the data treatment in case AMS downtime.	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.26. Is the monitoring plan established appropriately as a result?	2	Yes, the monitoring plan is established appropriately.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Approved CDM methodology approach				
D.1.27. Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses pertaining to monitoring in the PDD made in accordance with referenced approved CDM methodology?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.28. Is it explained how the procedures provided in the methodology are applied by the proposed project activity?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.29. Is every selection of options offered by the methodology correctly justified and is this justification in line with the situation verified on-site?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.30. Is the operational and management structure clearly described and in compliance with the envisioned situation?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.31. Are responsibilities and institutional arrangements for data collection and archiving	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
clearly provided?				
D.1.32. Has the monitoring system installed using the European Norm 14181 (2004)?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.33. Will the three quality assurance levels been met by the planned Automated Measuring System (AMS) according to the EN14181?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.34. Are the specific performance characteristics of the monitoring system chosen by the project listed in the PDD?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.35. Is information on the margins of errors and the cumulative error for the complete measurement system provided in the PDD?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.36. Are the requirements on the treatment of downtime of the AMS clearly reflected in the envisioned calculation routines?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.1.37. Is the monitoring plan established appropriately as a result?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.2. Data and parameters not monitored- determination of the permitted ranges for the operating parameters				
D.2.1. Does the PDD explicitly indicate which of following sources were used for determination of the permitted ranges for the operating parameters: (a) Historical data from the immediately previous five campaigns. (or fewer, if the plant has not been operating for five campaigns). (b) If no data on historical data is available, the range stipulated in the operating manual for	2, 14	The permitted operation conditions are based on a short campaign (28,330.4 t HNO ₃). <u>Clarification Request No. 6.</u> Additional evidence (operating manual, etc) regarding permitted operating ranges is needed. Please clearly indicate the source used for determination of the permitted ranges for the operating parameters in the revised PDD.	CL	FAR

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD																								
the existing equipment; or (c) If no operating manual is available or the operating manual gives insufficient information, from an appropriate technical literature source?																												
D.2.2. In case option (a) is selected, has a proper statistical analysis of the historical data been conducted as required by AM0034?	2, 14	Please refer to the comments in D.2.1.	CL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																								
D.2.3. Once the permitted ranges of the operating parameters are determined, is it demonstrated that those ranges are within the specifications of the facility?	2, 14	Please refer to the comments in D.2.1.	CL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																								
D.2.4. Parameter: OT _{normal} Normal operating temperature (of line i)	2, 14	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Title in line with methodology?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Source clearly referenced?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Has this value been verified?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Measurement method correctly described?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct reference to standards?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures described?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Please refer to the comments in D.2.1. Corrective Action Request No.11.</p>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	Yes	Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	No	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes	QA/QC procedures described?	No	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No	CAR CL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	Yes																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	No																											
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures described?	No																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No																											

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD																								
		<p>The analysis of the historical data for OT showed a different variability for the three AOR. A new definition for OT permitted range specifically for each reactor should be envisaged.</p> <p>The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>																										
<p>D.2.5. Parameter: OP_{normal} Normal operating pressure (of line i)</p>	2, 14	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Title in line with methodology?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Source clearly referenced?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Has this value been verified?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Measurement method correctly described?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct reference to standards?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures described?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Please refer to the comments in D.2.1.</p> <p>The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	Yes	Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	No	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes	QA/QC procedures described?	No	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No	CL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	Yes																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	No																											
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures described?	No																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No																											
<p>D.2.6. Parameter: $AFR_{max,i}$ Maximum ammonia gas flow rate to the AOR (of line i)</p>	2, 14	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Title in line with methodology?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Source clearly referenced?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Has this value been verified?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	Yes	Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	CL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>										
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	Yes																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD																								
		<table border="1" data-bbox="1016 421 1778 592"> <tr> <td>Measurement method correctly described?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct reference to standards?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures described?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="1016 603 1778 683">Please refer to the comments in D.2.1. The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Measurement method correctly described?	No	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes	QA/QC procedures described?	No	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No																
Measurement method correctly described?	No																											
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures described?	No																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No																											
<p data-bbox="203 699 734 810">D.2.7. Parameter: AIFR_{max} Maximum ammonia to air ratio</p>	2, 14	<table border="1" data-bbox="1016 735 1778 1161"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Title in line with methodology?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Source clearly referenced?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Has this value been verified?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Measurement method correctly described?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct reference to standards?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures described?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1016 1173 1778 1246">Please refer to the comments in D.2.1. The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	Yes	Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	No	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes	QA/QC procedures described?	No	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No	CL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	Yes																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	No																											
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures described?	No																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No																											
<p data-bbox="203 1265 853 1417">D.2.8. Parameter: GS_{normal} Normal gauze supplier for the operation condition campaigns (of line i)</p>	2, 14, 12	<table border="1" data-bbox="1016 1302 1778 1442"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Title in line with methodology?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	Yes	Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	CL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	Yes																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD																																				
		<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td>Source clearly referenced?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Has this value been verified?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Measurement method correctly described?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct reference to standards?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures described?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> </table> <p>Please refer to the comments in D.2.1. The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	No	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes	QA/QC procedures described?	No	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No																						
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																																							
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																																							
Has this value been verified?	N/A																																							
Measurement method correctly described?	No																																							
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																																							
Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes																																							
QA/QC procedures described?	No																																							
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No																																							
<p>D.2.9. Parameter: GC_{normal} Gauze composition during the operation campaign</p>	12	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <th colspan="2">Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> <tr> <td>Title in line with methodology?</td> <td></td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td> <td></td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td> <td></td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Source clearly referenced?</td> <td></td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Has this value been verified?</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Measurement method correctly described?</td> <td></td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct reference to standards?</td> <td></td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td> <td></td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures described?</td> <td></td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td> <td></td> <td>No</td> </tr> </table> <p>Please refer to the comments in D.2.1. The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Monitoring Checklist		Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?		Yes	Data unit correctly expressed?		Yes	Appropriate description of parameter?		No	Source clearly referenced?		Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?		N/A	Has this value been verified?		N/A	Measurement method correctly described?		No	Correct reference to standards?		Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?		Yes	QA/QC procedures described?		No	QA/QC procedures appropriate?		No	CL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Monitoring Checklist		Yes / No																																						
Title in line with methodology?		Yes																																						
Data unit correctly expressed?		Yes																																						
Appropriate description of parameter?		No																																						
Source clearly referenced?		Yes																																						
Correct value provided for estimation?		N/A																																						
Has this value been verified?		N/A																																						
Measurement method correctly described?		No																																						
Correct reference to standards?		Yes																																						
Indication of accuracy provided?		Yes																																						
QA/QC procedures described?		No																																						
QA/QC procedures appropriate?		No																																						
<p>D.2.10. Parameter: CL_{normal}</p>	2	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <th colspan="2">Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </table>	Monitoring Checklist		Yes / No	CAR CL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																																	
Monitoring Checklist		Yes / No																																						

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD																						
Normal campaign length (of campaign n of line i)		<table border="1" data-bbox="1016 419 1778 804"> <tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>No</td></tr> </table> <p data-bbox="1016 823 1476 852"><u>Corrective Action Request No.12.</u></p> <p data-bbox="1016 866 1872 1107">As mentioned in PDD, the nitric acid production is monitored with level meters installed in the storage tanks. A possibility of cross-check should be included in PDD (mass balance analysis with NH₃ input for the HNO₃ flow, ammonium nitrate production, etc). Also lab analysis results for HNO₃ concentration should be discussed. Furthermore please also refer to the comments in D.2.1. The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Title in line with methodology?	Yes	Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	No	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes	QA/QC procedures described?	No	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No		
Title in line with methodology?	Yes																									
Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes																									
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																									
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																									
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																									
Has this value been verified?	N/A																									
Measurement method correctly described?	No																									
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																									
Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes																									
QA/QC procedures described?	No																									
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No																									
D.2.11. Does the PDD explicitly state the design capacity of the plant? By nameplate (design) implies the total yearly capacity (considering 365 days of operation per year) as per the documentation of the plant technology provider (such as the Operation Manual).	2	<p data-bbox="1016 1129 1391 1158"><u>Clarification Request No. 7.</u></p> <p data-bbox="1016 1173 1872 1369">In "ERUs calculations Chemgas and Nitroporos.xlsx" it is written that "Production plant design capacity 0,0164 t of Nitric Acid 56% per hour, and calculated for 3 reactor for 330 days". Please also discuss the possibility of running with 4 reactors. Please state explicitly the design capacity of the plant and describe the source of that figure.</p>	CL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																						

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD																								
D.3. Monitoring of the emissions in the <u>project</u> scenario and the <u>baseline</u> scenario:																												
D.3.1. Data to be collected in order to monitor emissions from the <u>project</u> and how these data will be archived:																												
D.3.1.1. Is the list of parameters collected in order to monitor emissions from the project in chapter D.1.1. considered to be complete with regard to the requirements of the applied methodology?	2	Yes, it is. All parameters required for monitoring of project emissions, determining of baseline emissions and how these data will be calculated and archived has to be presented in tables D.1.1.1 and D.1.1.3 of the PDD, respectively.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																								
D.3.1.2. Is the data provided in this section in consistency with data as presented in other chapters of the PDD?	2	Yes, it is	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																								
Integrate the required amount of sub-checklists for monitoring parameter and comment on any line answered with "No"																												
D.3.1.3. Parameter Title: NCSG _{PC,i} N ₂ O concentration in the stack gas (of line i)	2	<table border="1" data-bbox="1016 967 1778 1393"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1016 967 1626 1002">Monitoring Checklist</th> <th data-bbox="1626 967 1778 1002">Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1016 1002 1626 1037">Title in line with methodology?</td> <td data-bbox="1626 1002 1778 1037">No</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1016 1037 1626 1072">Data unit correctly expressed?</td> <td data-bbox="1626 1037 1778 1072">No</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1016 1072 1626 1107">Appropriate description of parameter?</td> <td data-bbox="1626 1072 1778 1107">No</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1016 1107 1626 1142">Source clearly referenced?</td> <td data-bbox="1626 1107 1778 1142">Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1016 1142 1626 1177">Correct value provided for estimation?</td> <td data-bbox="1626 1142 1778 1177">N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1016 1177 1626 1212">Has this value been verified?</td> <td data-bbox="1626 1177 1778 1212">N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1016 1212 1626 1248">Measurement method correctly described?</td> <td data-bbox="1626 1212 1778 1248">Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1016 1248 1626 1283">Correct reference to standards?</td> <td data-bbox="1626 1248 1778 1283">Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1016 1283 1626 1318">Indication of accuracy provided?</td> <td data-bbox="1626 1283 1778 1318">N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1016 1318 1626 1353">QA/QC procedures described?</td> <td data-bbox="1626 1318 1778 1353">Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1016 1353 1626 1388">QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td> <td data-bbox="1626 1353 1778 1388">Yes</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1016 1401 1704 1433">The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	No	Data unit correctly expressed?	No	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A	QA/QC procedures described?	Yes	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	No																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	No																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																											
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A																											
QA/QC procedures described?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																											

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD																								
D.3.1.4. Parameter Title: VSG _{PC, i} Volume flow rate of the stack gas in project campaign (of line i)	2	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Title in line with methodology?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Source clearly referenced?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Has this value been verified?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Measurement method correctly described?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct reference to standards?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures described?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	No	Data unit correctly expressed?	No	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A	QA/QC procedures described?	Yes	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	No																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	No																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																											
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A																											
QA/QC procedures described?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																											
D.3.1.5. Is the application of the methodological requirements for re- calculation of the EF _{baseline} when the project campaign length is shorter than normal campaign length (EB 51 Annex 12) correctly described in the PDD?	2	<p><u>Corrective Action Request No.13.</u></p> <p>Please include CL_n in PDD and excel calculation file. Furthermore please clearly describe the application of the methodological requirements for re- calculation of the EF_{baseline} when the project campaign length is shorter than normal campaign length (EB 51 Annex 12).</p>	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																								
D.3.1.6. Parameter Title: OH _{PC, i} Operating hours in project campaign (of line i)	2	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Title in line with methodology?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Source clearly referenced?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	No	Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	No	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>												
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	No																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											
Source clearly referenced?	No																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD																								
		<table border="1" data-bbox="1016 419 1778 628"> <tr> <td>Has this value been verified?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Measurement method correctly described?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct reference to standards?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures described?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="1016 639 1308 667">Please refer to D.1.23.</p> <p data-bbox="1016 683 1473 710"><u>Corrective Action Request No.14.</u></p> <p data-bbox="1016 724 1872 855">The source/control data used for monitoring of operation hours of baseline and project campaigns should be clearly described in revised PDD. Furthermore the on/off criteria for the plant operation (e.g. trip values) should be clearly defined.</p> <p data-bbox="1016 869 1704 896">The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes	Correct reference to standards?	N/A	Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A	QA/QC procedures described?	Yes	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes														
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																											
Correct reference to standards?	N/A																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A																											
QA/QC procedures described?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																											
<p data-bbox="203 919 864 1091">D.3.1.7. Parameter Title: NAP_{PC} Nitric acid (100% concentrated) over the project campaign (of line i)</p>	<p data-bbox="913 1166 987 1193">2, 21</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="1016 943 1778 1366"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Title in line with methodology?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Source clearly referenced?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Has this value been verified?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Measurement method correctly described?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct reference to standards?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures described?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1016 1377 1301 1404">Please refer to D.2.10</p> <p data-bbox="1016 1418 1704 1445">The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	No	Data unit correctly expressed?	No	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A	QA/QC procedures described?	Yes	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes	<p data-bbox="1912 919 1989 946">CAR</p>	<p data-bbox="2056 919 2089 946"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	No																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	No																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																											
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A																											
QA/QC procedures described?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																											

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD																								
D.3.1.8. Parameter Title: TSG Temperature of stack gas (of line i)	2, 25	<table border="1" data-bbox="1016 467 1778 890"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	No	Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A	QA/QC procedures described?	Yes	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes	☑	☑
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	No																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																											
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A																											
QA/QC procedures described?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																											
D.3.1.9. Parameter Title: PSG Pressure of stack gas (of line i)	2, 25	<table border="1" data-bbox="1016 991 1778 1414"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	No	Data unit correctly expressed?	No	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A	QA/QC procedures described?	Yes	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes	☑	☑
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	No																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	No																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																											
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A																											
QA/QC procedures described?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																											

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Pub- lished PDD	Final PDD																								
D.3.1.10. Parameter Title: AFR Ammonia gas flow rate to the AOR (of line i)	2	<table border="1" data-bbox="1016 467 1776 890"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>No</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	No	Data unit correctly expressed?	No	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	No	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	No	Correct reference to standards?	No	Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A	QA/QC procedures described?	No	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No	☑	☑
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	No																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	No																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											
Source clearly referenced?	No																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	No																											
Correct reference to standards?	No																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A																											
QA/QC procedures described?	No																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No																											
D.3.1.11. Parameter Title: AIFR Ammonia to Air ratio (of line i)	2	<table border="1" data-bbox="1016 991 1776 1414"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>No</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	No	Data unit correctly expressed?	No	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	No	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	No	Correct reference to standards?	No	Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A	QA/QC procedures described?	No	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No	☑	☑
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	No																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	No																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											
Source clearly referenced?	No																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	No																											
Correct reference to standards?	No																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A																											
QA/QC procedures described?	No																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No																											

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD																								
D.3.1.12. Parameter Title: OT _h Oxidation temperature for each hour (of line i)	2	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Title in line with methodology?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Source clearly referenced?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Has this value been verified?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Measurement method correctly described?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct reference to standards?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures described?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Please refer to D.1.23. The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	No	Data unit correctly expressed?	No	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	No	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	No	Correct reference to standards?	No	Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A	QA/QC procedures described?	No	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	No																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	No																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											
Source clearly referenced?	No																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	No																											
Correct reference to standards?	No																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A																											
QA/QC procedures described?	No																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No																											
D.3.1.13. Parameter Title: OP _h Oxidation Pressure for each hour (of line i)	2	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Title in line with methodology?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Source clearly referenced?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Has this value been verified?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Measurement method correctly described?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct reference to standards?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures described?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	No	Data unit correctly expressed?	No	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	No	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	No	Correct reference to standards?	No	Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A	QA/QC procedures described?	No	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	No																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	No																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											
Source clearly referenced?	No																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	No																											
Correct reference to standards?	No																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A																											
QA/QC procedures described?	No																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No																											

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD																								
		Please refer to D.2.1. The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.																										
D.3.1.14. Parameter Title: GS _{Project} Gauze supplier for project campaign (of line i)	2, 23	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Title in line with methodology?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Source clearly referenced?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Has this value been verified?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Measurement method correctly described?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct reference to standards?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures described?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	No	Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	No	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes	Correct reference to standards?	N/A	Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A	QA/QC procedures described?	Yes	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	No																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											
Source clearly referenced?	No																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																											
Correct reference to standards?	N/A																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A																											
QA/QC procedures described?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																											
D.3.1.15. Parameter Title: GC _{Project} , Gauze composition during project campaign (of campaign n of of line i)	2, 23	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Title in line with methodology?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Source clearly referenced?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Has this value been verified?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Measurement method correctly described?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct reference to standards?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	No	Data unit correctly expressed?	No	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	No	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	No	Correct reference to standards?	No	Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	No																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	No																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											
Source clearly referenced?	No																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	No																											
Correct reference to standards?	No																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A																											

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD																
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures described?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> </table> <p>The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	QA/QC procedures described?	No	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No														
QA/QC procedures described?	No																			
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No																			
D.3.1.16. Parameter Title EF _{reg} Emissions level set by incoming policies or regulations	2	<table border="1"> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> <tr> <td>Title in line with methodology?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Source clearly referenced?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Has this value been verified?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures described?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> </table> <p>The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	Yes	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	QA/QC procedures described?	No	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																			
Title in line with methodology?	Yes																			
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																			
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																			
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																			
Has this value been verified?	N/A																			
QA/QC procedures described?	No																			
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No																			
D.3.2. Description of formulae used to estimate <u>project</u> emissions (for each gas, source etc.; emissions in units of CO₂ equivalent)																				
Jl specific approach																				
D.3.2.1. Does the monitoring plan elaborate all algorithms and formulae used for the estimation/calculation of project emissions?	2	Pls. refer to A.4.3.2	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																
D.3.2.2. Is the underlying rationale for the algorithms/formulae explained?	2	Yes, the underlying rationale for the formulae is explained. However see A.4.3.2	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																
D.3.2.3. For the equations presented: - Are consistent variables, equation formats, subscripts etc. used? - Are all equations numbered? - Are all variables, with units indicated de-	2	Pls. refer to A.4.3.2	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
fined?				
D.3.2.4. Is the conservativeness of the algorithms/procedures justified?	2	Yes, the conservativeness of the algorithms is justified in the PDD. However see A.4.3.2	CAR	
D.3.2.5. To the extent possible, are methods to quantitatively account for uncertainty in key parameters included?	2	In order to consider the level of uncertainty (UNC) for AMS and possible error propagation, the overall UNC will be calculated using the Gauss's law of error propagation. In such way all the relevant uncertainties arising from the individual performance characteristics of the AMSs components will be considered. The resulting UNC will be than used in order to reduce the baseline emission factor. This issue will be checked during the first verification, when QAL 2 result will be available.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.3.2.6. Is it justified that the procedure is consistent with standard technical procedures in the sector?	2	Yes, it is justified. Furthermore the procedure for estimation/ calculation of the project emissions is based on the one proposed by the AM0034, it was just adapted to the needs of this particular project activity.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.3.2.7. Are the formulae required for the derivation of a moving average emission factor correctly presented, enabling a complete identification of parameter to be used and / or monitored?	2	Yes, however see A.4.3.2.	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.3.2.8. Are implicit and explicit key assumptions explained in a transparent manner?	2	Yes, all key assumptions are described in a transparent and complete manner. However pls. refer to A.4.3.2	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.3.2.9. Is it clearly stated which assumptions and procedures have significant uncertainty associated with them, and how such uncertainty is to be addressed?	2	Yes, it is. See also comments to D.3.2.5.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
Approved CDM methodology approach				
D.3.2.10. Are the formulae required for the determination of project emissions correctly presented, enabling a complete identification of parameter to be used and / or monitored?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.3.2.11. Are the formulae required for the derivation of a moving average emission factor correctly presented, enabling a complete identification of parameter to be used and / or monitored?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.3.3. Relevant data necessary for determining the <u>baseline</u> of anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases by sources within the project boundary, and how such data will be collected and achieved:				
D.3.3.1. Is the list of parameters monitored in chapter D.1.3. considered to be complete with regard to the requirements of the applied methodology?	2	Yes, it is.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.3.3.2. Is the data provided in this section in consistency with data as presented in other chapters of the PDD?	2	The data provided in this section are in consistency with data as presented in other chapters of the PDD. Clarification Request No. 8. Despite the fact that the plant will use in ERU the calculated EF for baseline (for 5000 MT of HNO ₃ produced), the use in PDD – for ex-ante calculation - of the default IPCC EF of 7 kg/t HNO ₃ shall be supported by DFP. A written confirmation of the DFP regarding the IPCC emission factor of 7 kg/t HNO ₃ is needed. Once the DFP confirmation is available, please amend the PDD accordingly.	CL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Integrate the required amount of sub-checklists for monitoring parameter and comment on any line answered with “No”				

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD																								
D.3.3.3. Parameter Title: NCSG _{BC, i} N ₂ O concentration in the stack gas in baseline campaign (of line i)	2	<table border="1" data-bbox="1016 467 1778 890"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	No	Data unit correctly expressed?	No	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A	QA/QC procedures described?	Yes	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes	☑	☑
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	No																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	No																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																											
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A																											
QA/QC procedures described?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																											
D.3.3.4. Parameter Title: VSG _{BC, i} Volume flow rate of the stack gas in baseline campaign (of line i)	2	<table border="1" data-bbox="1016 975 1778 1398"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	No	Data unit correctly expressed?	No	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A	QA/QC procedures described?	Yes	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes	☑	☑
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	No																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	No																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																											
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A																											
QA/QC procedures described?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																											

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD																								
D.3.3.5. Parameter Title: CL _{BC, i} Baseline campaign length (of line i)	2,14	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Title in line with methodology?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Source clearly referenced?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Has this value been verified?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Measurement method correctly described?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct reference to standards?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures described?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	No	Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A	QA/QC procedures described?	Yes	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	No																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																											
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	N/A																											
QA/QC procedures described?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																											
D.3.3.6. Is the application of the methodological requirements to calculate the EFbaseline when the baseline campaign length is longer/shorter than normal campaign length (EB 51 Annex 12) correctly described in the PDD?	2	See D.3.1.5.	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																								
D.3.3.7. Parameter Title: OH _{BC, i} Operating hours in baseline campaign (of line i)	2	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Title in line with methodology?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Source clearly referenced?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Has this value been verified?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Measurement method correctly described?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	No	Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>								
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	No																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																											

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Pub- lished PDD	Final PDD																								
		<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td>Correct reference to standards?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures described?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> </table> <p>Please refer to D.1.23, D.2.1. The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes	QA/QC procedures described?	No	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No																		
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures described?	No																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No																											
<p>D.3.3.8. Parameter Title: NAP_{BC, i} Nitric Acid production (100% concentrated) over baseline campaign (of line i)</p>	2	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Please refer to D.2.10. The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	No	Data unit correctly expressed?	No	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes	QA/QC procedures described?	Yes	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	No																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	No																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																											
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures described?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																											
<p>D.3.3.9. Parameter Title: TSG_i Temperature of stack gas (of line i)</p>	2	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	No	Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>										
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	No																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD																								
		<table border="1"> <tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> </table> <p>The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes	QA/QC procedures described?	Yes	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																											
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures described?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																											
D.3.3.10. Parameter Title: PSG _i Pressure of stack gas (of line i)	2	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	No	Data unit correctly expressed?	No	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes	QA/QC procedures described?	Yes	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes	☑	☑
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	No																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	No																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																											
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures described?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																											
D.3.3.11. Parameter Title: GS _{BC,i} Gauze supplier for the baseline campaign (of line i)	2,12	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	No	Data unit correctly expressed?	No	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	No	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes	☑	☑								
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	No																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	No																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											
Source clearly referenced?	No																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																											

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD																								
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Correct reference to standards?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures described?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </table> <p>The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes	QA/QC procedures described?	Yes	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																		
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures described?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																											
<p>D.3.3.12. Parameter Title: $GC_{BC,i}$ Gauze composition during baseline campaign (of line i)</p>	2, 12	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Title in line with methodology?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Source clearly referenced?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Has this value been verified?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Measurement method correctly described?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct reference to standards?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures described?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	No	Data unit correctly expressed?	N/A	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	No	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes	QA/QC procedures described?	Yes	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	No																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	N/A																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											
Source clearly referenced?	No																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																											
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures described?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																											
<p>D.3.3.13. Parameter Title: $OP_{h,i}$ Oxidation Pressure for each hour (of line i)</p>	2	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Title in line with methodology?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Source clearly referenced?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Has this value been verified?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Measurement method correctly described?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	No	Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes	Appropriate description of parameter?	Yes	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>								
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	No																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	Yes																											
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																											

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD																								
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Correct reference to standards?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures described?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </table> <p>Please refer to D.2.1. The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes	QA/QC procedures described?	Yes	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																		
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures described?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																											
<p>D.3.3.14. Parameter Title: OT_{h,i} Oxidation Temperature for each hour (of line i)</p>	2	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Title in line with methodology?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Source clearly referenced?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Has this value been verified?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Measurement method correctly described?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct reference to standards?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures described?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Please refer to D.1.23. The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	No	Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes	Appropriate description of parameter?	Yes	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes	QA/QC procedures described?	Yes	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	No																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	Yes																											
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																											
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures described?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																											
<p>D.3.3.15. Parameter Title: AFR_i Ammonia gas flow rate (of line i)</p>	2	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Title in line with methodology?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Source clearly referenced?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	No	Data unit correctly expressed?	No	Appropriate description of parameter?	Yes	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>														
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	No																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	No																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	Yes																											
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																											

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD																								
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Has this value been verified?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Measurement method correctly described?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct reference to standards?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures described?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </table> <p>Please refer to D.1.23. The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes	QA/QC procedures described?	Yes	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes												
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																											
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures described?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																											
D.3.3.16. Parameter Title: $AIFR_i$ Ammonia to Air Flow Ratio (of line i)	2	<table border="1"> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> <tr> <td>Title in line with methodology?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Source clearly referenced?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Has this value been verified?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Measurement method correctly described?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Correct reference to standards?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures described?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </table> <p>Please refer to D.1.23. The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	No	Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	Yes	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes	QA/QC procedures described?	Yes	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	No																											
Data unit correctly expressed?	Yes																											
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																											
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																											
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																											
Has this value been verified?	N/A																											
Measurement method correctly described?	Yes																											
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																											
Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures described?	Yes																											
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	Yes																											
D.3.3.17. Parameter Title: EF_{reg} Emissions level set by incoming policies	2	<table border="1"> <tr> <th>Monitoring Checklist</th> <th>Yes / No</th> </tr> <tr> <td>Title in line with methodology?</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </table>	Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																				
Monitoring Checklist	Yes / No																											
Title in line with methodology?	Yes																											

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD																											
or regulations		<table border="1"> <tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>No</td></tr> </table> <p>The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Data unit correctly expressed?	N/A	Appropriate description of parameter?	No	Source clearly referenced?	Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A	Has this value been verified?	N/A	Measurement method correctly described?	No	Correct reference to standards?	Yes	Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes	QA/QC procedures described?	No	QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No									
Data unit correctly expressed?	N/A																														
Appropriate description of parameter?	No																														
Source clearly referenced?	Yes																														
Correct value provided for estimation?	N/A																														
Has this value been verified?	N/A																														
Measurement method correctly described?	No																														
Correct reference to standards?	Yes																														
Indication of accuracy provided?	Yes																														
QA/QC procedures described?	No																														
QA/QC procedures appropriate?	No																														
D.3.3.18. Parameter Title: UNC _i Overall measurement uncertainty of the monitoring system (of line i)	2	<table border="1"> <tr><td colspan="2">Monitoring Checklist</td><td>Yes / No</td></tr> <tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td></td><td>No</td></tr> <tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td></td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td></td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td></td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td></td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td></td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td></td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td></td><td>Yes</td></tr> </table> <p>The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</p>	Monitoring Checklist		Yes / No	Title in line with methodology?		No	Data unit correctly expressed?		Yes	Appropriate description of parameter?		Yes	Source clearly referenced?		Yes	Correct value provided for estimation?		Yes	Has this value been verified?		N/A	Measurement method correctly described?		Yes	Correct reference to standards?		Yes	☑	☑
Monitoring Checklist		Yes / No																													
Title in line with methodology?		No																													
Data unit correctly expressed?		Yes																													
Appropriate description of parameter?		Yes																													
Source clearly referenced?		Yes																													
Correct value provided for estimation?		Yes																													
Has this value been verified?		N/A																													
Measurement method correctly described?		Yes																													
Correct reference to standards?		Yes																													
D.3.4. Description of formulae used to estimate <u>baseline</u> emissions (for each gas, source etc.; emissions in units of CO₂ equivalent)																															
JI specific approach																															
D.3.4.1. Does the monitoring plan elaborate all algorithms and formulae used for the estima-	2	Pls. refer to A.4.3.2	CAR	☑																											

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
tion/calculation of baseline emissions?				
D.3.4.2. Is the underlying rationale for the algorithms/formulae explained?	2	Yes, the underlying rationale for the formulae is explained. However see A.4.3.2	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.3.4.3. For the equations presented: - Are consistent variables, equation formats, subscripts etc. used? - Are all equations numbered? - Are all variables, with units indicated defined?	2, 27	Pls. refer to A.4.3.2	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.3.4.4. Is the conservativeness of the algorithms/procedures justified?	2	Yes, the conservativeness of the algorithms is justified in the PDD. However see A.4.3.2	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.3.4.5. To the extent possible, are methods to quantitatively account for uncertainty in key parameters included?	2	See comment to D.3.2.5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.3.4.6. Is it justified that the procedure is consistent with standard technical procedures in the sector?	2	Yes, it is justified. Furthermore the procedure for estimation/ calculation of the baseline emissions is based on the one proposed by the AM0034, it was just adapted to the needs of this particular project activity.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.3.4.7. Are implicit and explicit key assumptions explained in a transparent manner?	1, 2,	Yes, however see A.4.3.2	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.3.4.8. Is it clearly stated which assumptions and procedures have significant uncertainty associated with them, and how such uncertainty is to be addressed?	1, 2	Yes, it is. See also comments to A.4.3.2	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.3.4.9. Is consistency between the elaboration of the baseline scenario and the procedure for calculating the emissions of the baseline en-	1, 2	Yes, it is ensured. Furthermore the procedure for estimation/ calculation of the baseline emissions is based on the one proposed by the AM0034, it was just adapted to the needs of this particular	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
sured?		project activity.		
Approved CDM methodology approach				
D.3.4.10. Is consistency between the elaboration of the baseline scenario and the procedure for calculating the emissions of the baseline ensured?	2	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.3.4.11. Are the formulae required for the determination of baseline emissions correctly presented, enabling a complete identification of parameter to be used and / or monitored?	2	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D.3.4.12. Are the formulae required for the determination of leakage emissions correctly presented, enabling a complete identification of parameter to be used and / or monitored?	2	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E. Estimation of greenhouse gas emission reductions				
E.1. Estimation of baseline and project emissions, leakage and emission reductions as a result				
E.1.1. Does the PDD provide ex ante estimates of - Project emissions - Leakage - Baseline emissions - Emission reductions	2	Please see the comments in A.4.3.2. There are no leakage emissions in the project.	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.1.2. Are the estimates given - On a periodic basis? - At least from the beginning until the end of	2	The estimates are given from the beginning until the end of the crediting period on monthly basis in tones of CO2 equivalent using global warming potential of N2O defined by decision 2/CP.3 or as subsequently revised in accordance with Article 5 of the Kyoto	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Pub- lished PDD	Final PDD
the crediting period? - On a source-by-source basis? - In tones of CO2 equivalent using global warming potentials defined by decision 2/CP.3 or as subsequently revised in accordance with Article 5 of the Kyoto Protocol?		Protocol.		
E.1.3. Are key factors influencing the baseline emissions and the activity level of the project and the emissions as well as risks associated with the project taken into account, as appropriate?	2	Please see the comments in A.4.3.2	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.1.4. Are data sources used for calculating the estimates clearly identified, reliable and transparent?	2	In principle yes, however see the comments in A.4.3.2	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.1.5. Are emissions factors (incl. default emission factors) used for calculating the estimates selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice?	2	Yes, they are. In doing so project developers were guided by the AM0034. However see the comments in A.4.3.2	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.1.6. Is the estimation based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner?	2	Please see the comments in A.4.3.2	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.1.7. Are the estimates of project emissions, baseline emissions and leakage consistent throughout the PDD?	2	Yes, the data provided in this section is consistent with data as presented in other chapters of the PDD. However please refer to A.4.3.2	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.1.8. Are the estimates of project emissions, baseline emissions and leakage transparent, feasible and mathematical correct calculated?	2	Please see the comments in A.4.3.2	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
E.1.9. If the calculation of the baseline emission is to be performed ex post, does the PDD include an illustrative ex ante emissions calculation?	2	Yes, the baseline emissions are calculated ex-ante by the PPs in order to estimate ERs.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.1.10. Is the projection of estimated project emissions, baseline emissions and leakage based on the same procedures as used for future monitoring?	2	The projection of estimated project emissions and baseline emissions is done by the same algorithms as used for later monitoring. Leakage does not exist in this project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.1.11. Does the PDD appropriately describe an assessment of the potential leakage of the project and appropriately explain which sources of leakage are to be calculated and which can be neglected?	2	No leakage exists in this project acc. to the methodology applied.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.1.12. If approved CDM methodology approach is used, is the estimation of ERs made in accordance with the approved CDM methodology?	-	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.1.13. Are the formulae required for the determination of emission reductions correctly presented?	2	Yes, it is correctly presented in the PDD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.1.14. Will the project result in fewer GHG emissions than the baseline scenario?	2	The project activity will result in emission reductions.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.1.15. Is the projection in line with the envisioned time schedule for the project's implementation and the indicated crediting period?	2	Yes, the projection is in line with the project implementation plan.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E.1.16. Is the form/table required for the indication of projected emission reductions correctly applied?	2	Yes, it is.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
F. Environmental impacts				
F.1. Documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts, including transboundary impacts				
F.1.1. Does the PDD list and attach documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts (e.g. EIA) of the project, including transboundary impacts, in accordance with procedure as determined by the host Party?	2	<u>Corrective Action Request No.15.</u> As verified on site, an EIA procedure is not requested by Romanian legislation for this kind of project. However an EIA has been conducted by the project participants voluntarily. Please amend the PDD accordingly.	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
F.1.2. Are the respective host Party requirements for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) clearly referenced in the PDD?	2, 18, 30	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
F.1.3. Has the EIA conducted been approved by the host Party?	30	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
F.1.4. If the EIA indicates that the environmental impacts are considered significant by the project participants or/and the host party, does the PDD provide conclusion and all references to supporting documentation of an EIA undertaken in accordance with the procedures as required by the host Party?	30	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G. Stakeholders' comments				
G.1. Brief description how comments by <u>local</u> stakeholders have been invited and compiled				
G.1.1. Have relevant stakeholders been consulted?	30	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.1.2. Have appropriate media been used to	30	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
invite comments by local stakeholders?				
G.1.3. If a stakeholder consultation process is required by regulations/laws in the host country, has the stakeholder consultation process been carried out in accordance with such regulations/laws?	30	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.2. Summary of the comments received				
G.2.1. If stakeholder consultation was undertaken in accordance with procedure as required by the host Party, does the PDD provide: (a) A list of stakeholders from whom comments on the projects have been received, if any? (b) The nature of the comments? (c) A description on whether and how the comments have been addressed?	30	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.3. Report on how due account was taken of any comments received				
G.3.1. Has due account been taken of any stakeholder comments received?	30	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
G.3.2. If the AIE received comments on the PDD and any supporting information from Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC accredited observers within the 30-day period, did the AIE promptly acknowledge the receipts of the comments?	-	No comments have been received during the 30-day period of PDD publishing.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
H. Annexes 1 – 3				
H.1. Annex 1: Contact Information				
H.1.1. Is the information provided consistent with the one given under section A.3?	2	Yes, it is.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
H.1.2. Is the information on all private participants and directly involved Parties presented?	2	Yes, it is.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
H.2. Annex 2: Baseline information				
H.2.1. Does Annex 2 of the PDD provide key elements of the baseline and any supporting documentation/information?	2	Yes, Annex 2 provides ex-ante estimations of the key baseline parameters.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
H.2.2. If additional background information on baseline data is provided: Is this information consistent with data presented by other sections of the PDD?	2	Please see the comments in A.4.3.2.	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
H.2.3. Is the data provided verifiable? Has sufficient evidence been provided to the validation team?	2	Please refer to A.4.3.2.	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
H.3. Annex 3: Monitoring information				
H.3.1. If applicable: Does Annex 3 provide useful information enabling a better understanding of the envisioned monitoring provisions?	2	Yes, it does. However please refer to D.1.23.	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
H.3.2. If additional background information on monitoring is provided: Is this information consistent with data presented in other sections of the PDD?	2	Please refer to A.4.3.2.	CAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Published PDD	Final PDD
H.3.3. Is the information provided verifiable? Has sufficient evidence been provided to the validation team?	2	See A.2.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
H.3.4. Do the additional information and / or documented procedures substantiate / support statements given in other sections of the PDD?	2	Yes, it does.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

Table 2 Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests

Corrective Action Requests by audit team			
	Comments and Results	Ref	Conclusion and IRL
Issue	<u>Corrective Action Request No.1.</u> Chapter A.2 of the PDD has to indicate the expected outcome of project scenario and briefly summarize the history of the project including information about implementation schedule of the project according to requirements of the Guidelines for users of the JI PDD form, version 3. Thus please describe the project implementation history in a more traceable way (a table for eg.) starting with early JI consideration, contract with the PDD developer, PIN, LoE, AMS acquisition and installation etc. A graphical representation of the time milestones (historical campaign – baseline – AMS installation – project starting date) can be included. In addition JI project implementation plan has to be provided. In order to demonstrate the early JI consideration, please provide the directorate decision concerning the proposed JI project (minutes of the meeting etc.).	A.1.4	This issue is closed.
Response	Timeline with description of main steps is added to the PDD		
Assessment	The revised PDD, "JI_PDD_Nitroporos -Final - 26-05-11-clean.doc" (IRL 2) includes the project implementation schedule in Table 1 (page 4). The Action plan is included in "Nitroporos-new-15-03-2011.xls" (IRL 19). The PIN, LoE (IRL 8) and the directorate decision concerning the proposed JI project "Nitroporos-CAR1-Approval of the Contract with MGM and start up of the project.pdf" (IRL 9) were also provided. All the evidence documents provided confirm the project history as described in the revised PDD.		
Issue	<u>Corrective Action Request No.2.</u> According to the preliminary contract between BASF and Interagro, the efficiency of the secondary catalyst will be 83% instead of 80% as considered in ERU calculation. Revision of PDD and Excel calculation is necessary.	A.4.2.2	This issue is closed.
Response	Correspondent changes have been made in Excel file and PDD		
Assessment	The Excel calculation file "Nitroporos-CAR2-ERUs calculations Nitroporos.xlsx" (IRL 31) and		

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

	<p>“JI_PDD_Nitroporos -Final - 26-05-11-clean.doc” – page 61 (IRL 2) have been cross checked. The warranted abatement efficiency of the secondary catalyst as per the BASF offer has been considered in the revised ER estimates.</p>		
Issue	<p><u>Corrective Action Request No.3.</u> The crediting period lasts until the end of 2012. Whether the end of the crediting period can be after 2012 subject to the approval by the host Party. Thus please split the table with the ERs estimates presented in chapter A.4.3.1 and provide the estimates for the first commitment period in complete manner (years of the crediting period, total estimated ERs, annual average of estimated ERs over the crediting period) as required by Guidelines for users of JI PDD Form v.04.</p>	A.4.4.1	This issue is closed.
Response	<p>Tables have been updated</p>		
Assessment	<p>Chapter A.4.3.1, “JI_PDD_Nitroporos -Final - 26-05-11-clean.doc” – page 11 (IRL 2) has been checked. The ER estimates are now in accordance with the Guidance for users of JI PDD Form v.04</p>		
Issue	<p><u>Corrective Action Request No.4.</u> In order to clearly demonstrate all the deviations from the methodology AM0034, a detailed description of the project specific approach has to be included in revised PDD according to the Guidelines for users of JI PDD form, version 04. In doing so the latest version of AM0034 should be used. A description using a table format with the first column the requirement of the AM0034 and the second one the specific JI approach of this project would be helpful. Furthermore the starting date of the Baseline/Project in terms of primary catalyst age/composition should be included in the revised PDD.</p>	B.1.1	This issue is closed.
Response	<p>Version of the methodology had been updated; table with clarification specific approach and clarification regarding date of Baseline/Project Periods have been added to PDD.</p>		
Assessment	<p>Chapter B.1, “JI_PDD_Nitroporos -Final - 26-05-11-clean.doc” – page 13 (IRL 2) has been checked. The main deviation from the methodology AM0034 is the application of the benchmark baseline emission factor. The Romanian DFP confirmed the applicability of this project specific approach in its official letter № 10246/MA/14.04.2011. The applicability of the benchmark will be ensured by conducting continues real time measurements of the N2O emissions during the production of 5000 tons nitric acid. The production figure is considered acceptable taking into account the current production amounts at the plant. The permitted ranges of the operating parameters will be monitored and cross checked against the normal ranges in order to ensure the validity of the baseline emissions data during this period. Due</p>		

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

	to the partial primary gauzes replacement in the ammonia oxidation reactors during the historical nitric acid production, it is not possible to define the production campaign. Thus the campaign approach is not applicable to the project at hand and the project emissions will be obtained based on the verification periods instead of the project campaigns. This is acceptable as the project specific approach.		
Issue	<u>Corrective Action Request No.5.</u> The date of the baseline setting is mentioned in the PDD to be the November 2010. However please amend this date taking into account the format requirements of the guidelines for users of JI PDD form v. 4.	B.1.5	This issue is closed.
Response	Correspondent changes had been made in PDD		
Assessment	Chapter B.4, "JI_PDD_Nitroporos -Final - 26-05-11-clean.doc" – page 24 (IRL 2) has been checked, the date of the baseline setting is now provided in the correct format.		
Issue	<u>Corrective Action Request No.6.</u> According to the additionality tool the costs related to the JI project have to be documented and clearly listed in the PDD. Please amend the PDD accordingly.	B.2.5	This issue is closed.
Response	Correspondent changes have been made in PDD		
Assessment	Annex 4, "JI_PDD_Nitroporos -Final - 26-05-11-clean.doc" – page 74 (IRL 2) has been checked, the respective costs as per additionality tool are now listed in the Annex 4 of the revised PDD.		
Issue	<u>Corrective Action Request No.7.</u> In order to demonstrate project boundary clearly and transparently revised PDD has to be amended by including a plant specific flow diagram. Or at least JI related measuring points/equipment shall be identified on the diagram presented in Figure 4 from PDD. Furthermore please include a statement on the project operation with 3 AORs vs. 4 AORs.	B.3.4	This issue is closed.
Response	Correspondent changes have been made in PDD. Since 4 th AOR is dismantled plant can't operate now with 4 reactors.		
Assessment	Chapter B.3, "JI_PDD_Nitroporos -Final - 26-05-11-clean.doc" – page 23 (IRL 2) has been checked. All project specific details are now provided on the figure 4. During the on-site inspection the determiners confirmed that the 4 th AOR is completely dismantled and the plant is operating with 3 AORs.		
Issue	<u>Corrective Action Request No.8.</u> Please set the length of crediting period in years and months as required by the Guidelines for users of the JI PDD form, version 3.	C.3.1	This issue is closed.

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

Response	Correspondent changes have been made in PDD		
Assessment	Chapter C.3, "JI_PDD_Nitroporos -Final - 26-05-11-clean.doc" – page 24 (IRL 2) has been checked, the length of crediting period is provided in years and months now.		
Issue	<u>Corrective Action Request No.9.</u> At page 15 from the PDD it is specified that the OT is the result of average of three measurements (for each AOR) and at page 22 (PDD) the same parameter is the median of 4 measurements in each AOR. Clarification is needed.	D.1.23	This issue is closed.
Response	In according with proposed version of PDD we use all data array from 3 reactors to calculate OT _{normal} , without preliminary calculations of median or average		
Assessment	Checked in the new PDD "JI_PDD_Nitroporos -Final - 26-05-11-clean.doc" (IRL 2). "Temperature during operating condition period using OT values of 3 reactors taken together. During the baseline period, control of OT parameters will be performed for each of 3 reactors separately".		
Issue	<u>Corrective Action Request No.10.</u> The PDD should be amended by including information on the data treatment in case AMS downtime.	D.1.25	This issue is closed.
Response	Correspondent information has been made in PDD.		
Assessment	Annex 2, "JI_PDD_Nitroporos -Final - 26-05-11-clean.doc" – page 66 (IRL 2) has been checked, data treatment in case of AMS downtime is now described in the revised PDD.		
Issue	<u>Corrective Action Request No.11.</u> The analysis of the historical data for OT showed a different operating range for each of the three AOR. A new definition for OT permitted range for each reactor should be envisaged.	D.2.4	This issue is closed.
Response	In according with proposed version of PDD we use all data array from 3 reactors to calculate OT _{normal} , and during Baseline period we control oxidation temperature limits is each reactor separately.		
Assessment	See answer to CAR 9.		
Issue	<u>Corrective Action Request No.12.</u> As mentioned in PDD, the nitric acid production is monitored with level meters installed in the storage tanks. A possibility of cross-check should be included in PDD (mass balance analysis with NH ₃ input for the HNO ₃ flow, ammonium nitrate production, etc). Also lab analysis results for HNO ₃ concentration should be discussed.	D.2.10	This issue is closed.
Response	Correspondent information has been made in PDD. Moreover internal manual with detailed		

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

	description of procedure has been submitted		
Assessment	Chapter D.1.1.3, "JI_PDD_Nitroporos -Final - 26-05-11-clean.doc" – page 43 (IRL 2) has been checked. "Nitropors - CAR12- Manual for NAP.doc" and "Nitropoos-CAR12-Manual crosscheck.doc" (IRL 21) have been also checked. The ammonia input and ammonium nitrate production (in all 4 forms) are parameters used for cross-check the NAP production. In the same time, any quantity of nitric acid sold separately is recorded from the account department. If the difference NAP measured with level meters/NAP calculated is less than 1%, the monthly production is registered.		
Issue	<u>Corrective Action Request No.13.</u> Please include CLn in PDD and excel calculation file. Furthermore please clearly describe the application of the methodological requirements for re- calculation of the EFbaseline when the project campaign length is shorter than normal campaign length (EB 51 Annex 12).	D.3.1.5	This issue is closed.
Response	Since we don't use campaigns definition in PDD specific approach and use monitoring periods that not linked to the gauzes replacement schedule and at the same time use benchmarks values for baseline emission factor, we don't use CLn definition in PDD and recalculation of the EFbaseline is not required in accordance with applied approach.		
Assessment	Checked in the new PDD "JI_PDD_Nitroporos -Final - 26-05-11-clean.doc" (IRL 2). As the project specific approach is applied in this project, no campaigns are defined. Hence, the CLn is omitted, what is correct and acceptable.		
Issue	<u>Corrective Action Request No.14.</u> The source/control data used for monitoring of operation hours of baseline and project campaigns should be clearly described in revised PDD. Furthermore the on/off criteria for the plant operation (e.g. trip values) should be clearly defined.	D.3.1.6	This issue is closed.
Response	Correspondent information has been made in PDD. Plant operating status is determined and fixed AMS by software on the basis of the speed indicator of steam turbine. If the trip value is equal or higher than 4450 revolutions per minute the plant ON otherwise plant status is OFF. Since plant doesn't keep the records of steam turbine RPM values the oxidation temperature is used during emission factor and emission reductions calculation for crosscheck of plant status. If hourly oxidation temperature value is lower than 750°C the plant status during hour is treated like OFF		

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

Assessment	Chapter D.1.1.3, "JI_PDD_Nitroporos -Final - 26-05-11-clean.doc" – page 28 (IRL 2) has been checked. The requested information is now give in the revised PDD and is acceptable.		
Issue	<u>Corrective Action Request No.15.</u> As verified on site, an EIA procedure is not requested by Romanian legislation for this kind of project. However an EIA has been conducted by the project participants voluntarily. Please amend the PDD accordingly.	F.1.1	This issue is closed.
Response	The correspondent changes have been made in PDD		
Assessment	Chapter D.1.1.3, "JI_PDD_Nitroporos -Final - 26-05-11-clean.doc" – page 63 (IRL 2) has been checked. The revised PDD now provides the necessary information on the EIA conducted.		
Issue	<u>Corrective Action Request No.16.</u> The PDD has to be amended by conducting some editorial corrections, e.g. removing some doubled statements, improving the AMS description, correcting typos etc., by providing more clarity on the justification of the baseline specific approach, by including some additional information in section D on how the moisture content in tail gas is handled, by providing clarification on the availability of historical data for establishment of permitted operating ranges.		This issue is closed.
Response	The correspondent changes have been made in PDD.		
Assessment	The final revised PDD v. 2.2 (IRL 35) has been checked. All the requested corrections were found to be conducted.		
Clarification Requests by audit team			
	Comments and Results	Ref	Conclusion and IRL
Issue	<u>Clarification Request No.1</u> S.C. Nitroporos S.R.L. (Romania) and MGM Worldwide, S.a.r.l (Sweden) are the project participants as per PDD. To confirm this fact the Emission Reduction Units Purchase Agreement (ERPA) between the project participants have to be submitted to the audit team.	A.3.2	This issue is closed.
Response	In accordance with service agreement MGM Worldwide S.a.r.l receives their fee by the percentage of emission reductions. The service agreement had been submitted to audit team.		

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

Assessment	“Nitroporos-CR1-JI InterAgro-MGM agreement.pdf” (IRL 9) has been provided.		
Issue	<u>Clarification Request No.2</u> The secondary catalyst supplier’s approval and delivery contract signed (according to project implementation plan) should be provided to the confidential insight of the assessment team.	A.4.2.10	FAR 3
Response	Plant is facing some problem while negotiating some terms of the contract with BASF. The talks are still in progress. That is why the BASF offer is used in PDD to estimate project costs.		
Assessment	The offer from the secondary catalyst supplier BASF was available to the audit team and confirms the warranted abatement efficiency and costs of the secondary catalyst. The contract with the catalyst supplier will be checked at the first periodic verification.		
Issue	<u>Clarification Request No.3</u> Please clarify the use of different benchmark emission factors for PE and BE calculation. Please revise PDD and Excel file, if necessary.	A.4.3.2	This issue is closed.
Response	In PDD we assume that real calculated emissions are equal to 8,4 kg N ₂ O/tHNO ₃ (the IPCC upper limit default emission factor for N ₂ O emissions from medium pressure nitric acid plants). In this case for baseline in accordance with PDD for calculation of emission reductions we use benchmark emission factor 7 kg N ₂ O/tHNO ₃ . At the same time to calculate actual PE we should take in account calculated actual baseline emission factor (in our case 8,4 kg N ₂ O/tHNO ₃), since catalyst distructs 83% of <u>real</u> N ₂ O emissions.		
Assessment	The explanation is acceptable as it represents the conservative estimates of the emission reductions..		
Issue	<u>Clarification Request No.4</u> According to technical specifications of DeNO _x unit, contract Steuler – Nitroporos (IRL 16), the NO _x outlet concentration could not be less than 200 ppm, but – as set in the IPPC Permit, the plant should comply with a threshold of 150 ppm. A clarification how this DeNO _x unit will ensure the plant environmental compliance is needed.	B.1.16	FAR 4
Response	The design of SCR DeNO _x for Nitroporos assumes 1000 ppm NO _x emissions before installation of SCR DeNO _x system and 200 ppm after system installation. Taking in account that actual NO _x emissions are at least 2 times lower than 1000 ppm, we could expect that concentration of NO _x in stack gas will be much lower than 150 ppm.		

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

Assessment	The explanation regarding the NOx compliance is reasonable. The plant's compliance with the IPPC permit regarding the NOx limits will be checked during the first periodic verification.		
Issue	<u>Clarification Request No.5</u> An alternative is discussed at step 4 of the baseline identification which seems to have been eliminated at the step 3 already (tertiary DeNOx/DeN2O abatement technology), this should be clarified; the PDD should be corrected if necessary. Furthermore several editorial corrections should be conducted in the PDD (replace CDM with JI, correct data units, correct wording used in B.2, parameter tables seem to be doubled in chapter D.1.1 and B.1, the responsibilities diagram on p. 63 mentions JISC while the project is Track 1 one etc.).	B.1.28	This issue is closed.
Response	The correspondent changes have been made in PDD		
Assessment	The revised PDD "JI_PDD_Nitroporos -Final - 26-05-11-clean.doc" (IRL 2) was assessed by the audit team, the requested corrections have been made.		
Issue	<u>Clarification Request No.6</u> Additional evidences (operating manual, etc) regarding permitted operating ranges are needed. Please clearly indicate the source used for determination of the permitted ranges for the operating parameters. Furthermore please provide the road map for nitric acid production.	D.2.1	FAR5
Response	The correspondent evidence (internal operating plant manual, plant design diagram, log-books with historical data) have been submitted. The permitted ranges of operational parameters (OT, AFR, AIFR) will be defined on the base of AM0034 using historical data for the period going from plant start-up in October 2009 after long term downtime until the date of the start of the period for the measuring of actual plant N ₂ O emissions (baseline period). For oxidation pressure the plant design diagram and internal production manuals are applied. Operating manuals and road maps have been submitted.		
Assessment	The documents "Nitroporos-CR6 -road map production 2011-2020.jpg", "Nitroporos-CR6-design diagram-OP,OT2.jpg", "Nitropos-CR6- operation manual-OP.pdf", "Nitropos-CR6-design-OP,OT.jpg", "Nitropos-CR6-operation manual-AFR,AIFR,OT.pdf" (IRL 13) and "Historical Data-Nitroporos-26.05.2011.xls" (IRL 14) have been provided and checked by the determination team. Thus it is confirmed that there are historical data available for establishing the permitted operating ranges. Pls. refer to FAR 5.		
Issue	<u>Clarification Request No.7</u>	D.2.11	This issue is

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

	In "ERUs calculations Chemgas and Nitroporos.xlsx" it is written that "Production plant design capacity 0,0164 t of Nitric Acid 56% per hour, and calculated for 3 reactor for 330 days". Please also discuss the possibility of running with 4 reactors. Please state explicitly the design capacity of the plant and describe the source of that figure.		closed.
Response	<p>The calculation has been made on the base of the Note drawn by IITPIC Bucharest, containing an analysis of engineering, functioning and defects identified in the oxidation reactors (design IITPIC No. Ch 425.5-0). This Note in addition confirms that plant has the same capacity with 3 and 4 reactors. (Production for 4 reactors kg/h = 12300 per reactor *4 = 49200 kg/h Production for 3 reactors kg/h = 16400 per reactor*3 = 49200 kg/h) But now, since 4th AOR is dismantled, plant can't operate with 4 reactors.</p> <p>In updated PDD production values before modernization in accordance with design IITPIC Ch 425.5.0/A developed in 1982 are applied. The plant design documents show that before the modernization the daily design capacity was 750 metric tonnes of HNO₃. To ensure the conservativeness of the approach we use this value and it is assumed that the plant operates 330 days per year (instead of 365 days as suggested in the methodology). This gives the annual capacity of 247,500t. Correspondent changes have been made in PDD.</p>		
Assessment	<p>The Audit team checked in the revised PDD "JI_PDD_Nitroporos -Final - 26-05-11-clean.doc" (IRL 2) and "IITPIC Ch 425.5.0/A" – "Nitroporos-CR7-plant design.pdf" (IRL 32).</p> <p>The Plant operated with only three reactors during historical campaigns, during baseline and will operate with only 3 reactors during the project campaign also.</p>		
Issue	<p><u>Clarification Request No.8</u></p> <p>Despite the fact that the plant will use in ERU the calculated EF for baseline (for 5000 MT of HNO₃ produced), the use in PDD – for ex-ante calculation - of the default IPCC EF of 7 kg/t HNO₃ shall be supported by DFP. A written confirmation of the DFP regarding the IPCC emission factor of 7 kg/t HNO₃ is needed. Once the DFP confirmation is available, please amend the PDD accordingly. Furthermore please consider the road map figures for the future HNO₃ production in the ERs calculation.</p>	D.3.3.2	This issue is closed.
Response	DFP confirmation has been submitted. Road map figures had been taken in account in ERs calculation		
Assessment	The official document "Nitroporos-CR8-DFP confirmation of IPCC EF .jpg" has been provided and checked (IRL 8). The conservative approach used in the new PDD is in line with		

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

	DFP's statement.		
Forward Action Requests by audit team			
	Comments and Results	Ref	Conclusion and IRL
Issue	<p><u>Forward Action Request No.1</u></p> <p>The LoAs from the host and investor Parties should be submitted to AIE at least at the moment at the first periodic verification.</p>	A.3.8	FAR 1
Response			
Assessment			
Issue	<p><u>Forward Action Request No.2</u></p> <p>During the on-site visit the quality assurance and quality control procedure have been discussed while TÜV SÜD assessment team underlined the importance of such procedures for the future data quality. The project proponents provided a draft version of a so called "JI Manual" which comprises description of the work scope as well as tasks of responsible personnel. The project manager agreed to amend the existing JI Manual by including further information on qualification requirements and continuous training for responsible staff, procedures on the data treatment acc. to AM0034 rules and requirements (e.g. downtime of AMS), QAL 3 procedures, JI project related documentation procedures, troubleshooting procedures, list of the spare equipment, provisions for the data quality in case of data recording in the hand written logbooks and manual data transfer etc. During the first periodic verification the PPs will provide the JI Manual to a verifying entity.</p>	D.1.9	FAR 2
Response			
Assessment			
Issue	<p><u>Forward Action Request No.3</u></p> <p>The offer from the secondary catalyst supplier BASF was available to the audit team and confirms the warranted abatement efficiency and costs of the secondary catalyst. The contract with the catalyst supplier will be checked at the first periodic verification.</p>	A.4.2.10	FAR 3
Response			

Determination Protocol

Project Title: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project

Date of Completion: 2011-08-30

Number of Pages: 73



Industrie Service

Assessment			
Issue	<p><u>Forward Action Request No.4</u></p> <p>The plant's compliance with the IPPC permit regarding the NOx limits will be checked during the first periodic verification.</p>	B.1.16	FAR 4
Response			
Assessment			
Issue	<p><u>Forward Action Request No.5</u></p> <p>For avoidance of the possibility to modify the operating conditions of the nitric acid plant in such way that increases N2O generation during the baseline campaign, the normal ranges for operating conditions shall be determined as follow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For oxidation temperature: historical data are used using OT values of 3 reactors separately and similar, during the baseline period, control of OT will be performed for each of 3 reactors separately. - For pressure: values from plant design diagram and internal production manual are applied. - For AFR: historical data is applied - For AIFR: historical data is applied <p>The defined normal operating conditions will be available at the first periodic verification and have to be verified by the verifying AIE.</p>	D.2.1	FAR 5
Response			
Assessment			

Table 3 Unresolved Corrective Action and Clarification Requests (in case of denials)


Clarifications and / or corrective action requests by validation team	Id. of CAR/CR	Explanation of Conclusion for Denial
-	-	-

Determination of the JI Track 1 project:
"Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project"




Industrie Service


Annex 2: Information Reference List

Determination Report	2011-08-30	Determination of the JI Project: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project, Romania Information Reference List	Page 1 of 4	 Industrie Service
----------------------	------------	---	----------------	--


Ref. No.	Issuance and/or submission date (dd/mm/yyyy)	Title/Type of Document	Author / Editor / Issuer	Additional Information (Relevance in JI Context)
		<p>On-site interviews conducted at March 15-16, 2011 in Fagaras, Romania at S.C. Nitroporos by auditing team of TÜV SÜD.</p> <p><u>Determination Team:</u></p> <p>Ms Olena Maslova TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH, GHG Lead Auditor, Project Manager Mr Constantin Zaharia TÜV SÜD Romania LLC, GHG Auditor</p> <p><u>Interviewed persons at Nitroporos:</u></p> <p>Mr Gheorghe Ion Nitroporos, General Manager Mr Costache Marius Nitroporos, Chief of Technical Department Mr Pop-Coman Mihai Nitroporos, Chief of Technical Department, Nitric Acid Plant Ms Rotariu Lucica Nitroporos, Chief of Environment and Quality Department. Mr. Constantin Neagoe Nitroporos, Deputy General Manager Mr Baciu Dan Nitroporos, Technical Manager Ms Olivia Ticleanu INTERAGRO, Counsellor Mr Ioana Iulian Nitroporos, Engineer Ms Sergey Klibus MGM, Senior Technical Expert Mr Floare Alexandru Nitroporos, Engineer</p>		
0.		UNFCCC homepage http://www.unfccc.int including the Joint Implementation section http://ji.unfccc.int (DVM, Clarification regarding overlapping monitoring periods under the verification procedure under the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee, Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring, Glossary of JI terms etc.)		
1.	01/12/2010	Published Project Design Document of JI project "Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project", version 1.		Published PDD
2.	26/07/2011	Final Project Design Document of JI project "Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project", version 2.1.		PDD version 2.1
3.	13/08/2010	Approved baseline and monitoring methodology AM0034 "Catalytic reduction of N2O inside the ammonia burner of nitric acid plants", version 05.1.0	UNFCCC	
4.	25/02/2010	Approved baseline methodology AM0028 "Catalytic N2O destruction in the tail gas of Nitric Acid or Caprolactam Production Plants", version 05.1.0	UNFCCC	

Determination Report	2011-08-30	Determination of the JI Project: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project, Romania Information Reference List	Page 2 of 4	 Industrie Service
----------------------	------------	---	----------------	--

Ref. No.	Issuance and/or submission date (dd/mm/yyyy)	Title/Type of Document	Author / Editor / Issuer	Additional Information (Relevance in JI Context)
5.	26/08/2008	Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality, version 05.2.	UNFCCC	
6.		Guidelines for Users of the Joint Implementation Project Design Document Form, version 3.	UNFCCC	
7.	15-16/03/2011	Participant list of on-site interviews.	TÜV SÜD	
8.	29/09/2009	LoE No. 8333/09-09, Letter of Endorsement from Romania (host party).	MMP	Letter of Endorsement - DFP
9.	21/04/2008	Agreement between MGM and INTERAGRO on the development of JI project.	MGM, INTERAGRO	Starting date of the project activity
10.	16/03/2011	Block flow Diagram of plant facilities / Process Scheme of the Project activity	NITROPOROS	
11.	25/02/2010	Design documents for non-concentrated nitric acid production including last modernization works performed and design capacity of the plant	IITPIC	Design capacity
12.	25/07/2006	Historic maintenance schedule of primary gauzes and composition data for at least 5 historic campaigns at the nitric acid plant	NITROPOROS	Primary gauzes
13.	06/2008	Technical regulations of non-concentrated nitric acid production (operating Manual)	NITROPOROS	
14.	26.05.2011	Historical Data-Nitroporos-26.05.2011.xls	NITROPOROS	Historical campaigns
15.	29/07/2008	License No. B/1410439 on the fertilizer production.	Ministry of Industry	Operating License
16.	05/08/2009	JI project implementation plan. ("PIN Nitroporos EN 12.05.2009.doc")	NITROPOROS, MGM	
17.	29/09/2009	Specifications of the (SCR) DeNOx abatement unit	Steuler Anlagenbau	
18.	2007	IPPC permit / Environmental Permit	EPA	

Determination Report	2011-08-30	Determination of the JI Project: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project, Romania Information Reference List	Page 3 of 4	 Industrie Service
----------------------	------------	---	----------------	--

Ref. No.	Issuance and/or submission date (dd/mm/yyyy)	Title/Type of Document	Author / Editor / Issuer	Additional Information (Relevance in JI Context)
19.	26.05.2011	Nitroporos-CR6 -road map production 2011-2020	NITROPOROS	
20.	09/03/2011	Proofs on NOx monitoring log sheets (current and historic) (e.g. Plant report for the last year and current situation, compliance with NOx emission regulations).	EPA	Environmental compliance
21.	19/04/2011	Equipment for NAP monitoring and cross check possibilities (CAR #12)	Nitroporos	
22.	14/04/2011	Letter from Ministry regarding the applicability of the benchmark baseline emission factor with english translation.	MMP	
23.	2009-2010	Type of precious metal catalyst gauzes and supplier info (purchasing agreements and invoices)	Nitroporos/Umicore	
24.	11/2009	N2O measurement instruments and location of sampling points at the plant	ABB/SGS	
25.	06/2009	Continuous automatic N2O monitoring system (AMS): Specific performance characteristics incl. QAL 1 and concept of emission data processing, purchasing agreement	Nitroporos/ABB	AMS
26.	15/01/2008	Secondary catalyst: Financial Proposal from the catalyst supplier	Nitroporos/BASF	Secondary catalyst
27.	28/12/2010	Excel sheets with ERs calculations, version 01.	MGM	
28.	02/2011	Material safety data sheet for secondary catalyst	BASF	
29.	02/2011	Techno-commercial proposal for supplying of the secondary catalyst	BASF	
30.	11/01/2010	Letter No. 2934/16/12/2010 concerning non necessity of EIA Nitroporos's JI project.	EPA	
31.	29/05/2011	Excel sheets with ERs calculations, version 02.	MGM	
32.	1982	Internal document IITPIC No. Ch 425.5-0	IITPIC	Design capacity, 3 AOR/4 AOR
33.	2007	BREF Document: Large Volume Inorganic Chemicals - Ammonia, Acids and Fertilisers, 2007	IPCC	
34.	24/11/2010	Training records ABB "20110705135348146.pdf"	AFRISO	Training for Floare Alexandru and

Determination Report	2011-08-30	Determination of the JI Project: Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project, Romania Information Reference List	Page 4 of 4	 Industrie Service
----------------------	------------	---	----------------	--

Ref. No.	Issuance and/or submission date (dd/mm/yyyy)	Title/Type of Document	Author / Editor / Issuer	Additional Information (Relevance in JI Context)
				Ionescu Alexandru
35.	29.08.2011	Project Design Document of JI project "Nitroporos Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project", version 2.2		Final PDD