



JI VERIFICATION REPORT

- 2ND PERIOD –

GPN S.A.

GPN GRAND QUEVILLY N8 N₂O ABATEMENT PROJECT

ITL PROJECT ID : FR1000147

Monitoring Period: 2010-11-01 TO 2011-08-10
(incl. both days)

Report No: 8000399522 – 11/542

Date: 2012-02-23

TÜV NORD CERT GmbH
JI/CDM Certification Program
Langemarckstraße, 20
45141 Essen, Germany
Phone: +49-201-825-3335
Fax: +49-201-825-3290
www.tuev-nord.de
www.global-warming.de



Verification Report:	Report No.	Rev. No.	Date of 1st issue:	Date of this rev.
	8000399522 – 11/542	0	2012-02-23	2012-02-23
Project:	Title:	Registration date:		UNFCCC-No.:
	GPN Grand Quevilly N8 N ₂ O abatement project	2010-04-16		FR1000147
Project Participant(s):	Host party:		Other involved parties:	
	France		Germany, Belgium	
Applied methodology/ies:	Title:	No.:	Scope:	
	Project specific methodology: 'Catalytic reduction of N ₂ O at nitric acid plants'	N/A	5	
Monitoring:	Monitoring period (MP):	No. of days:	MP No.	
	2010-11-01 to 2011-08-10 - both days included	283	2	
Monitoring report:	Title:	Draft version:	Final version:	
	GPN Grand Quevilly N8 N ₂ O abatement project	2011-08-25	2012-02-23	
Verification team / Technical Review and Final Approval	Verification Team:		Technical review:	Final approval:
	Alexandra Nebel Ulrich Walter	Sabine Meyer	Rainer Winter Susanne Pasch	Rainer Winter
Emission reductions: [t CO_{2e}]	Verified amount		As per Draft MR:	As per PDD:
	110,747		111,503	221,022
Summary of Verification Opinion:	<p>GPN S.A. has commissioned the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program to carry out the 2nd periodic verification of the: "GPN Grand Quevilly N8 N₂O abatement project", with regard to the relevant requirements for JI project activities. The project reduces GHG emissions due to the reduction of N₂O emissions from the production of nitric acid with tertiary N₂O abatement technology (tertiary catalyst). This verification covers the period from 2010-11-01 to 2011-08-10 (including both days).</p> <p>In the course of the verification 8 Corrective Action Requests (CAR) and 2 Clarification Requests (CL) were raised and successfully closed. Furthermore 3 FARs are raised to improve the monitoring system in the future. The verification is based on the draft monitoring report, revised monitoring report, and the monitoring plan as set out in the registered PDD, the determination report, emission reduction calculation spreadsheet and supporting documents made available to the TÜV NORD JI/CDM CP by the project participant.</p> <p>As a result of this verification, the verifier confirms that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> all operations of the project are implemented and installed as planned and described in the project design document. the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied country specific methodology: Méthode pour les Projets Domestiques: "Réduction catalytique du N₂O dans des usines d'acide nitrique". the installed equipment essential for measuring parameters required for calculating emission reductions are calibrated appropriately. the monitoring system is in place and functional. The project has generated GHG emission reductions. <p>As the result of the 2nd periodic verification, the verifier confirms that the GHG emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements in a conservative and appropriate manner. TÜV NORD JI/CDM CP herewith confirms that the project has achieved emission reductions in the above mentioned reporting period as follows:</p> <p>Emission reductions: 110,747 t CO_{2e} including a deduction of 10% according to the Arrêté du 2 mars 2007</p>			
Document information:	Filename:			No. of pages:
	FVR GPN 2nd N8 2012-02-22 final.doc			80



Abbreviations:

AIE	Accredited Independent Entity
AMS	Automated Measuring System
CA	Corrective Action / Clarification Action
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CL	Clarification Request
CO₂	Carbon dioxide
CO_{2eq}	Carbon dioxide equivalent
DVM	Determination and Verification Manual
DCS	Data Collection System
ER	Emission Reduction
ERU	Emission Reduction Units
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
HNO₃	Nitric Acid
JI	Joint Implementation
MMD	Measurement and Monitoring Devices
MP	Monitoring Plan
MR	Monitoring Report
N₂O	Nitrous Oxide
PCS	Process Control System
PDD	Project Design Document
PP	Project Participant
QA/QC	Quality Assurance / Quality Control
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
XLS	Emission Reduction Calculation Spread Sheet



Table of Contents	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	6
1.1. Objective	6
1.2. Scope	6
2. GHG PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	8
2.1. Project Characteristics	8
2.2. Project Verification History	8
2.3. Involved Parties and Project Participants	9
2.4. Project Location	9
2.5. Technical Project Description	9
3. METHODOLOGY AND VERIFICATION SEQUENCE	11
3.1. Verification Steps	11
3.2. Contract review	11
3.3. Appointment of team members and technical reviewers	12
3.4. Publication of the Monitoring Report	13
3.5. Verification Planning	13
3.6. Desk review	15
3.7. On-site assessment	16
3.8. Draft verification reporting	17
3.9. Resolution of CARs, CLs and FARs	17
3.10. Final reporting	18
3.11. Technical review	18
3.12. Final approval	18
4. VERIFICATION FINDINGS.....	19
5. SUMMARY OF VERIFICATION ASSESSMENTS.....	30
5.1. Implementation of the project	30
5.2. Project history	30
5.3. Special events	31
5.4. Compliance with the monitoring plan	31
5.5. Monitoring parameters	32
5.6. Monitoring report	33
5.7. ER Calculation	33
5.8. Quality Management	34
5.9. Overall Aspects of the Verification	34
5.10. Hints for next periodic Verification	34



6.	VERIFICATION OPINION.....	36
7.	REFERENCES	37
	ANNEX 1: VERIFICATION PROTOCOL.....	45

1. INTRODUCTION

GPN S.A. has commissioned the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program (CP) to carry out the 2nd periodic verification of the project

“GPN Grand Quevilly N8 N₂O abatement project”

with regard to the relevant requirements for JI (Track 1) project activities. The verifiers have reviewed the implementation of the monitoring plan (MP) in the registered JI project number FR1000147¹.

GHG data for the monitoring period covering 2010-11-01 to 2011-08-10 was verified in detailed manner applying the set of requirements, audit practices and principles as required under the Determination and Verification Manual ^{/DVM/} of the UNFCCC.

This report summarizes the findings and conclusions of this 2nd periodic verification of the above mentioned UNFCCC registered project activity.

1.1. Objective

The objective of the verification is the review and ex-post determination by an independent entity of the GHG emission reductions. It includes the verification of the:

- implementation and operation of the project activity as given in the PDD,
- compliance with applied approved monitoring plan,
- data given in the monitoring report by checking the monitoring records, the emissions reduction calculation and supporting evidence,
- accuracy of the monitoring equipment,
- quality of evidence,
- significance of reporting risks and risks of material misstatements.

1.2. Scope

The verification of this registered project is based on the project design document ^{/PDD/}, the monitoring report ^{/MR/}, emission reduction calculation spreadsheet ^{/XLS/}, supporting documents made available to the verifier and information collected through performing interviews and during the on-site assessment. Furthermore publicly available information was considered as far as available and required.

The verification is carried out on the basis of the following requirements, applicable for this project activity:

- Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol ^{/KP/},

¹⁾ <http://ji.unfccc.int/JIITLProject/DB/45O56GWFCPYVIRXJ8SVOQJ75WSOV58/details>



- guidelines for the implementation of Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol as presented in the Marrakesh Accords under decision 9/CMP.1 ^{/MA/}, and subsequent decisions made by the JISC and COP/MOP,
- other relevant rules, including the host country legislation,
- JI Validation and Verification Manual ^{/DVM/},
- monitoring plan as given in the registered PDD ^{/PDD/},
- Projet Domestique Methodology: "Catalytic reduction of N₂O at nitric acid plants ^{/METH/} Méthode pour les Projets Domestiques: "Réduction catalytique du N₂O dans des usines d'acide nitrique"^{/METH/}



2. GHG PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1. Project Characteristics

Essential data of the project is presented in the following Table 2-1.

Table 2-1: Project Characteristics

Item	Data
Project title	GPN Grand Quevilly N8 N ₂ O abatement project
JI Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Track 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Track 2 <input type="checkbox"/> JPA
Project size	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Large Scale <input type="checkbox"/> Small Scale
JI Approach	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> JI Specific Approach <input type="checkbox"/> Approved CDM Methodology
Project Scope (according to UNFCCC sectoral scope numbers for CDM)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Energy Industries (renewable- /non-renewable sources)
	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Energy distribution
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Energy demand
	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Manufacturing industries
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 Chemical industry
	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 Construction
	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 Transport
	<input type="checkbox"/> 8 Mining/Mineral production
	<input type="checkbox"/> 9 Metal production
	<input type="checkbox"/> 10 Fugitive emissions from fuels (solid, oil and gas)
	<input type="checkbox"/> 11 Fugitive emissions from production and consumption of halocarbons and hexafluoride
	<input type="checkbox"/> 12 Solvents use
	<input type="checkbox"/> 13 Waste handling and disposal
	<input type="checkbox"/> 14 Land-use, land-use change and forestry
	<input type="checkbox"/> 15 Agriculture
Methodology:	<i>Projet Domestique Methodology: "Catalytic reduction of N₂O at nitric acid plants"</i>
Technical Area(s):	Q: 5.1
ITL Project ID No.:	FR1000147
Crediting period	<input type="checkbox"/> Renewable Crediting Period (7 y) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fixed Crediting Period (3 y, 1 m)

2.2. Project Verification History

Essential events since the registration of the project are presented in the following Table 2-2.

Table 2-2: Project verification history

#	Item	Time	Status
1	Date of registration	2010-04-16 ¹⁾	-
2	Start of crediting period	2009-12-08	-
3	1 st Monitoring period	2009-12-08 to 2010-10-31	Verified and issued
4	2 nd Monitoring period	2010-11-01 to 2011-08-10	Enclosed in this verification

1) Date of registration is the date of issuing of the LoA by the DFP

2.3. Involved Parties and Project Participants

The following parties to the Kyoto Protocol and project participants are involved in this project activity (Table 2-3).

Table 2-3: Project Parties and project participants

Characteristic	Party	Project Participant
Host party	France	GPN S.A.
	France	N.serve Environmental Services GmbH
	France	Total Petrochemicals
Other Involved Party/ies (investor)	Belgium	GPN S.A.

2.4. Project Location

The details of the project location are given in table 2-4:

Table 2-4: Project Location

No.	Project Location
Host Country	France
Region	North West (Haute Normandie), Département: Seine-Maritime, Commune : Le Grand Quevilly (near Rouen)
Project location address	30, rue de l'industrielle - BP 204 76121 Grand Quevilly Cadex
Plant Coordinates	Latitude: 49°25'2.31"N Longitude: 1°1'28.38"E

2.5. Technical Project Description

The project activity aims to reduce levels of N₂O emissions from the production of nitric acid with tertiary N₂O abatement technology (tertiary catalyst).

The key parameters for the project are given in table 2-5:

Table 2-5: Technical data of the plant N8

Parameter	Unit	Value
Ammonia Oxidation Reactor		
Manufacturer	-	ALSTOM
Diameter	mm	6198
Start of commercial production	-	July 2009
Operating conditions as per specifications (trip point values)		



Parameter	Unit	Value
- Temperature (min/max):	°C	810 – 870
- Temp. (minmin/maxmax):	°C	790 – 900 (Trip points)
- Pressure (min/max):	Bar abs	5,9 (security)
- Ammonia to Air ratio (max)	Vol.-%	10,5
Ammonia Oxidation Catalyst		
Manufacturer	-	Johnson Matthey
Composition:	-	Pt/Rd/Pd
Absorber		
Design capacity per day	t/d (100 %)	1,500
Annual production	t/year (100%)	525,000
Annual operation (design)	days	350
Tertiary Catalyst		
Manufacturer	-	GPN S.A.
Start of operation		July 2009
Type		Pelleted tertiary catalyst
Composition		Iron Zeolite
Design efficiency N ₂ O reduction	%	>95
Design efficiency NO _x reduction	%	>80
Capacities of substituted plants		
Oissel	t/a (metric)	297,500
N5	t/a (metric)	119,000
N6	t/a (metric)	119,000
N₂O Analyzer (stack)		
Manufacturer	-	FT Fine Tech
Type	-	ANAFIN 5000 ORBITAL AIT
Measurement Principle	-	FTIR spectrometry
Stack volume flow rate measurement		
Manufacturer	-	Sick Maihak GmbH
Type	-	FLAWSICK 100
Measurement Principle	-	Ultrasonic

3. METHODOLOGY AND VERIFICATION SEQUENCE

3.1. Verification Steps

The verification consisted of the following steps:

- Contract review
- Appointment of team members and technical reviewers
- Publication of the monitoring report
- A desk review of the Monitoring Report^{/MR/} submitted by the client and additional supporting documents with the use of customised verification protocol^{/CPM/} according to the Determination and Verification Manual^{/DVM/},
- Verification planning,
- On-Site assessment,
- Background investigation and follow-up interviews with personnel of the project developer and its contractors,
- Draft verification reporting
- Resolution of corrective actions (if any)
- Final verification reporting
- Technical review
- Final approval of the verification.

The sequence of the verification is given in the table 3.0 below:

Table 3.0: Verification sequence

Topic	Time
Assignment of verification	2011-09-01
On-site-visit	From 2011-09-06 till 2011-09-07
Draft reporting finalised	2011-10-06
Final reporting finalised	2012-02-23
Technical review finalised	2012-02-23

3.2. Contract review

To assure that

- the project falls within the scopes for which accreditation is held,



- the necessary competences to carry out the verification can be provided,
- Impartiality issues are clear and in line with the CDM accreditation requirements

a contract review was carried out before the contract was signed.

3.3. Appointment of team members and technical reviewers

On the basis of a competence analysis and individual availabilities a verification team, consistent of one team leader and 2 additional team members, was appointed. Furthermore also the personnel for the technical review and the final approval were determined.

The list of involved personnel, the tasks assigned and the qualification status are summarized in the table 3-1 below.

Table 3-1: Involved Personnel

	Name	Company	Function ¹⁾	Qualification Status ²⁾	Scheme competence ³⁾	Technical competence ⁴⁾	Verification competence ⁵⁾	Host country Competence	On-site visit
<input type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Alexandra Nebel	TN CERT GmbH	TL	SA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Ulrich Walter	TN CERT GmbH	TM ^{A)}	LA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Sabine Meyer	TN CERT GmbH	TM ^{A)}	LA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms.			TR ^{B)}		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
<input type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Susanne Pasch	TN CERT GmbH	TR ^{B)}	A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Rainer Winter	TN CERT GmbH	TR, FA ^{B)}	SA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-

¹⁾ TL: Team Leader; TM: Team Member, TR: Technical review; OT: Observer-Team, OR: Observer-TR; FA: Final approval

²⁾ GHG Auditor Status: A: Assessor; LA: Lead Assessor; SA: Senior Assessor; T: Trainee; TE: Technical Expert

³⁾ GHG auditor status (at least Assessor)

⁴⁾ As per S01-MU03 or S01-VA070-A2 (such as 1.1, 1.2, ...)

⁵⁾ In case of verification projects



- A) Team Member: GHG auditor (at least Assessor status), Technical Expert (incl. Host Country Expert or Verification Expert), not ETE
- B) No team member

3.4. Publication of the Monitoring Report

In accordance with decision 9/CMP.1 (§ 36) the draft monitoring report, as received from the project participants, has been made publicly available on the TÜV NORD Website www.global-warming.de during a 30 days period from 2011-10-08 to 2011-11-08. Comments received are taken into account in the course of the verification, if applicable. (No comments were received.)

3.5. Verification Planning

In order to ensure a complete, transparent and timely execution of the verification task the team leader has planned the complete sequence of events necessary to arrive at a substantiated final verification opinion.

Various tools have been established in order to ensure an effective verification planning.

Risk analysis and detailed audit testing planning

For the identification of potential reporting risks and the necessary detailed audit testing procedures for residual risk areas table A-1 is used. The structure and content of this table is given in table 3-2 below.

Table 3-2: Table A-1; Identification of verification risk areas

Table A-1: GHG calculation procedures and management control testing / Detailed audit testing of residual risk areas and random testing				
Identification of potential reporting risk	Identification, assessment and testing of management controls	Areas of residual risks	Additional verification testing performed	Conclusions and Areas Requiring Improvement (including Forward Action Requests)
<i>The following potential risks were identified and divided and structured according to the possible areas of occurrence.</i>	<i>The potential risks of raw data generation have been identified in the course of the monitoring system implementation. The following measures were taken in order to minimize the corresponding</i>	<i>Despite the measures implemented in order to reduce the occurrence probability the following residual risks remain and have to be addressed in</i>	<i>The additional verification testing performed is described. Testing may include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sample cross checking of manual transfers of data - Recalculation - Spreadsheet 'walk throughs' to check 	<i>Having investigated the residual risks, the conclusions should be noted here. Errors and uncertainties are highlighted.</i>



Table A-1: GHG calculation procedures and management control testing / Detailed audit testing of residual risk areas and random testing

Identification of potential reporting risk	Identification, assessment and testing of management controls	Areas of residual risks	Additional verification testing performed	Conclusions and Areas Requiring Improvement (including Forward Action Requests)
	<p><i>risks.</i></p> <p><i>The following measures are implemented:</i></p>	<p><i>the course of every verification.</i></p>	<p><i>links and equations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Inspection of calibration and maintenance records for key equipment</i> - <i>Check sampling analysis results</i> <p><i>Discussions with process engineers who have detailed knowledge of process uncertainty/error bands.</i></p>	

The completed table A-1 is enclosed in the annex 1 (table A-1) to this report.

Project specific periodic verification checklist

In order to ensure transparency and consideration of all relevant assessment criteria, a project specific verification protocol has been developed. The protocol shows, in a transparent manner, criteria and requirements, means and results of the verification. The verification protocol serves the following purposes:

- It organises, details and clarifies the requirements a JI project is expected to meet for verification
- It ensures a transparent verification process where the verifying AIE documents how a particular requirement has been proved and the result of the verification.

The basic structure of this project specific verification protocol for the periodic verification is described in table 3-3.



Table 3-3: Structure of the project specific periodic verification checklist

Table A-2: Periodic verification checklist						
No.	DVM² paragraph / Checklist Item <i>(incl. guidance for the determination team)</i>	Initial Finding <i>(Means and results of assessment)</i>	Ref.	Action requested to project participant <i>(CAR, CL, FAR)</i>	Review of PP's action	Conclusion
<i>Number of the checklist item</i>	<i>The section gives a reference to the relevant paragraph of the DVM. The checklist items are linked to the various requirements the project should meet. The checklist is organised in various sections. Each section is then further subdivided as per the requirements of the topic and the individual project activity.</i>	<i>The section is used to elaborate and discuss the checklist item in detail. It includes the initial assessment of the verification team and how the assessment was carried out.</i>	<i>Gives reference to the information source on which the assessment is based on.</i>	<i>Assessment based on evidence provided if the criterion is not fulfilled a CAR, CL or FAR (details of each finding are elaborated in chapter 4) is raised otherwise no action is requested. The assessment refers to the draft verification stage.</i>	<i>Assessment based on the project participant action in response to the raised CAR, CL or FAR (details of each finding are elaborated in chapter 4). The assessment refers to the final verification stage.</i>	<i>Final assessment at the final verification stage is given.</i>

The periodic verification checklist (verification protocol) is the backbone of the complete verification starting from the desk review until final assessment. Detailed assessments and findings are discussed within this checklist and not necessarily repeated in the main text of this report.

The completed verification protocol is enclosed in the annex (table A-2) to this report.

3.6. Desk review

During the desk review all documents initially provided by the client and publicly available documents relevant for the verification were reviewed. The main documents are listed below:

² JISC 19 Annex 4



- the last revision of the PDD including the monitoring plan^{/PDD/},
- the last revision of the determination report^{/DET/},
- the monitoring report, including the claimed emission reductions for the project^{/MR/},
- the emission reduction calculation spreadsheet^{/XLS/}.

Other supporting documents, such as publicly available information on the UNFCCC / host country website and background information were also reviewed.

3.7. On-site assessment

As most essential part of the verification exercise it is indispensable to carry out an inspection on site in order to verify that the project is implemented in accordance with the applicable criteria. Furthermore the on-site assessment is necessary to check the monitoring data with respect to accuracy to ensure the calculation of emission reductions. The main tasks covered during the site visit include, but are not limited to:

- The on-site assessment included an investigation of whether all relevant equipment is installed and works as anticipated.
- The operating staff was interviewed and observed in order to check the risks of inappropriate operation and data collection procedures.
- Information processes for generating, aggregating and reporting the selected monitored parameters were reviewed.
- The duly calibration of all metering equipment was checked.
- The monitoring processes, routines and documentations were audited to check their proper application.
- The monitoring data were checked completely.
- The data aggregation trails were checked via spot sample down to the level of the meter recordings.

The auditor Ulrich Walter attended the site visit.

Before and during the on-site visit the verification team performed interviews with the project participants to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review.

Representatives of GPN N8 Nitric Acid Plant and N.serve including the operational staff of the plant were interviewed. The main topics of the interviews are summarised in Table 3-4.

Table 3-4: Interviewed persons and interview topics

Interviewed Persons / Entities	Interview topics
1. Projects & Operations Personnel, GPN N8 Nitric Acid Plant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - General aspects of the project - Technical equipment and operation - Changes since validation



Interviewed Persons / Entities	Interview topics
2. Consultant, N.serve	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Calibration procedures - Quality management system - Involved personnel and responsibilities - Training and practice of the operational personnel - Implementation of the monitoring plan - Monitoring and measurement equipment - Maintenance - Remaining issues from validation - Monitoring data management - Data uncertainty and residual risks - GHG emission reduction calculation - Procedural aspects of the verification - Environmental aspect

3.8. Draft verification reporting

On the basis of the desk review, the on-site visit, follow-up interviews and further background investigation the verification protocol is completed. This protocol together with a general project and procedural description of the verification and a detailed list of the verification findings from the draft verification report. This report is sent to the client for resolution of raised CARs, CLs and FARs.

3.9. Resolution of CARs, CLs and FARs

Non-conformities raised during the verification can either be seen as a non-fulfilment of criteria ensuring the proper implementation of a project or where a risk to deliver high quality emission reductions is identified.

Corrective Action Requests (CARs) are issued, if:

- Non-conformities with the monitoring plan or methodology are found in monitoring and reporting, or if the evidence provided to prove conformity is insufficient;
- Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data or calculations of emission reductions which will impair the estimate of emission reductions;
- Issues identified in a FAR during validation or previous verifications requiring actions by the project participants to be verified during verification have not been resolved.

The verification team uses the term Clarification Request (CL), which is issued if:

- information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable JI requirements have been met.

Forward Action Requests (FAR) indicate essential risks for further periodic verifications. Forward Action Requests are issued, if:

- the monitoring and reporting require attention and / or adjustment for the next verification period.

For a detailed list of all CARs, CLs and FARs raised in the course of the verification pl. refer to chapter 4.

3.10. Final reporting

Upon successful closure of all raised CARs and CLs the final verification report including a positive verification opinion can be issued. In case not all essential issues could finally be resolved, a final report including a negative verification opinion is issued.

The final report summarizes the final assessments w.r.t. all applicable criteria.

3.11. Technical review

Before submission of the final verification report a technical review of the whole verification procedure is carried out. The technical reviewer is a competent GHG auditor being appointed for the scope this project falls under. The technical reviewer is not considered to be part of the verification team and thus not involved in the decision making process up to the technical review.

As a result of the technical review process the verification opinion and the topic specific assessments as prepared by the verification team leader may be confirmed or revised. Furthermore reporting improvements might be achieved.

3.12. Final approval

After successful technical review an overall (esp. procedural) assessment of the complete verification will be carried out by a senior assessor located in the accredited premises of TÜV NORD.

After this step the request for issuance can be started.



4. VERIFICATION FINDINGS

In the following paragraphs the findings from the desk review of the monitoring report^{/MR/}, the calculation spreadsheet^{/XLS/}, PDD^{/PDD/}, the Determination Report^{/DET/} and other supporting documents, as well as from the on-site assessment and the interviews are summarised.

The summary of CAR, CL and FAR issued are shown in Table 4-1:

Table 4-1: Summary of CAR, CL and FAR

Verification topic	No. of CAR	No. of CL	No. of FAR
A – Project Approvals	1	0	1
B – Project Implementation	2	0	1
C – Monitoring Plan Compliance	0	0	0
D – Monitoring Plan Revision	0	0	0
E – Data Management	6	2	1
SUM	8	2	3

The following tables include all raised CARs, CLs and FARs and the assessments of the same by the verification team. For an in depth evaluation of all verification items it should be referred to the verification protocols (see Annex).

Finding:	A1		
Classification	<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	The verifier of subsequent verification shall check that the sum of registered ERUs from former verifications and the ERUs of the actual period do not exceed the cap defined in the French LoA.		
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>			
AIE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-2. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and AIE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>			



Finding:	A1
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the next periodic verification <input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements

Finding:	A2		
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	N8: The PP shall state the involved parties as per provided LoAs.		
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	<i>The relevant section of the MR has been updated</i>		
AIE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-2. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and AIE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	The involved parties / PP are: France (host) GPN S.A. (Courbevoie) France N.serve Environmental Services GmbH France Total Petrochemicals (Antwerp) Belgium (investor) GPN S.A. (Courbevoie)		
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the next periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements		

Finding:	B1		
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	Issues of the MR: Chapter 2: 1. The regulatory limits of the Plant shall be mentioned as per arrêté préfectoral (also Chapter. 5.1) 2. The percentage of the abatement efficiency needs to be explained and updated 3. N/A (Not relevant for plant N8) Chapter 4: 4. N/A (Not relevant for plant N8) 5. Both alarm and trip values (OT in °C) for plant N8 shall be mentioned Chapter 5.1 6. The period in which the regulatory limit of 2,47 kg N ₂ O/tHNO ₃ is applicable shall be mentioned correctly for		



Finding:	B1
	<p>Plant N8.</p> <p>Chapter 5.3.5: 7. The QAL2 test in which the uncertainty of the AMS has been determined shall be referenced</p> <p>Chapter 6.4: 8. The table should include the date of the tests and of the completion of the reports for plant N8 9. N/A (Not relevant for plant N8)</p> <p>Chapter 7.2.: 10. Last bullet point. The significant higher number of ERUs needs further explanation</p> <p>Annex 1: 11. Parameter OH_n Determination of operation hours shall be explained and trip points needs to be included. 12. Tag numbers of relevant monitoring devices shall be included. 13. The numbering of parameters shall be consecutive at N8</p> <p>Annex 2: 14. The calibration procedure and date for the flow meter (NAP) shall be included for plant 15. Description of incidents, plant stops and special events shall be included.</p>
<p>Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i></p>	<p>Issues of the MR:</p> <p>Chapter 2: 1. The regulatory limits of the plant are now well specified in chapter 2 and chapter 5.1. 2. The percentage of the factual abatement efficiency for N8 for this verification period has been specified under section 7.2. The expected efficiency factor under section 2 has been deleted to prevent any confusion. The factor is not relevant for the project and has already been stated in the PDD for a general understanding of the technology.</p> <p>Chapter 4: 5. Both alarm and trip values (OT in °C) for plant N8 are included in the monitoring report under Annex 1. Under chapter 4, a reference to Annex1 is included.</p> <p>Chapter 5.1 6. The period in which the regulatory limit of 2,47 kg N₂O/tHNO₃ is applicable is now correctly specified for plant N8.</p> <p>Chapter 5.3.5: 7. The QAL2 test in which the uncertainty of the AMS has been determined is now referenced under chapter 5.3.5. The specifications are listed under Annex 2.</p> <p>Chapter 6.4: 8. The table now includes the date of the tests and of the completion of the reports for plant N8.</p> <p>Chapter 7.2.: 10. The significant higher number of ERUs of N8 plant is now</p>



Finding:	B1
	<p>well explained.</p> <p>Annex 1:</p> <p>11. The three parameter Oth₁, Oth₂, Oth₃ that are used to determine whether the plant is in operation or not are now well explained for N8, as well as the procedure of how they are applied. The trip points and pre-trip points (alarms) are included for each OH parameter under Annex 1.</p> <p>12. The tag numbers for the Oth₁, Oth₂, Oth₃ devices are included and consistent with the tag numbers referred to in the data sheet for Oth at N8.</p> <p>13. The numbering of parameters is corrected at N8</p> <p>Annex 2:</p> <p>14. The calibration procedure and date for the flow meter (NAP) is now included for plant 7 and 8 (now Annex three)</p> <p>15. Description of incidences, plant stops and special events are not included in the MR because they are confidential but have been made available to the auditor in the calculation sheet.</p>
<p>AIE Assessment #1</p> <p><i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-2. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and AIE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i></p>	<p>Chapter 2:</p> <p>1. The regulatory limits were mentioned as per arrêté préfectoral.</p> <p>2. The actual abatement efficiency for N8 was mentioned in the relevant section and deviation from estimation was explained</p> <p>Chapter 4:</p> <p>5. The alarm and trip values are now mentioned in the MR.</p> <p>Chapter 5.1</p> <p>6. The regulatory limit of 2.47 kg N₂O/tHNO₃ is applicable for the whole monitoring period and was stated correctly for Plant N8.</p> <p>Chapter 5.3.5:</p> <p>7. The QAL2 test in which the uncertainty of the AMS has been determined is Müller BBM M82 881/1 dated 2009-12-18</p> <p>Chapter 6.4:</p> <p>8. The table now includes the date of the tests and of the completion of the reports for plant N8</p> <p>Chapter 7.2.:</p> <p>10. The PP explains that the significant higher number of ERUs is the result of an optimized installation of the N₂O abatement catalyst and the replacement of the DeNOx catalyst. The verification team accepts this explanation.</p> <p>Annex 1:</p> <p>11. There are three thermocouple installed in the oxidation reactor giving the parameter parameters Oth₁, Oth₂, Oth₃. If at least one of the temperature values is within the trip values, the plant is considered to be in operation. This logic chain could be verified during on site visit.</p> <p>12. The tag numbers of relevant monitoring devices were included. N/A</p>



Finding:	B1
	<p>13. The numbering of parameters is now correct Annex 2:</p> <p>14. The calibration procedure and date for the flow meter (NAP) was included. Last calibration was 2010-09-30, next will be 2011-09-11.</p> <p>15. A description of incidences, plant stops and special events has been provided to the verification team</p>
<p>Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the next periodic verification</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements</p>

Finding:	B2		
Classification	<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FAR
<p>Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i></p>	It must be proven at each verification, that the plant's average emission levels for the past year did not exceed the regulatory limit.		
<p>Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i></p>			
<p>AIE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-2. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and AIE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i></p>			
<p>Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the next periodic verification</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements</p>		

Finding:	B3		
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<p>Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i></p>	The PP has to implement a QA/QC procedure to cross-check the Nitric Acid Production registered in the DCS.		



Finding:	B3
<p>Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i></p>	<p>The PP has a quality procedure to cross-check the nitric acid production. The procedure had been provided to the auditor during the onsite visit. However, it was assessed that a more detailed explanation is needed of how this procedure is executed. The procedure has been extended. The new version has been sent to the auditor.</p>
<p>AIE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-2. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and AIE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i></p>	<p>OK. The PP provided sufficient information (quality procedures and reports according to ISO 9001) to prove that a cross-check of nitric acid production data is well implemented.</p>
<p>Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i></p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the next periodic verification <input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements </p>

Finding:	E1		
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<p>Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i></p>	<p>Excel-Sheet:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Start and end date stated in the raw data sheet are not correct for plant N8 2. Application of moisture content correction for NCSG is not correct for plant N8 3. Operation hours of raw data sheet and determined in the calculation sheet is not consistent for each plant N8 4. Operational temperatures (trip point values) in the raw data sheet are not as per plant operation system for N8 5. Plant was in operation (plant status signal) in hours which the temperature was below the trip values for N8. 6. Plant status signal was "1" in times the plant was not in full operation for plant N8 7. The raw data sheet shall include the formulas and not only values without source/relation reference for plant N8 8. QAL2 correction factors are applied for raw data at plant and in N.serve calculation. Double calculation shall be removed for plant N8 		



Finding:	E1
<p>Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Start and end date as mentioned in the raw data sheet were updated to be in line with the monitoring period of this verification 2. The equation for moisture correction was corrected in the raw data table. 3. In the raw data sheet three temperature values are used to define whether or not the plant is in operation. Each temperature parameter is compared with the trip values. If at least one of the temperature values is within the trip values, the plant is considered to be in operation. Three temperature probes are used to monitor the temperature, in case one temperature probe is broken. In order to be conservative, the hour just after start up and before shut down is not considered for calculating the operating hours of the verification period in the calculation sheet. 4. The trip values used in the calculation sheet are updated according to the values in the plant operation system. 5. The definition of the plant status in the calculation sheet was updated to the actual situation in the plant operation system. The hour after startup and before shutdown was excluded. 6. See explanation 3 and 5 7. An Example of the raw data sheet with formulas will be provided 8. QAL 2 correction factor for NCSG is not applied in the system (the formula do not work in the analyser computer), but that the factor of correction of the VSG, TSG and PSG are applied in the DCS



Finding:	E1
<p>AIE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-2. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and AIE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i></p>	<p>Excel-Sheet:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Start and end date stated in the raw data sheet are now 2010-11-01 00:00 and 2011-07-15 and comply with the period of this verification. 2. Moisture content is now taken into account according to following equation: "Wet gas N₂O-concentration* (100+Moisture in %)/100" which is correct. 3. The PP now uses the PSC logic (direct processing of OT data taken from three thermocouples as described at parameter P.4 in Annex 1) to determine if the plant N8 was in operation or not. The results are now consistent 4. The trip values are now as per plant specification^{/TRIP/} 5. The PP now uses the OT to determine the plant status (see above). Additionally, the hour before and after plant stop was eliminated to avoid counting of not fully operational hours. This is acceptable since the verification team checked the PCS-logic which forced the plant to shut down after detecting of a temperature trip insight the oxidation reactor. 6. See explanation 3 and 5. 7. The PP provided a template of the raw data sheet with all formulas used for internal calculation. 8. The PP removed the QAL2 factor for VSG, TSG and PSG from ER calculation and now avoids double counting.
<p>Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i></p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the next periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements </p>

Finding:	E2		
Classification	<input type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FAR
<p>Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i></p>	<p>The correspondence with raw data provided by the plant to N.serve for data processing shall be forwarded to the verification team before verification for plant N8.</p>		
<p>Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i></p>			
<p>AIE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-2. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and AIE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i></p>			



Finding:	E2
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the next periodic verification <input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements

Finding:	E3		
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	An internal quality check of project-data registration and processing at the plant should be implemented and documented at N8. Confirmation of data shall be explained and implemented.		
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	An internal quality check of project-data registration and processing at the plant has been implemented: ENV-2_0006_R1 and ENV-2_0006_A3_R0. Both documents have been provided to the auditor. The procedure explains how the data is checked.		
AIE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-2. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and AIE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i>	The PP provided a quality document /QAL11/ which documents the implementation and responsibilities for project-data registration and processing. The documents includes the scope of parameters directly checked, a graphical analysis of recorded data to detect outliers and if necessary corrective actions. Also an organisational structure of the project responsibilities and a list of related document were created. The verification team found this measures to be sufficient to ensure a proper quality in the project activity.		
Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the next periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements		

Finding:	E4		
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i>	The time displayed on the monitor of the AMS-device and at the plant (process interface PI) should be the same.		
Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i>	The system time of the analyzer and the PI system were compared. A minor deviation of approximately 2 minutes has been detected. This deviation was found to be acceptable by the project participants. The time will be regulatory checked in order to prevent any major differences.		



Finding:	E4
<p>AIE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-2. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and AIE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i></p>	<p>The verification team can also accept a deviation of 2 minutes between PCS and AMS time since the deviation of values in this period of time is insignificant and has no influence on correct data processing.</p>
<p>Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i></p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the next periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements </p>

Finding:	E5		
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<p>Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the context (e.g. section)</i></p>	<p>The auditor should check, that following mistakes in data processing were corrected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NCSG-values in the data storage and therefore in the ERU-calculation of N8 were capped to 400 ppm, because 400 ppm was set as 100 %-value in the DCS. The 100% value should be revised. • The 4-20 mA output signal of the AMS is equivalent to a maximum of 500 ppm N₂O, but the maximum value in the DCS is set to 400 ppm. Because of that the registered NCSG-values used for ERU-calculation are 20 % to low. 		
<p>Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i></p>	<p>The analyser output range and DCS range are both set to 0-500 ppm N₂O. This is confirmed by the AST test (report number M87 7502) performed on 24/11/2010 and by the auditor during the onsite visit. The 100% value is therefore revised to 500 ppm in the analyser and the DCS system.</p>		
<p>AIE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-2. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and AIE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i></p>	<p>The verification team checked the parameterisation of the AMS and DCS settings and found that AMS output and DCS input range are now consistent</p>		
<p>Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i></p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the next periodic verification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly <input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements </p>		

Finding:	E6		
Classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAR	<input type="checkbox"/> CL	<input type="checkbox"/> FAR
<p>Description of finding <i>Describe the finding in unambiguous style; address the</i></p>	<p>TR-Findings: MR:</p>		



Finding:	E6
<p><i>context (e.g. section)</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. p.2: Date of Monitoring Period is not correct. 2. p.4: Why is GPN S.A France stated twice as project participant? 3. p.15/16/17: highlighted sections 4. general/ p.25: An extra correction factor for the uncertainty of the N₂O measurement (which is 8,5% according to QAL2 test) was applied to NCSG. Why it is not mentioned in Annex 2? <p>XLS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Summary: reference to 1st verification period. 6. Lower limit of confidence interval of NCSG should not be negative (which is scientifically not possible)
<p>Corrective Action #1 <i>This section shall be filled by the PP. It shall address the corrective action taken in details.</i></p>	<p><i>MR</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>The Monitoring Period date has been corrected</i> 2. <i>GPN S.A. was mistakenly stated twice. This has been corrected. Project Participants are: GPN. S.A., N.serve Environmental Services GmbH and Total Petrochemicals</i> 3. <i>The highlights have been erased</i> 4. <i>Annex 2 lists events that are related to the monitoring equipment and not to the calculation. The uncertainty has been added to Annex 1 Parameter PEn.</i> <p>XLS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. <i>The reference to the 1st verification period has been erased</i> 6. <i>The lower limit of confidence has been set to 0 manually in order to avoid negative results</i>
<p>AIE Assessment #1 <i>The assessment shall encompass all open issues in annex A-2. In case of non-closure, additional corrective action and AIE assessments (#2, #3, etc.) shall be added.</i></p>	<p>OK. MR: Corrections were made. XLS: Corrections were made.</p>
<p>Conclusion <i>Tick the appropriate checkbox</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> To be checked during the next periodic verification</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate action was taken</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project documentation was corrected correspondingly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional action should be taken</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project complies with the requirements</p>

5. SUMMARY OF VERIFICATION ASSESSMENTS

The following paragraphs include the summary of the final verification assessments after all CARs and CRs are closed out. For details of the assessments pl. refer to the discussion of the verification findings in chapter 4 and the verification protocol (Annex 1).

5.1. Implementation of the project

During the verification a site visit was carried out. On the basis of this site visit and the reviewed project documentation it can be confirmed that w.r.t. the realized technology, the project equipments, as well as the monitoring and metering equipment, the project has been implemented and operated as described in the registered PDD.

5.2. Project history

During the determination the AIE raised issues that could not be closed or resolved during the validation stage. For this purpose following FAR have been raised.

FAR B 3 (CAR B3 of this report):

The PP has to implement a QA/QC procedure to cross-check the Nitric Acid Production registered in the DCS.

FAR C2 (FAR B2 of this report):

It must be proven at each verification, that the plant's average emission levels for the past year did not exceed the regulatory limit.

FAR E3 (CAR E3 of this report):

An internal quality check of project-data registration and processing at the plant should be implemented and documented.

FAR E7 /CAR E5 of this report):

The auditor of the next verification should check, that following mistakes in data processing were corrected.

- The NCSG-values in the data storage and therefore in the ERU-calculation of N8 were capped to 400 ppm, because 400 ppm was set as 100 %-value in the DCS. The 100% value should be revised.
- The 4-20 mA output signal of the AMS is equivalent to a maximum of 500 ppm N₂O, but the maximum value in the DCS is set to 400 ppm. Because of that the registered NCSG-values used for ERU-calculation are 20 % to low.



Further issues:

It must be proven at each verification, that the plant’s average emission levels for the past year did not exceed this regulatory limit of 2.47 kg N₂O/t HNO₃ (100%).

5.3. Special events

Some events have been taken place, which influenced the N₂O-emissions from the plant and as an effect of this, catalyst performance and N₂O release to the atmosphere. The PP provided an overview of the events, which was spotchecked by the verifier^{/EXCEL/}.

Date		Event
Start	End	
2010-11-07; 17:00	08.11.2010; 19:00	–confidential- List of events has been provided to the verification team and found to be comprehensible.
2010-11-24; 22:00	25.11.2010;19:00	
2010-11-26; 04:00	08.01.2011;20:00	
2011-01-10; 16:00	14.01.2011; 16:00	
2011-01-22; 07:00	24.01.2011; 18:00	
2011-01-25; 04:00	31.01.2011; 23:00	
2011-04-20; 12:00	13.07.2011; 15:00	

Table 5.3.: Special events

5.4. Compliance with the monitoring plan

The monitoring system and all applied QA/QS procedures are completely in compliance to the registered monitoring plan.

Parameter	Measurement device	QA/QS-Measures	
		Last	Next
N ₂ O	FTIR Fine Tech ^{/AST/}	Calibration: 2010-11-24 (AST)	Calibration: Subsequent year (AST)*
NAP [t HNO ₃]	Microflow CMF 300L	Calibration: 2011-09-02	Subsequent year
Calibration gas: 100 ppm N ₂ O	Bottle No: BX13671F ^{/BOTTLE8/}	Opened: N/A	Valid: 2012-12-07

Table 5.4.: QA/QS-measures

*not carried out at date of on site visit

5.5. Monitoring parameters

During the verification all relevant monitoring parameters (as listed in the PDD) have been verified with regard to the appropriateness of the applied measurement / determination method, the correctness of the values applied for ER calculation, the accuracy, and applied QA/QC measures. The results as well as the verification procedure are described parameter-wise in the project specific verification checklist.

After appropriate corrections were carried out by the project participant in the course of this verification, it can be confirmed that all monitoring parameters have been measured / determined without material misstatements and in line with all applicable standards and relevant requirements.

Parameter:	Unit:	Applied value:
NCSG _n	[mg N ₂ O/Nm ³]	
	57.02	mean
	0.00 (the statistical value is below zero which is physically impossible)	lower limit of confidence interval
	317.09	upper limit of confidence interval
VSG _n	[Nm ³ /h]	
	180,163.80	mean
	159,388.00	lower limit of confidence interval
	203.978,00	upper limit of confidence interval

Table 5.5.1: Upper/Lower limits and mean value of NCSG and VSG according to statistical analysis applied for ER-calculation

Parameter:	Unit:	Applied value:
OH _n	[h]	3,353
NAP _n	[tHNO ₃]	174,791
OT	[°C]	Not applicable
AIFR	[%]	Not applicable
TSG	[°C]	Not applicable
PSG	[Pa]	Not applicable
EF _{reg}	[kgN ₂ O/tHNO ₃]	2.47kg N ₂ O/tHNO ₃ for the

		whole monitoring period.
EF _n	[kgN ₂ O/tHNO ₃]	0.19903 According to formula: EF _n = (PE _n / NAP _n)
PE _n	[kgN ₂ O]	34,789.08

Table 5.5.2: Monitored plant parameter/results of ER calculation

5.6. Monitoring report

A draft monitoring report was submitted to the verification team by the project participants. The team has made this report publicly available prior to the start of the verification activities. No comments were received.

During the verification, mistakes and needs for clarification were identified. The PP has carried out the requested corrections so that it can be confirmed that the monitoring report is complete and transparent and in accordance with the registered PDD and other relevant requirements.

5.7. ER Calculation

During the verification mistakes in the ER calculation were identified. Corresponding CARs were raised. A revised ER calculation was prepared by the PP and presented to the verification team. All raised issues were addressed appropriately so that all corresponding CARs/CLs could be closed out. Thus it is confirmed that the ER calculation is overall correct.

Relevant data for ER-calculation are:

Parameter	Value	Unit
Nitric Acid Production (100% concentrate)	174,791	tHNO ₃
Project Emissions	34,789.08	tCO ₂ e
Increasing of PE in case the overall uncertainty of the monitoring equipment is higher than 7,5 % ^{/METH/} : Permitted uncertainty: 7,5 % Uncertainty acc. to QAL2 ^{/QAL2/} : 8,5 % Increase: 1,0 %	1	%
Emission Factor	0.19903	kgN ₂ O/tHNO ₃
Governmental ERU deduction	10	%
Emission Reductions (this 2 nd period)	110,747	tCO ₂ e

Emission Reduction (1 st period)	125,810	tCO ₂ e
Sum of emission reduction generated	236,557	tCO ₂ e
Sum of emission reductions without governmental reduction of 10%	262,841	tCO ₂ e
LoA-cap ^{/LOA/} (without deduction)	883.977	tCO ₂ e
Max. emission reduction below cap	Yes	

Table 5.7: Data for ER-calculation

5.8. Quality Management

Quality Management procedures for measurements, collection and compilation of data, data storage and archiving, calibration, maintenance and training of personnel in the framework of this JI project activity have been defined. The procedures defined can be assessed as appropriate for the purpose.

5.9. Overall Aspects of the Verification

All necessary and requested documentation was provided by the project participants so that a complete verification of all relevant issues could be carried out.

Access was granted to all installations of the plant which are relevant for the project performance and the monitoring activities.

No issues have been identified indicating that the implementation of the project activity and the steps to claim emission reductions are not compliant with the UNFCCC / host country criteria and relevant guidance provided by the COP/CMP and the JISC (clarifications and/or guidance).

5.10. Hints for next periodic Verification

FAR A1:

The verifier of subsequent verification shall check that the sum of registered ERUs from former verifications and the ERUs of the actual period do not exceed the cap defined in the French LoA.



FAR B2:

It must be proven at each verification, that the plant's average emission levels for the past year did not exceed the regulatory limit.

FAR E2:

The correspondence with raw data provided by the plant to N.serve for data processing shall be forwarded to the verification team before verification for plant N8.

6. VERIFICATION OPINION

GPN S.A. has commissioned the TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program to carry out the 2nd periodic verification of the: “*GPN Grand Quevilly N8 N₂O abatement project*”, with regard to the relevant requirements for JI project activities. The project reduces GHG emissions due to the reduction of N₂O emissions from the production of nitric acid with tertiary N₂O abatement technology (tertiary catalyst). This verification covers the period from 2010-11-01 to 2011-08-10 (including both days).

In the course of the verification 8 Corrective Action Requests (CAR) and Clarification Requests (CL) were raised and successfully closed. Furthermore 3 FARs are raised to improve the monitoring system in the future. The verification is based on the draft monitoring report, revised monitoring report, and the monitoring plan as set out in the registered PDD, the determination report, emission reduction calculation spreadsheet and supporting documents made available to the TÜV NORD JI/CDM CP by the project participant.

As a result of this verification, the verifier confirms that:

- all operations of the project are implemented and installed as planned and described in the project design document.
- the monitoring plan is in accordance with the applied country specific methodology: Méthode pour les Projets Domestiques: “Réduction catalytique du N₂O dans des usines d’acide nitrique”.
- the installed equipment essential for measuring parameters required for calculating emission reductions are calibrated appropriately.
- the monitoring system is in place and functional. The project has generated GHG emission reductions.

As the result of the 2nd periodic verification, the verifier confirms that the GHG emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements in a conservative and appropriate manner. TÜV NORD JI/CDM CP herewith confirms that the project has achieved emission reductions in the above mentioned reporting period as follows:

Emission reductions: **110,747** t CO_{2e}

including a deduction of 10% according to the Arrêté du 2 mars 2007.

Essen, 2012-02-23



Alexandra Nebel

TÜV NORD JI/CDM CP

Verification Team Leader

Essen, 2012-02-23



Rainer Winter

TÜV NORD JI/CDM CP

Final Approval

7. REFERENCES

Table 7-1: Documents provided by the project participant(s)

Reference	Document
/AP/	Decree of the DRIRE from 04/04/2009 setting the limits for N ₂ O-emissions for the N8-plant to 2.47 kg/tHNO ₃ .
/APS/	Prescriptions Complementaires (Plant permission (decree) of N5, N6, N7, N8 indicates the plant capacity of HNO ₃)
/AST/	AST-report on performance tests and calibration of the automatic measuring system for N ₂ O of acid plant Line N8, No.: M87 750/2, dated 2011-03-21
/BILANXLS/	BILAN HNO ₃ BALANCE-1_20110706.xls sheet for calculation of mass balance
/BOTTLE8/	Calibration gas certificate for N8 plant, all in period of validity
/BOOK/	Quality document: Procedure d'Exploitation Environnement, Chapitre 07 N°02 Rejets N ₂ O, Consignes d'exploitation et projet domestique Rev.: 0, dated: 2010-11-25. This procedure outlines the main constraints and rules imposed on the project by legislation in relation to emissions of N ₂ O from the production plant of nitric acid.
/CAPN8/	Units characteristics sheet of plant N8 showing the design capacity of Nitric Acid.
/CAT/	Fiche de données de sécurité (safety sheet according to GHS standard) of the abatement catalyst, issued by Yara on 2008-01-16
/CERT/	ISO 9001, 14001 Certificates, issued by AFNOR, valid until 2012-10-11
/DDA/	Demande d'Autorisation d'Exploiter (Plant permission (decree) of N8 from 15/12/2006 indicates the 100 % plant capacity of 1,500 tonnes HNO ₃ /year).
/DECLA/	Declaration of emissions to local government (Effluents Gazeux-N ₂ O), Atelier Nitrique 8 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2010 • 2011

Reference	Document
/DN8B/	Technical drawing of the Ammonia-Boiler of Plant N8
/DVOLN8/	Technical description of the HNO ₃ -volume flow meter of plant N 8, Micro Motion ELITE
/EMISN8/	Declaration of GPN to local government declaring emissions, i.e. N ₂ O emission of the recent 12 months, dated October 2010. The declaration shows, that the determined N ₂ O emission factor of 0.12 was below the value of the decree ^{/AP/} of 2.47 kg N ₂ O/t HNO ₃ .
/FICHE8/	Fiche de vie – analyseur Nitrique 8 (Control card for N ₂ O-analyser of plant N8, with complete weekly calibrations noted)
/FICHE/	Fiche renseignement carte de controle –Analyseurs Nitrique, control cards for AMS
/LOA/	Host country <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LoA issued by the French “Ministère de l'Écologie, de l'Énergie, du Développement Durable et de la Mer, en charge des Technologies vertes et des Négociations sur le climat” on 2010-04-16, Ref-No.: 10007194 to GPN S.A. and N.serve Environmental services LoA issued by the French “Ministère de l'Écologie, de l'Énergie, du Développement Durable et de la Mer, en charge des Technologies vertes et des Négociations sur le climat” on 2011-07-20, Ref-No.: 11-0756 5E DNbis to Total Petrochemicals Investor country <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LoA issued by the National Climate Commission of Belgium on 2010-12-03, Ref-No.: NKC/DFP/3 to GPN S.A.
/MANUAL/	Procedure: Manuel Maintenance Travaux Neufs: Procédures Techniques Projet Domestique, Version No.2, 15.402.00 (Description of the organization, instructions and department procedures implemented in the framework of domestic projects), dated 2011-11
/MR/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> First Monitoring report of GHGs emission reductions “GPN Grand Quevilly N8 N₂O abatement project”, version 1, dated 2011-08-25 issued by N.serve. Final Monitoring report of GHGs emission reductions “GPN Grand Quevilly N8 N₂O abatement project”, version 5, dated 2012-02-23 issued by N.serve.
/NAPFS/	Flow Sheet of Nitric Acid Production Plant N8, Rev. 1 from 08/2007 (Doc.-No.: 1A0010-PFD-0010-0001).
/ORGPD/	Organisation projets domestiques (Survey of personnel organisation of the

Reference	Document
	Jl-project), issued by the GPN plant on 2010-11-18.
/PART/	Attestation de participation (participation certificate of plant staff on maintenance work at the AMS, dated 2011-06-30
/P&IN8/	Pipe and Installation sheet of N8 plant.
/PROC1/	Quality procedure: Organisation de la Cellule Analysateur pour le Suivi de analysateur securite (IPS) environment qualite (Organisation of maintenance of the AMS), TEIN/12/300
/PROC108/	Mode operatoire-Principe de mesure et echantillonnage de l'analysateur NH3 N2O NO NO2 NITRIQUE8 - Procedure-sampling and measuring principle of the analyzer MEI_3_1268, rev. 0.
/PROC2/	Plan de controle suivi de analysateurs à l'émision des Nitriques N7, 8 (Plan (Procedure) of Mainenance of AMS), MEI_2_1200
/PROC3/	Verification des Analyseurs FTIR (Calibration procedure of the AMS (N ₂ O-Analysator), MEI_3_1221, Rev 4 dated 2009-11-24
/PROC4/	Procedure – Gestion des documents maitrises des enregistrements, (document management system), AQ/2/0001
/PROC5/	Programme individuel de formation au poste de travail (Individual program for training on workplace)
/PROC6/	Elaboration, execution et suivi du plan de formation (Development, Implementation and monitoring plan for training of plan staff), RH_2_0303
/PROC7/	Mode operatoire – Debitmetres Etalonnage verification (Procedures for calibration of HNO ₃ flow meters), ELMR/3/017
/PROC8/	Mode operatoire – Bilan N ₂ O (Quality document regarding N ₂ O emissions from the GPN nitric acids plants), ENV/3/1121, dated 2010-12-20, version 7
/PROC98/	Mode-operatoire – Verification des analysateurs FTIR (Quality document related to the calibration of the N ₂ O-analyser at N8 plant)
/PROC10/	Procedure of organisation, ENV/2/0006 domestic project, dated 2011-09-12, rev 0 (Description of the organisation which was implemented for the domestic project between the operators, the maintenance and the environment department, extract from Environment Quality handbook SYS/1/0001



Reference	Document
/PROC11/	Quality document ENV_2_0006_A3 dated 2011-09-12, rev. 0, Check od project data (plausibility check)
/PROC12/	Quality document describing the mass balance procedure DTU/2/0001, dated 2011-02-11, rev. 0
/QAL2CAL8/	Report on performance tests and calibration of the AMS, report No.: M82 881/1, issued by Müller BBM on 2009-12-18
/QAL2INST/	QAL2 check of correct installation of the AMS, report No.: M83 984/3, issued by Müller-BBM on 2010-08-09
/SPIE CON1/	Mémoire technique et organisationnel, dated 2009-10-01 (Definition of scope of contract ^{/CONSPIE/}).
/SPIE5/	Contrat analysateurs 2010 – Annexe 5: definition des travaux de maintenance courante (Technical specification of global contract ^{/CONSPIE/})
/SPIECON/	Contrat de maintenance (Refreshed contract between GPN and SPIE regarding maintenance of MMD equipment), dated October 2010
/TRAIN/	Module 4: le System d'échantillonnage (Training course for maintenance works, with staff of ESPIE and GPN, signed by the attendances)
/TRAIN2/	FineTech – Certificat d'aptitude (2 days service training for Mr. Pascal Fauquet), dated 2008-03-28
/TRAIN2/	Attestation de presence (Different certificates of participation in a training course: Maintenance of analysers, level 2 and 3)
/TRIPN8/	Tableau des securities: Nitrique 8 (List of trip point values of N8 plant)
/XLS/	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Initial version: ERU Excel calculation spreadsheet (Calc_N02_V01_GPN_N8_20110819_MS) Final version: ERU Excel calculation spreadsheet (Calc_N02_V06_GPN_N8_20120221_MS)

Table 7-2: Background investigation and assessment documents

Reference	Document
/14181/	European Standard DIN EN 14181: "Stationary source emissions – Quality assurance of automated measuring systems



Reference	Document
/AM0034/	Approved baseline and monitoring methodology AM0034: “Catalytic reduction of N ₂ O inside the ammonia burner of nitric acid plants”, version 3.4
/AR/	Arrêté du 2 mars 2007 of the ‘Ministère de l’écologie et du développement durable (Implementation of the JI-Guidelines in France)
/BACK/	Background paper: “N ₂ O EMISSIONS FROM ADIPIIC ACID AND NITRIC ACID PRODUCTION“, Good Practice Guidance and Uncertainty Management in National Greenhouse Gas Inventories issued by the NGGIP
/BELGIUM/	Rules established by the National Climate Commission for the submission of an application for approval for a project activity
/BREF/	Reference Document on Best Available Techniques for the Manufacture of Large Volume Inorganic Chemicals - Ammonia, Acids and Fertilisers
/CPM/	TÜV NORD JI / CDM CP Manual (incl. CP procedures and forms)
/DET/	Final JI Determination Report: GPN Grand Quevilly N8 N ₂ O Abatement Project, Report No.: 8000373119 – 09/265, dated 2010-04-28, issued by TÜV NORD
/DVM/	Ji Determination and Verification Manual
/GUIDE/	Guidance: Developing a CDM or JI project to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, issued by the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • French Ministry for Economy, Industry and Employment • French Ministry for Ecology, Energy, Sustainable Development and Town and Country Planning • French Global Environment Facility
/IPCC/	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: work book 2. 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: work book
/KP/	Kyoto Protocol (1997)
/MA/	Decision 3/CMP. 1 (Marrakesh – Accords)
/METH/	Méthode pour les Projets Domestiques Réduction catalytique du N ₂ O dans des usines d’acide nitrique (Projet Domestique Methodology: Catalytic reduction of N ₂ O at nitric acid plants)

Reference	Document
/METHE/	Projet Domestique Methodology Catalytic reduction of N ₂ O at nitric acid plants (Translation of ^{/METH/})
/PDD/	Project Design Document Version 03 dated 2009-08-06 “GPN Grand Quevilly N8 N ₂ O abatement project”
/OTN8/	Diagram of parameter OT - Extract of ERU-calculation Excel-sheet
/NCSGN8/	Diagram of parameter NCSG - Extract of ERU-calculation Excel-sheet

Table 7-3: Websites used

Reference	Link	Organisation
/bref/	http://eippcb.jrc.ec.europa.eu/reference/	Website of the European Commission, Joint Research Centre, Institute for Prospective Technological Studies (Provision of BAT-Reference documents)
/dehst/	http://www.dehst.de	German Emissions Trading Authority (DEHSt) at the Federal Environment Agency
/dfp/	http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/	Ministère de l'Écologie, de l'Énergie, du Développement Durable et de la Mer, en charge des Technologies vertes et des Négociations sur le climat
/douane/	http://www.douane.gouv.fr/data/file/6146.pdf	Web-file regarding N ₂ O emission taxation.
/gw/	http://www.global-warming.de/	TÜV Nord platform hosting projects open for comments at the determination stage
/ipcc/	www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp	IPCC publications
/lf/	http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/	Site of the Legifrance (La service public de la diffusion du droit)
/mist/	http://www.ecologie.gouv.fr/Methodologies-de-projets.html	Ministère de l'Écologie, de l'Énergie, du Développement durable et de la Mer (Ministry of ecology and sustainable development)

Reference	Link	Organisation
/nfg/	http://www.effet-de-serre.gouv.fr/accueil	Mission interministérielle sur l'effet de serre (French Inter-Ministry Mission on the Greenhouse Effect)
/unfccc/	http://ji.unfccc.int	JI-SC

Table 7-4: List of interviewed persons

Reference	Moi ¹		Name	Organisation / Function
/IM01/	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms	Bertrand Walle	GPN N8 Nitric Acid Plant (Coordinator JI-Projects)
/IM01/	V	<input type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Isabelle Martineau	GPN N8 Nitric Acid Plant (Quality/Environmental manager)
/IM01/	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Pascal Fauquet	GPN N8 Nitric Acid Plant (Instrumentation Engineer)
/IM01/	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Simon Deglaire	GPN Grandpuits Nitric Acid Plant (Production Engineer)
/IM01/	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Nelson Rodrigues	GPN N8 Nitric Acid Plant (Energy Purchasing Engineer)
/IM01/	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Pierre Henri Chretien	GPN N8 Nitric Acid Plant (Staff)
/IM01/	V	<input type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Sarah Debor	N.serve (Project manager)
/IM01/	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Martin Stilkenbäumer	N.serve (Monitoring Expert)

¹⁾ Means of Interview: (Telephone, E-Mail, Visit)



ANNEX

A1: Verification Protocol



ANNEX 1: VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

Table A-1: GHG calculation procedures and management control testing / detailed audit testing of residual risk areas and random testing

Identification of potential reporting risk	Identification, assessment and testing of management controls	Areas of residual risks	Additional verification testing	Conclusions and Areas Requiring Improvement (including <i>Forward Action Requests</i>)
Raw data generation				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installation of measuring equipment • Dysfunction of installed equipment • Maloperation by operational personnel • Downtimes of equipment • Exchange of equipment • Change of measurement equipment characteristic • Insufficient accuracy • Change of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installation of modern and state of the art equipment • Process control automation • Internal data review • Regular visual inspections of installed equipment • Only skilled and trained personnel operates the relevant equipment • Daily raw data checks • Immediate exchange of dysfunctional equipment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate installation / operation of the monitoring equipment • Inadequate exchange of equipment • Change of personnel • Undetected measurement errors • Inappropriateness of Management system procedures w.r.t. monitoring plan requirements (e.g. substitute value strategies) • Non-application of management system procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site – visit (maintenance dept., gas supplier) • Check of equipment • Check of technical data sheets • Check of suppliers information / guarantees • Check of calibration records, if applicable • Check of maintenance records • Counter-check of raw data and commercial data • Check of JI management system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Table A-2



Identification of potential reporting risk	Identification, assessment and testing of management controls	Areas of residual risks	Additional verification testing	Conclusions and Areas Requiring Improvement (including <i>Forward Action Requests</i>)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> technology Accuracy of values supplied by Third Parties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stand-by duty is organized Training Internal audit procedures Internal check of QA/QC measures of involved Third Parties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient accuracy Inappropriate QA/QC measures of Third Parties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check of JI related procedures Application of JI management system procedures Check of trainings Check of responsibilities Check of QA/QC documentation / evidences of involved Third Parties 	
Raw data collection and data aggregation				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wrong data transfer from raw data to daily and monthly aggregated reporting forms IT Systems Spread sheet programming Manual data transmission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cross-check of data Plausibility checks of various parameters. Appropriate archiving system Clear allocation of responsibilities Application of JI Management system procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unintended usage of old data that has been revised Incomplete documentation Ex-post corrections of records Ambiguous sources of information Non-application of management system procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check of data aggregation steps Counter-calculation Data integrity checks by means of graphical data analysis and calculation of specific performance figures Check of management system certification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Table A-2



Identification of potential reporting risk	Identification, assessment and testing of management controls	Areas of residual risks	Additional verification testing	Conclusions and Areas Requiring Improvement (including <i>Forward Action Requests</i>)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data protection Responsibilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Usage of standard software solutions (Spreadsheets) Limited access to IT systems Data protection procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manual data transfer mistakes Unintended change of spread sheet programming or data base entries Problems caused by updating/upgrading or change of applied software 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check of data archiving system Check of application of Management system procedures 	
Other calculation parameters				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emission factors, oxidation factors, coefficients 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The values and data sources applied are defined in the PDD and monitoring plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unintended or intended Modification of calculation parameters Wrong application of values Misinterpretations of the applied methodology and/ or the PDD Missing update of applicable regulatory framework (e.g. IPCC values) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update-check of regulatory framework Countercheck of the applied MP in the MR against the approved version 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Table A-2
Calculation Methods				



Identification of potential reporting risk	Identification, assessment and testing of management controls	Areas of residual risks	Additional verification testing	Conclusions and Areas Requiring Improvement (including <i>Forward Action Requests</i>)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applied formulae • Miscalculation • Mistakes in spreadsheet calculation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advanced calculation and reporting tools • A JI coordinator is in charge of the JI related calculations • Usage of tested / counterchecked Excel spreadsheets • Involvement of external consultants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The danger of miscalculation can only be minimized. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Countercheck on the basis of own calculation. • Spread sheet walk-through. • Plausibility checks • Check of plots 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Table A-2
Monitoring reporting				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data transfer to the author of the monitoring report • Data transfer to the monitoring report • Unintended use of outdated versions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An experienced JI consultant is responsible for monitoring reporting. • JI QMS procedures are defined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The danger of data transfer mistakes can only be minimized • Inappropriate application of QMS procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Counter check with evidences provided. • Audit of procedure application 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Table A-2



Table A-2: (Project specific) Periodic Verification Checklist

No.	DVM ³ paragraph / Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the determination team)	Initial Finding (Means and results of assessment)	Ref.	Action requested to PPs (CAR, CL, FAR)	Review of PP's action	Conclusion
A	Project Approvals by Parties involved					
A.1	<p><i>DVM § 90</i> Has the DFPs of at least one Party involved, other than the host Party, issued a written project approval when submitting the first verification report to the secretariat for publication in accordance with paragraph 38 of the JI guidelines, at the latest?</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The report will be submitted directly to the DFP by the PP because it is a track 1 project. The PP provided following LoA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Host country France (PP is GPN S.A., N.serve and Total Petrochemicals) • Investor country Belgium (PP is GPN S.A.) <p><i>Means of determination:</i> DFP-website, LoA, Unfccc-website, MR <i>Conclusion:</i> Not all parties stated in section 2.1. of the MR are mentioned in the provided LoAs provided by the PP. CAR A2: The PP shall state the involved parties as per provided LoA.</p>	/LOA/ /dfp/ /unfccc/	CAR A2	CAR A2 Pls. see Chapter 4.	OK
A.2	<i>DVM § 91</i>	<i>Description:</i> The French LoA has two conditions, which	/LOA/	FAR A1		

³ JISC 19 Annex 4



No.	DVM ³ paragraph / Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the determination team)	Initial Finding (Means and results of assessment)	Ref.	Action requested to PPs (CAR, CL, FAR)	Review of PP's action	Conclusion
	<p>Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved unconditional?</p>	<p>need to be taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only 90 % of the verified emission reductions of one period shall be claimed by the PP. The ERU quantity stated in this report already takes into account the 10% deduction. • The total amount of verified emission reductions until 2012-12-31 is limited to 883,977 tonnes (before 10 % reduction, 795,579 tonnes after reduction) <p>The Belgian LoA is unconditional <i>Means of determination:</i> LoA <i>Conclusion:</i> OK,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 % of the emission reductions are subtracted from the initial result. The ERU quantity stated in this report already takes into account the 10% deduction. • The sum of emission reduction AIEs not exceed the maximum amount stated in the host LoA. <p>FAR A1: The verifier of subsequent verification shall check that the sum of registered ERUs from former verifications and the ERUs of the actual period AIEs not exceed the CAP defined in the French LoA.</p>	<p>/dfp/ /unfccc/</p>			



No.	DVM ³ paragraph / Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the determination team)	Initial Finding (Means and results of assessment)	Ref.	Action requested to PPs (CAR, CL, FAR)	Review of PP's action	Conclusion
B	Project implementation					
B.1	<p><i>DVM § 92</i> Has the project been implemented in accordance with the PDD regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website?</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The PP installed a tertiary abatement catalyst inside the DeNOx-reactor and an AMS conforming to the DIN EN 14181 before start of the project. QA/QS measures were implemented.</p> <p><i>Means of determination:</i> PDD, certificates provided by the PP, on-site visit</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The project installations (Abatement catalyst, AMS) and procedures were checked by the verification team and compared with the description given in the registered PDD. The installation of the abatement catalyst and monitoring system is in line with the PDD. The verification team found some inconsistencies in the monitoring report, which are summarised in CAR B1.</p> <p><u>Issues of monitoring report:</u> Chapter 2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The regulatory limits shall be mentioned as per arrêté préfectoral (also Chapter. 5.1) 2. The percentage of the abatement efficiency needs to be explained and updated 5. Both alarm and trip values (OT in °C) for plant N8 shall be mentioned 	<p>/PDD/ /QAL2 CAL7/ /AST/ /MR/ /14181/ /CAT/ /PROC 1/ - /PROC 12/ /MANUA L/</p>	<p>CAR B1</p>	<p>CAR-B1 Pls. refer to section 4.</p>	<p>OK</p>



No.	DVM ³ paragraph / Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the determination team)	Initial Finding (Means and results of assessment)	Ref.	Action requested to PPs (CAR, CL, FAR)	Review of PP's action	Conclusion
		<p>Chapter 5.1 6. The period in which the regulatory limit of 2,47 kg N₂O/tHNO₃ is applicable shall be mentioned correctly</p> <p>Chapter 5.3.5: 7. The QAL2 test in which the uncertainty of the AMS has been determined shall be referenced</p> <p>Chapter 6.4: 8. The table should include the date of the AST-tests and of the completion of the report</p> <p>10. Last bullet point. The significant higher number of ERUs needs further explanation</p> <p>Annex 1: 11. Parameter OH_n Determination of operation hours shall be explained and trip points needs to be included</p> <p>12. Tag numbers of relevant monitoring devices shall be included</p> <p>13. The numbering of parameters shall be consecutive</p> <p>Annex 2: 14. The calibration procedure and date for the flow meter (NAP) shall be included</p> <p>15. Description of incidences, plant stops and special events shall be included.</p>				
B.2	<p><i>DVM § 93</i> What is the status of operation</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The project is running according to the description provided in the PDD. Some unforeseeable</p>	<p>/PDD/ /XLS/</p>	<p>CAR B1</p>	<p>CAR B1 Pls. see</p>	<p>OK</p>



No.	DVM ³ paragraph / Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the determination team)	Initial Finding (Means and results of assessment)	Ref.	Action requested to PPs (CAR, CL, FAR)	Review of PP's action	Conclusion
	of the project during the monitoring period?	<p>events took place during verification period:</p> <p>The plant was shut down for several period of time caused by trip point triggering and maintenance works^{/HIST8/}.</p> <p><i>Means of determination:</i> Calculation sheets annexed to the monitoring report, on-site visit and inspection of implementations, plant history, PDD</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The project history was discussed in detail during on site visit and found to be plausible. Nevertheless, the PP is requested to give a more detailed explanation of the increased efficiency</p> <p>CAR B1:</p> <p><u>Issues of monitoring report:</u> Chapter 7.2.: 10. Last bullet point. The significant higher number of ERUs needs further explanation</p>	/MR/ /HIST N8/ /EMISN 8/		Chapter 4.	
C	Compliance with monitoring plan					
C.1	<p><i>DVM § 94</i></p> <p>Did the monitoring occur in accordance with the monitoring plan included in the PDD</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> Monitored parameter and parameter (according to the methodology and the registered PDD) used for calculation are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCSG_n [mg N₂O/Nm³] 	/PDD/ /MR/ /14181/	FAR E2 CAR E3 CAR E4	FAR E2 CAR E3 CAR E4	OK



No.	DVM ³ paragraph / Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the determination team)	Initial Finding (Means and results of assessment)	Ref.	Action requested to PPs (CAR, CL, FAR)	Review of PP's action	Conclusion
	<p>regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website?</p>	<p><u>Meaning:</u> Average N₂O concentration in the tail gas during project Verification Period n.</p> <p><u>Source:</u> Continuous emissions N₂O analyser (part of AMS)</p> <p><u>Measurement frequency:</u> Hourly value based on continuous monitoring (10 second frequency)</p> <p><u>Storage frequency:</u> 10 sec</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VSG_n [Nm³/h] <p><u>Meaning:</u> Average Volume flow rate of the tail gas during project Verification Period n.</p> <p><u>Source:</u> Gas volume flow meter (part of AMS)</p> <p><u>Measurement frequency:</u> Hourly value based on continuous monitoring (10 second frequency)</p>	/XLS/	<p>FAR E2 CAR E3 CAR E4</p>	<p>FAR E2 CAR E3 CAR E4 Pls. see Chapter 4</p>	



No.	DVM ³ paragraph / Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the determination team)	Initial Finding (Means and results of assessment)	Ref.	Action requested to PPs (CAR, CL, FAR)	Review of PP's action	Conclusion
		<p><u>Storage frequency:</u> 10 sec</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PE_n [kgN₂O] <p><u>Meaning:</u> N₂O emissions during project Verification Period n.</p> <p><u>Source:</u> Calculated from measured data</p> <p><u>Measurement frequency:</u> Calculated after each Verification Period</p> <p><u>Applied value:</u> Calculated according to the methodology: $PE^n = VSG_n * NCSG_n * OH_n * 10^{-6}$</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OH_n [h] <p><u>Meaning:</u> Total operating hours of Verification Period n.</p> <p><u>Source:</u> Derived from OT (oxidation temperature in the ammonia burner). In the case the OT will leave the range of trip</p>				



No.	DVM ³ paragraph / Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the determination team)	Initial Finding (Means and results of assessment)	Ref.	Action requested to PPs (CAR, CL, FAR)	Review of PP's action	Conclusion
		<p>points, a plant stop will be forced by the PCS.</p> <p><u>Measurement frequency:</u> Continuous</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NAP_n [tHNO₃] <p><u>Meaning:</u> Metric tonnes of 100% concentrated nitric acid during any Verification Period n.</p> <p><u>Source:</u> Nitric acid flow meter</p> <p><u>Measurement frequency:</u> Continuously throughout the Verification Period n.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OT [°C] <p><u>Meaning:</u> Oxidation temperature in the ammonia oxidation reactor (AOR).</p> <p><u>Source:</u> 3 Thermocouples inside the AOR. 3 thermocouples inside the AOR. If at least one of the temperature values is within the trip values, the plant is considered to be in</p>				



No.	DVM ³ paragraph / Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the determination team)	Initial Finding (Means and results of assessment)	Ref.	Action requested to PPs (CAR, CL, FAR)	Review of PP's action	Conclusion
		<p>operation.</p> <p><u>Measurement frequency:</u> Hourly average value based on continuous monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AFR [kgNH₃/h] <p><u>Meaning:</u> Ammonia Flow rate to the ammonia oxidation reactor (AOR)</p> <p><u>Source:</u> Continuous emissions ammonia flow meter</p> <p><u>Measurement frequency:</u> Hourly average value based on continuous monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AIFR [%] <p><u>Meaning:</u> Ammonia to air ratio into the AOR</p> <p><u>Source:</u> Ammonia & Air flow meters</p> <p><u>Measurement frequency:</u> Hourly average value based on continuous monitoring</p>				



No.	DVM ³ paragraph / Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the determination team)	Initial Finding (Means and results of assessment)	Ref.	Action requested to PPs (CAR, CL, FAR)	Review of PP's action	Conclusion
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="779 534 1525 869"> <p>• TSG [°C] <i>Meaning:</i> Temperature of tail gas <i>Source:</i> Probe (part of the gas volume flow meter). <i>Measurement frequency:</i> Hourly average value based on continuous monitoring</p> <li data-bbox="779 885 1525 1220"> <p>• PSG [Pa] <i>Meaning:</i> Pressure of tail gas <i>Source:</i> Probe (part of the gas volume flow meter). <i>Measurement frequency:</i> Hourly average value based on continuous monitoring</p> <li data-bbox="779 1236 1525 1367"> <p>• EF_n [kgN₂O/tHNO₃] <i>Meaning:</i> Emissions factor calculated for project Verification</p> 				



No.	DVM ³ paragraph / Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the determination team)	Initial Finding (Means and results of assessment)	Ref.	Action requested to PPs (CAR, CL, FAR)	Review of PP's action	Conclusion
		<p>Period n.</p> <p><u>Source:</u> Calculated from measured data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EF_{reg} [kgN₂O/tHNO₃] <p><u>Meaning:</u> Emissions cap for N₂O from nitric acid production set by government/local regulation.</p> <p><u>Source:</u> National or local N₂O emissions legislation ^{/AP/}</p> <p>This regulatory limit is lower than the applicable benchmark emissions factor, EF_{reg} replaces EF_{BM} in the calculation of ERUs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EF_{BM} [kgN₂O/tHNO₃] <p><u>Meaning:</u> Specific reference value (benchmark emissions factor) that will be applied to calculate the emissions reductions from a specific Verification Period.</p> <p><u>Source:</u></p>				



No.	DVM ³ paragraph / Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the determination team)	Initial Finding (Means and results of assessment)	Ref.	Action requested to PPs (CAR, CL, FAR)	Review of PP's action	Conclusion
		<p>Included in the French Methodology</p> <p>QA/QS:</p> <p>The PP refers to the project European standard 14181 regarding implementation of monitoring equipment and maintenance procedures.</p> <p><i>Means of determination:</i> PDD, Monitoring report, ERU-calculation, DIN EN 14181, methodology, quality related procedures provided by the plant staff, on-site inspections and interviews with involved staff.</p> <p><i>Conclusion</i> The verification team can confirm that the monitoring of the relevant parameter implemented in the project and the referenced standards are in accordance with the monitoring plan of the final PDD. Checks details are i.e.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measurement frequency • Data source • Measurement procedures • Quality procedures • Measuring points • Cross checks • Data handling, storage and processing <p>Some findings were raised in the context of data monitoring:</p>				



No.	DVM ³ paragraph / Checklist Item (incl. guidance for the determination team)	Initial Finding (Means and results of assessment)	Ref.	Action requested to PPs (CAR, CL, FAR)	Review of PP's action	Conclusion
		<p>FAR E2: The correspondence with raw data provided by the plant to N.serve for data processing shall be forwarded to the verification team before verification for plant.</p> <p>CAR E3: An internal quality check of project-data registration and processing at the plant should be implemented and documented. Confirmation of data shall be explained and implemented.</p> <p>CAR E4: The time displayed on the monitor of the AMS-device and at the plant (process interface PI) must be the same.</p>				



<p>C.2</p>	<p><i>DVM § 95a)</i> For calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, were key factors, e.g. those listed in 23 (b) (i)-(vii) above, influencing the baseline emissions or net removals and the activity level of the project and the emissions or removals as well as risks associated with the project taken into account, as appropriate?</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The project baseline is set by default values of two sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plant specific regulatory limit of 2.47 kg N₂O/t HNO₃ (100%), introduced by the DRIRE. • The benchmark value of 1.85 kg N₂O/t HNO₃ of the methodology from 2012 on. <p>Following default values were used for determination the baseline scenario:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Year:</td> <td>2009</td> <td>2010</td> <td>2011</td> <td>2012</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Value:</td> <td>2.47</td> <td>2.47</td> <td>2.47</td> <td>1.85</td> <td>EF_{BM} [kg N₂O/t HNO₃]</td> </tr> </table> <p>The benchmark value is one of the key factors, which influence the baseline scenario and reduces the accountable emission reductions from realistic baseline emissions to the above mentioned values.</p> <p>The results of risk assessment are extensive measures to prevent a bypass of process gases in the catalyst bed since this will lead to a reduction of catalyst efficiency. Decreasing catalyst efficiency was identified as most important project risk</p> <p><i>Means of determination:</i> French methodology, LoA, interviews plant staff on GPN plant</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The benchmark values are correctly considered in the calculation of baseline emissions and take into account the sectoral reform policies and legislation (point 23 (b) (i) of DVM).</p>	Year:	2009	2010	2011	2012		Value:	2.47	2.47	2.47	1.85	EF _{BM} [kg N ₂ O/t HNO ₃]	<p>/METH/ /METHE / /DVM/ /AP/</p>	<p>FAR B2</p>	<p>FAR B2</p>	<p>OK</p>
Year:	2009	2010	2011	2012														
Value:	2.47	2.47	2.47	1.85	EF _{BM} [kg N ₂ O/t HNO ₃]													



		<p>The verification team can confirm, that the result of risk assessment (risks associated with the project) was taken into account.</p> <p>FAR B2:</p> <p>It must be proven at each verification, that the plant's average emission levels for the past year did not exceed the regulatory limit.</p>				
C.3	<p><i>DVM § 95b)</i> Are data sources used for calculating emission reductions or enhancements of net removals clearly identified, reliable and transparent?</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> Parameter and related data sources are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCSG_n [mg N₂O/Nm³] Finetech FTIR Anafin-5000 Continuous Emissions N₂O Analyser (part of AMS) • VSG_n [Nm³/h] Sick AG Flowsic 100 stack gas flow meter (part of AMS) • PE_n [kgN₂O] Calculation from measured data • OH_n [h] Derived from thermocouples for OT determination and processed in PCS plant security system • NAP_n [tHNO₃] Coriolis flow meter Emerson MicroMotion CMF 300L • OT [°C] Thermocouple Pt 1000, Honeywell 	<p>/PDD/ /MR/ /METH/ /METHE / /XLS/</p>			OK



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AFR [kg NH₃/h] Endress and Hauser Deltabar S • AIFR [%] Ammonia and Air flow meters • TSG [°C] Part of AMS • PSG [Pa] Part of the AMS • EF_n [kgN₂O/tHNO₃] For the verification period n the emission factor is: $EF_n = (PE_n / NAP_n)$ • EF_{reg} [kgN₂O/tHNO₃] The max. N₂O-emissions are set by the local government as: 2.47kg until end of 2011 • Increase of project specific emissions (max.: 2.5 %) In case of exceeding the limit of 7.5 % overall uncertainty, the project emissions must be increased (Increase [%] = Established uncertainty [%] – Permitted uncertainty [7.5]) 				
--	--	---	--	--	--	--



		<p>The ERU-calculation was carried out according to the formula described in the methodology: $ERU = ((EF_{BM} - EF_n)/1000 \times NAP \times GWP_{N_2O}) * 0.9 \text{ (tCO}_2\text{e)}$</p> <p><i>Means of determination:</i> PDD, methodology, plant permits, monitoring report, on-site visit of plant, PCS and data server</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>The PP could clearly demonstrate that data sources are clearly identified, reliable and transparent and calculated according to the methodology.</p>				
C.4	<p><i>DVM § 95c)</i></p> <p>Are emission factors, including default emission factors, if used for calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice?</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> As described under C.2., two emission factors where applied for determination of maximum N₂O-emissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plant specific regulatory limit of 2.47 kg N₂O/t HNO₃ (100%), introduced by the DRIRE. • The benchmark value of 1.85 kg N₂O/t HNO₃ of the methodology from 2012 on. <p>ERUs cannot be claimed if plant emissions are exceeding the lowest of each value.</p> <p><i>Means of determination:</i> Methodology, Monitoring report, arrêté préfectoral</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>The maximum allowed emission factor value of 2.47 kg N₂O/tHNO₃ was correctly applied in the ERU calculation of the whole period. The benchmark value of the methodology (2.5 kg N₂O/t HNO₃) exceeds the legal limit and was not</p>	<p>/PDD/ /METH/ /MR/ /XLS/ /AP/</p>			OK



		taken into account.				
C.5	<p><i>DVM § 95d)</i></p> <p>Is the calculation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals calculated based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner?</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The calculation includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A deduction in baseline emission scenario from 7 to 1.85 kg N₂O/t HNO₃ (benchmark values) in year 2012. • A legal limit of 2.47 kg N₂O/t HNO₃ for 2009-2011. • A 10% reduction of the verified emission reductions • Increase of project specific emissions of 1% due to exceedance of permitted overall uncertainty by 1 % <p><i>Means of determination:</i> Methodology</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The implementation of the benchmark values and 10% reduction is a conservative approach.</p>	<p>/METH/ /MR/ /XLS/ /OTN8/ /NCSGN 8/</p>			OK
Applicable to JI SSC projects only						
C.6	<p><i>DVM § 96</i></p> <p>Is the relevant threshold to be classified as JI SSC project not exceeded during the monitoring period on an annual average basis?</p> <p>If the threshold is exceeded, is the maximum emission reduction level estimated in the PDD for the JI SSC project or the bundle for the monitoring period determined?</p>	<p><i>Description:</i></p> <p>Estimation of total emissions reductions over the crediting period (after the 10% deduction) of 3 years and 1 month are: 795,579 (tonnes of CO_{2e}) according to the PDD.</p> <p><i>Means of determination:</i> PDD</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The average ERUs per year obviously exceed the threshold value of 60,000 t CO_{2e} per year; the project is classified as large-scale project.</p>				
Applicable to bundled JI SSC projects only						



C.7	<p><i>DVM § 97a)</i></p> <p>Has the composition of the bundle not changed from that is stated in F-JI-SSCBUNDLE?</p>	<p><i>Description: N/A</i></p> <p><i>Means of determination: N/A</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion: N/A</i></p>				
C.8	<p><i>DVM § 97b)</i></p> <p>If the determination was conducted on the basis of an overall monitoring plan, have the project participants submitted a common monitoring report?</p>	<p><i>Description: N/A</i></p> <p><i>Means of determination: N/A</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion: N/A</i></p>				
C.9	<p><i>DVM § 98</i></p> <p>If the monitoring is based on a monitoring plan that provides for overlapping monitoring periods,</p> <p>Are the monitoring periods per component of the project clearly specified in the monitoring report?</p> <p>Do the monitoring periods not overlap with those for which verifications were already deemed final in the past?</p>	<p><i>Description: N/A</i></p> <p><i>Means of determination: N/A</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion: N/A</i></p>				
D	<i>Revision of monitoring plan</i>					
	<i>Applicable only if monitoring plan is revised by project participants</i>					
D.1	<p><i>DVM § 99a)</i></p>	<p><i>Description: N/A</i></p>				



	Did the project participants provide an appropriate justification for the proposed revision?	<p><i>Means of determination: N/A</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion: N/A</i></p>				
D.2	<p><i>DVM § 99b)</i></p> <p>AIEs the proposed revision improve the accuracy and/or applicability of information collected compared to the original monitoring plan without changing conformity with the relevant rules and regulations for the establishment of monitoring plans?</p>	<p><i>Description: N/A</i></p> <p><i>Means of determination: N/A</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion: N/A</i></p>				
E	<i>Data management</i>					
E.1	<p><i>DVM § 101a)</i></p> <p>Is the implementation of data collection procedures in accordance with the monitoring plan, including the quality control and quality assurance procedures?</p>	<p><i>Description: Data collection procedures, quality control and quality assurance are implemented as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measured values were generated by local measurement and monitoring devices, stored in plant DCS and provided for calculation via OSI PI (process information) data acquisition system. Default i.e. plant trip point-values were determined before start of the project and included in the PDD. During data processing, measured values were evaluated according to statistical methods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application of instrument correction factors: 	<p>/PDD/ /METH/ /MR/ /PROCD / /QAL2C AL8/ /QAL2IN ST/</p>	<p>CAR E1 CAR E3</p>	<p>CAR E1 CAR E3 Pls. see Chapter 4.</p>	<p>OK</p>



		<p>The PP chooses a monitoring standard that requires the establishment of a calibration curve (EN14181). The correction factors derived from this calibration curve during the QAL2 audit must be applied onto both VSG and NCSG calculations. Correction factors are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 0.98 for stack gas flow meter ○ 0.97 for measurement of N₂O conc. ○ 1.0 for pressure of tail gas ○ 0.99 for temperature of tail gas <p>The values were applied on the xls-calculation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plausibility check: The methodology requires a plausibility check of all recorded/monitored data before processing which was conducted by the PP. plausibility criteria is: Negative values shall be eliminated. • Downtimes of the AMS: Acc. to the methodology, downtimes of the AMS shall be handled as following: The hourly average will be calculated based on the remaining values for the rest of the hour in question. If these remaining values account for less than 50% of the hourly data for one or more parameters, then this hour must be eliminated from the calculation and a substitute value will be used instead. • Missing data/Substitute value In the case where it is impossible to obtain one hour of 				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--



		<p>valid data for one or more elements of the emissions calculation due to downtime or malfunction of the AMS a substitute value for each hour of missing data shall be calculated as follows:</p> $C_{\text{subst}} = C + \sigma_C$ <p>where:</p> <p>C: arithmetic average of the concentration of the relevant parameter</p> <p>σ_C: best estimate standard deviation of the concentration of the relevant parameter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permitted overall uncertainty: <p>The methodology requires that the permitted overall uncertainty of the average hourly annual emissions must be less than 7.5% if technical possible. The determined (combined) uncertainty for N₂O mass flow measurement as per QAL2 report is 8.5% which exceeds the permitted overall uncertainty by one percent.</p> <p>If the total established uncertainty is higher than the permitted overall uncertainty, the project specific emissions are to be increased by the difference between the established uncertainty value and the permitted overall uncertainty value. The PP accordingly increases the project emissions for 1%.</p> <p><i>Means of determination:</i> Methodology, Monitoring report, on-site visit of plant, control room with PCS, server room</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--



		<p>with Exaquantum data server, QAL2 report</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> All procedures related to fulfil the requirements of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • quality management of the plant • quality assurance standard of the AMS • data processing as required per methodology <p>were implemented.</p> <p>CAR E3:</p> <p>An internal quality check of project-data registration and processing at the plant should be implemented and documented. Confirmation of data shall be explained and implemented. Nevertheless the data collection procedures and QA/QS-procedure needs corrections/improvements:</p> <p>CAR E1:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Operational temperatures (trip point values) in the raw data sheet are not as per plant operation system 5. Plant was in operation (plant status signal) in hours I which the temperature was below the trip values 6. Plant status signal was “1” in times the plant was not in full operation 7. The raw data sheet shall include the formulas and not only values without source/relation reference 8. QAL2 correction factors are applied for raw data at plant and in N.serve calculation. Double calculation shall be removed 				
--	--	---	--	--	--	--



<p>E.2</p>	<p><i>DVM § 101b)</i> Is the function of the monitoring equipment, including its calibration status, is in order?</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> The AMS is included in the quality procedures which are established for proper operation of the plant. The plant operator conducted a certified company (SPIE) for maintenance of all MMD of the plant. The PP therefore provides sufficient information regarding contractual/responsibility issues and scope of work.</p> <p>Additional measures are related to the European Norm EN14181 (2004) “Stationary source emissions - Quality assurance of automated measuring systems”. Müller BBM was conducted to carry out these measures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three quality assurance levels of EN 14181: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QAL 1: performance approval <p>The suitability of the analyser for the project was proved through the QAL2 audit, which was performed by an independent laboratory with EN ISO/IEC 17025 accreditation in 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QAL 2: commissioning and validation of an AMS <p>An accredited laboratory (acc. ISO 17025) carries out specific testing procedures to verify that the AMS installation meets the accuracy requirements laid down by EN 14181. The performance of the complete installation was compared against a series of measurements made with approved Standard Reference Methods.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QAL 3: ongoing operation and maintenance <p>The PP implemented a quality assurance system to prove the ongoing compliance of the AMS with the</p>	<p>/AST/ /QAL2 INST/ /QAL2 CALIB/ /CERT/ /PROC1/ - /PROC12 /</p>	<p>CAR E4</p>	<p>CAR E4 Pls. see Chapter 4.</p>	<p>OK</p>
------------	---	--	--	---------------	--	-----------



		<p>norm. The maintenance activities are monitored and controlled as part of an overall quality assurance programme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AST: Annual Surveillance Test <p>The PP verifies the continuing validity of the calibration function on yearly basis. The requirements and responsibilities for carrying out the AST tests are the same as for QAL 2. QAL2 was carried out in 2009, the 1. AST in 2010 and the consecutive 2. AST took place in 2011.</p> <p><i>Means of determination:</i> Methodology, EN14181, interview with monitoring manager of the plant, check of relevant documents and records</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> Some findings were raised in context of maintenance, functionality of monitoring equipment:</p> <p>Car E4:</p> <p>The time displayed on the monitor of the AMS-device and at the plant (process interface PI) should be the same.</p>				
E.3	<p><i>DVM § 101c)</i></p> <p>Are the evidence and records used for the monitoring maintained in a traceable manner?</p>	<p><i>Description:</i> All monitoring data are collected from the MMD as 4-20 mA signal and digitally forwarded to the plant via DCS on a digital Modbus on two second basis. Recording frequency of NCSG and VSG in data logger is 10 sec. A data extract of hourly mean values is reported to the assessment team (at N.serve),</p> <p><i>Means of determination:</i> Excel-datasheet for ER-calculation, data collections on second-basis provided by the plant operator during on-site visit (spot-check of single days)</p>	<p>/XLS/ /EMISN 8/ /EIPSN8 / /DCSN8 /</p>	<p>FAR E2 CAR E4 CAR E5</p>	<p>FAR E2 CAR E4 CAR E5 Pls. see Chapter 4.</p>	<p>OK</p>



		<p><i>Conclusion:</i> The verifier can confirm, that all data are traceable and correctly collected, converted and stored from MMD to ER-calculation sheet. A mistake in data processing of NCSG value was detected and corresponding actions requested:</p> <p>CAR E5:</p> <p>The auditor should check, that following mistakes in data processing were corrected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The NCSG-values in the data storage and therefore in the ERU-calculation of N8 were capped to 400 ppm, because 400 ppm was set as 100 %-value in the DCS. The 100% value should be revised. ○ The 4-20 mA output signal of the AMS is equivalent to a maximum of 500 ppm N₂O, but the maximum value in the DCS is set to 400 ppm. Because of that the registered NCSG-values used for ERU-calculation are 20 % to low. <p>FAR E2:</p> <p>The correspondence with raw data provided by the plant to N.serve for data processing shall be forwarded to the verification team before verification</p> <p>CAR E4:</p> <p>The verifier should check if the time displayed on the monitor of the AMS-device and at the plant (process interface PI) are the same</p>				
E.4	DVM § 101d)	<i>Description:</i> All process data relevant to the project activity	/PDD/	CAR B3	CAR B3	OK



	<p>Is the data collection and management system for the project in accordance with the monitoring plan?</p>	<p>are proper generated in the MMD as analogue signals, digitally transferred to the PSC and stored in the DCS in digital format. Hourly mean values were automatically calculated. Operating hours of the plant and AMS where generated and stored (value 0 or 1) to give the status information for data assessment.</p> <p><i>Means of determination:</i> Records of the DCS, compared with methodology and monitoring plan of PDD.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <p>The PP implemented a state-of-the-art plant operation and data collection system. In the context of the project activity the verifier found some chances to improve the data check and processing procedures and raises some FARs, to improve the quality in the future:</p> <p>CAR B3: The PP has to implement a QA/QC procedure to cross-check the Nitric Acid Production registered in the DCS.</p> <p>CAR E3: An internal quality check of project-data registration and processing at the plant should be implemented and documented.</p> <p>CAR E1: 9. Start and end date stated in the raw data sheet are not correct 10. Application of moisture content correction for NCSG is not correct 11. Operation hours of raw data sheet and determined</p>	<p>/MR/ /XLS/ /EMISN 8/</p>	<p>CAR E1 CAR E3</p>	<p>CAR E1 CAR E3 Pls. see Chapter 4</p>	
--	---	--	---	--------------------------	---	--



		in the calculation sheet is not consistent				
F	Verification regarding programmes of activities (additional elements for assessment)					
F.1	<i>DVM § 102</i> Is any JPA that has not been added to the JI PoA not verified?	<i>Description: N/A</i> <i>Means of determination: N/A</i> <i>Conclusion: N/A</i>				
F.2	<i>DVM § 103</i> Is the verification based on the monitoring reports of all JPAs to be verified?	<i>Description: N/A</i> <i>Means of determination: N/A</i> <i>Conclusion: N/A</i>				
F.3	<i>DVM § 103</i> AIEs the verification ensure the accuracy and conservativeness of the emission reductions or enhancements of removals generated by each JPA?	<i>Description: N/A</i> <i>Means of determination: N/A</i> <i>Conclusion: N/A</i>				
F.4	<i>DVM § 104</i> AIEs the monitoring period not overlap with previous monitoring periods?	<i>Description: N/A</i> <i>Means of determination: N/A</i> <i>Conclusion: N/A</i>				
F.5	<i>DVM § 105</i> If the AIE learns of an erroneously included JPA, has the AIE informed the JISC of its findings in writing?	<i>Description: N/A</i> <i>Means of determination: N/A</i> <i>Conclusion: N/A</i>				



Applicable to sample-based approach only						
F.6	<p><i>DVM § 106</i></p> <p><i>AIEs the sampling plan prepared by the AIE:</i></p> <p><i>(a) Describe its sample selection, taking into account that:</i></p> <p><i>(i) For each verification that uses a sample-based approach, the sample selection shall be sufficiently representative of the JPAs in the JI PoA such extrapolation to all JPAs identified for that verification is reasonable, taking into account differences among the characteristics of JPAs, such as:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>– The types of JPAs;</i> <i>– The complexity of the applicable technologies and/or measures used;</i> <i>– The geographical location of each JPA;</i> <i>– The amounts of expected emission reductions of the JPAs being verified;</i> 	<p><i>Description: N/A</i></p> <p><i>Means of determination: N/A</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion: N/A</i></p>				



	<p>– The number of JPAs for which emission reductions are being verified;</p> <p>– The length of monitoring periods of the JPAs being verified; and</p> <p>– The samples selected for prior verifications, if any?</p> <p>(ii) If, in its sample selection, the AIE AIEs not identify and take into account such differences among JPAs, then (AIEs the sampling plan) provide a reasonable explanation and justification for not doing so?</p> <p>(b) Provide a list of JPAs selected for site inspections, based on a statistically sound selection of sites for inspection in accordance with the criteria listed in (a) (i) above?</p>					
F.7	<p>DVM § 107</p> <p>Is the sampling plan ready for publication through the secretariat along with the</p>	<p>Description: N/A</p> <p>Means of determination: N/A</p> <p>Conclusion: N/A</p>				



	<i>verification report and supporting documentation?</i>					
F.8	<p><i>DVM § 108</i></p> <p><i>Has the AIE made site inspections of at least the square root of the number of total JPAs, rounded to the upper whole number? If the AIE makes no site inspections or fewer site inspections than the square root of the number of total JPAs, rounded to the upper whole number, then AIEs the AIE provide a reasonable explanation and justification?</i></p>	<p><i>Description: N/A</i></p> <p><i>Means of determination: N/A</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion: N/A</i></p>				
F.9	<p><i>DVM § 109</i></p> <p><i>Is the sampling plan available for submission to the secretariat for the JISC.s ex ante assessment? (Optional)</i></p>	<p><i>Description: N/A</i></p> <p><i>Means of determination: N/A</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion: N/A</i></p>				
Applicable to both sample based and non-sample based approaches						
F.10	<p><i>DVM § 110</i></p> <p><i>If the AIE learns of a fraudulently included JPA, a fraudulently monitored JPA or an inflated number of emission reductions claimed in a JI PoA, has the AIE</i></p>	<p><i>Description: N/A</i></p> <p><i>Means of determination: N/A</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion: N/A</i></p>				



	informed the JISC of the fraud in writing?					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--