Appendix A: Guidance

Appendix A1:	**Review of completeness of the project proposals, technical and financial due diligence assessment**
Appendix A2:	**Clarification request template**
Appendix A3:	**Technical due diligence (different for CCS and for RES)**
Appendix A4:	**Financial due diligence**
Appendix A5:	**Procurement procedures due diligence guidance**
Appendix A6:	**Initial technology allocation of project proposals**
Appendix A7:	**Geographical allocation of project proposals**
Appendix A8:	**Calculation of Cost Per Unit Performance (CPUP)**
Appendix A9:	**Initial ranking of projects**

Appendix A1: Review of completeness of project proposals, technical and financial due diligence assessment

1. The EIB will review the proposals received to check that all required documentation (e.g. application and submission forms) has been provided as requested in the second call for proposals in a satisfactory manner.

2. In case that any part of the proposal is incomplete, the EIB will refer back to the project sponsor to request outstanding items to be submitted, specifying a deadline of up to five days from the moment of issuing the request for receiving a full and complete response.

3. Incomplete proposals which have not received a positive response after the completion-related clarification question shall not be further evaluated.

4. In parallel to the completion check, the EIB will commence the financial and technical due diligence on proposals and submit clarification requests to project sponsors, where appropriate.

5. The EIB will address its clarification requests to the project sponsor, specifying an appropriate deadline for receiving a full and complete response. If the query requires agreement with or confirmation from the Member State, (for example on reference plant, discount rate, total request for public funding), then the EIB will take this into account when specifying the deadline and copy the Member State representatives and the Commission in the exchange with the project sponsor.

6. In order to facilitate the required information exchange, clarification may also be sought via teleconferences, meetings and/or site visits, as appropriate.

7. Completion and clarification requests will be issued after project proposals have been received.

8. The number of clarification requests is unlimited. The EIB may request as many clarifications as necessary in the course of its due diligence.

9. The EIB will note the results of its completion check in its inception report. It will consider the responses to any clarification requests in the relevant project evaluation report and update the Commission on any significant issues or developments through its inception, midterm and final reports.

10. The template in the following section should be used for issuing completion and/or clarification requests to project sponsors.

Appendix A2: Clarification request template

Clarification request template

Project Sponsor Name:	
Project Sponsor Contact E-mail:	
Project Title:	
Date Issued:	
Response due by (date/time):	
Reference to Application/Submission Form:	
Clarification questions:	
Project Sponsor's Response to Clarification Question:	

Appendix A3: Technical due diligence guidance (different for CCS and for RES)

[attached as a separate file, specific to CCS/RES]

Appendix A4: Financial due diligence guidance

[attached as a separate file]

Appendix A5: Procurement procedures due diligence guidance

For all projects, the due diligence should assess whether:

1. The description of each of the main contracts envisaged is sufficiently detailed with regard to the scope, general conditions, and commercial aspects of the contracts.
2. The procurement procedure to be followed is in conformity with legal requirements and appropriate to the scale and type of contract envisaged.
3. The expected dates for launching the tenders, signing the contracts and the contract execution schedule, together with any guarantees provided, allow for completion of the project on the proposed schedule.

Conclusions

1. Overall, are the procurement procedures appropriate, well planned and in progress such as to allow satisfactory delivery of the project?
2. Are there any issues that should be referred to the Commission via the project's evaluation report?

Appendix A6: Initial technology allocation of project proposals

1. Each proposal for a request for NER300 funding will be allocated to a project group, project category and project sub-category.

For CCS:

a. Map all CCS project proposals submitted to the EIB onto Table 4 by placing in the appropriate cell.

b. Note the NER300 funding request for each project (including adjustments where appropriate).

For example: Project A, a pre-combustion plant based on saline aquifer storage, would be listed in Cell A2 as follows: 'Project A (*Insert NER300 Funding request*)'.

Table 4: Initial allocation of CCS project proposals

Source → Storage	**(A) Pre-Combustion**	**(B) Post-Combustion**	**(C) Oxy-fuel**	**(D) Industrial Application**
(1) Hydrocarbon reservoir storage	*Cell A1*	*Cell B1*	*Cell C1*	*Cell D1*
(2) Saline aquifer storage	*Cell A2*	*Cell B2*	*Cell C2*	*Cell D2*

For RES:

a. Map all RES project proposals submitted to the EIB onto Table 5 by placing in the appropriate cell.

b. Note the NER300 funding request for each project (including adjustments where appropriate).

For example Project X, a bio-energy plant based on lignocellulose to intermediate solid, liquid or slurry bio-energy carriers via pyrolysis, would be listed in the first row under Column A as follows: 'Project X (*Insert NER300 funding request*)'.

Table 5: Initial allocation of RES project proposals

	(A) Bio-energy	(B) Concentrated Solar Power	(C) Photo-voltaics	(D) Geo-thermal	(E) Wind	(F) Ocean	(G) Hydro	(H) Distributed Renewable Mgmt
Sub-category	Lignocellulose – via pyrolysis	Parabolic / Fresnel – using molten salts or other environmentally-benign HTF	Concentrator – 20 MW nominal capacity	Tensional stress fields	Off-shore – minimum turbines size 6 MW	Wave energy – 5 MW	High Temperature Superconducting Generators	Rural environment – solar generation
	Lignocellulose – via torrefaction	Parabolic / Fresnel – Direct Steam Generation	Multi junction Si-thin-film – 40 MW nominal capacity	Compressional stress fields	Off-shore – minimum turbines size 8 MW	Marine / tidal currents energy – 5 MW		Rural environment – wind generation
	Lignocellulose – via gasification	Tower systems-superheated steam cycle	CIGS-based - 40 MW nominal capacity	Enhanced – sedimentary & granite	Off-shore – minimum turbines size 10 MW	OTEC – 10 MW		Urban environment
	Lignocellulose – via directly heated gasification	Tower systems-pressurised air		Enhanced – limestone	Floating off-shore			
	Lignocellulose raw material via entrained flow gasification	Large scale Stirling dish power plant			On-shore – complex terrains			
	Lignocellulose to electricity				On-shore – cold climates			
	Lignocellulose to ethanol & higher alcohols							
	Lignocellulose and/or householder waste to biogas, biofuels or bioliquids							
	Algae and/or micro-organisms							

Appendix A7: Geographical allocation of project proposals

1. The geographical location of all project proposals submitted to the EIB will be summarised and reported to the Commission. Table 6 will summarise the number of CCS and of RES projects submitted under each technology Category in each of the Member States and EEA countries.
2. For example if a Member State submits one pre-combustion CCS plant, one trans-boundary industrial application CCS plant and one photovoltaic renewable project, then this information would appear in Table 6 by putting '1' under Columns B, E and H, in each case accompanied by the appropriate project reference number, and '0' under columns C, D, F, G, I, J, K and L. Column N provides for the total across the row and would in this example be filled as '3'.

Table 6: Geographical allocation of all project proposals

(A) Member State	(B) Pre-Combustion	(C) Post-Combustion	(D) Oxy-fuel	(E) Industrial Application	(F) Bio-energy	(G) Conc. Solar Power	(H) Photo-voltaics	(I) Geo-thermal	(J) Wind	(K) Ocean	(L) Hydro	(M) Distr. Mgmt	(N) Total
Member State 1													
Member State 2													
Member State 3													
Member State 4													
Member State 5													
Member State 6													
Member State 7													
Member State 8													
Member State 9													
Member State 10													
Member State 11													
Member State 12													
Member State 13													
Member State 14													
Member State 15													
Member State 16													

(A) Member State	(B) Pre-Combustion	(C) Post-Combustion	(D) Oxy-fuel	(E) Industrial Application	(F) Bio-energy	(G) Conc. Solar Power	(H) Photo-voltaics	(I) Geo-thermal	(J) Wind	(K) Ocean	(L) Hydro	(M) Distr. Mgmt	(N) Total
Member State 17													
Member State 18													
Member State 19													
Member State 20													
Member State 21													
Member State 22													
Member State 23													
Member State 24													
Member State 25													
Member State 26													
Member State 27													
Member State 28													
EEA 1													
EEA 2													
EEA 3													
Total													

3. The EIB should note any issues or concerns arising from the results of the geographical allocation in its mid-term report to the Commission.

Appendix A8: Calculation of Cost Per Unit Performance (CPUP)

This appendix presents the calculations to be undertaken when deriving the CPUP for:

(i) CCS demonstration projects
(ii) RES demonstration projects

Section 1 explains the relevant algebra for CCS demonstration projects, noting its linkages to the NER300 Decision; Section 2 explains where the necessary information is located within the Member State submission forms, and suggests validation where applicable.

Sections 3 and 4 outline the same issues for RES demonstration projects.

1. Calculation of Cost Per Unit Performance – CCS Demonstration Projects

Article 8(2) of the NER300 Decision notes that the CPUP shall be calculated as the total request for public funding in Euro, plus the best estimate of the net present value of additional benefits resulting from support schemes as calculated according to Article 3(5) of the Decision, divided by performance, which for CCS demonstration projects is the total projected amount of CO_2 stored in the first ten years of operation.

This may be expressed as the following algebraic statement:

$$\mathbf{CPUP = \{TRPF + NPV_{10years}(Additional\ Benefits)\}/Performance}$$

Where TRPF is the 'Total Request for Public Funding' in Euro**,** i.e. the sum of all contributions from (direct) public sources envisaged to be provided to a project, such as funding from NER300, national sources, and state aid in terms of investment aid.

Note: 'Additional benefits' are any benefits resulting from support schemes even if they do not constitute state aid within the meaning of Article 107(1) of the Treaty, avoided costs (e.g. avoided carbon costs) and existing tax incentive measures as calculated according to Article 3(5) of the NER300 Decision. 'Performance' for CCS projects is the total projected amount of CO_2 stored in the first ten years of operation.

Article 5(3)(b) of the NER300 Decision notes that the factor TRPF may be expanded as the Relevant Costs (RC), minus any contribution to these costs from the operator (OC).

The above statement can therefore be expanded to read:

$$\mathbf{CPUP = \{RC - OC + NPV_{10years}(Additional\ Benefits)\}/Performance}$$

Where RC are the relevant costs of the project, and OC is the contribution to these costs from the operator, and $NPV_{10years}$ (additional benefits) refers to any benefits resulting from support schemes even if they do not constitute state aid within the meaning of Article 107(1) of the Treaty, avoided costs (e.g. avoided carbon costs) and

existing tax incentive measures as calculated according to Article 3(5) of the NER300 Decision.

The relevant costs for CCS projects are defined in Article 3(2) of the NER300 Decision. These may be expressed using the following expression:

(1) $RC_{CCS} = CAPEX_{CCS} – NPV_{10years}$(O&M Benefits - O&M Costs)

Where:

$CAPEX_{CCS}$ means those investment costs which are borne by the project due to the application of CCS.

O&M benefits means all benefits including the additional revenues due to the application of CCS including energy sales, Enhanced Hydrocarbon Recovery (EHR), any additional benefits resulting from support schemes even if they do not constitute state aid within the meaning of Article 107(1) of the Treaty, avoided costs (e.g. avoided carbon costs) and existing tax incentive measures, all during the first 10 years of operation.

O&M costs are the best estimate of operating costs arising due to the application of CCS during the first 10 years of operation.

Finally we can write out the CPUP algebra for CCS demonstration projects as follows:

CPUP = {$CAPEX_{CCS} – NPV_{10years}$(O&M Benefits - O&M Costs) - OC + $NPV_{10years}$(Additional Benefits)/ total projected amount of CO_2 stored in the first ten years

Note: In the case of pre-combustion application CCS demonstration plant, where the project involves the construction of a new Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC) power plant, the relevant costs shall be those extra investment costs of that proportion of the IGCC to which CO_2 capture, transport and storage has been fitted, compared to the corresponding costs of a supercritical coal–fired power plant without CO_2 capture, transport and storage, sized on an equivalent output basis, net of the net present value of the best estimate of operating costs and operating benefits of that proportion of the IGCC to which CO_2 capture, transport and storage has been fitted arising during the first 10 years, as compared to the corresponding costs of a supercritical coal-fired power plant, without CO_2 capture, transport and storage, sized on an equivalent output basis.

2. Guidance to the EIB assessor on the evaluation of the above formula for a CCS demonstration project

All data to be used to determine CPUP should be available in submission form C and its annex C.1. Data in submission form C and its annex should be consistent with the data compiled by the project sponsor in application form C and its annex C.2. Consistency of the figures should be verified by the EIB assessor.

CPUP is most easily calculated from the first expression above as **TRPF** can be extracted from section 3 of submission form C.

Where,

$NPV_{10years}$ (Additional Benefits) shall be extracted from section 2 of the submission form C

And

Total projected amount of CO_2 stored in the first ten years shall be extracted from item 1 of the relevant submission form D.

Further validation of data:

CCS Projects (other than those involving construction of an IGCC)
CPUP can then be confirmed using the final expression from section 1 above where:

$CAPEX_{CCS}$ shall be extracted from section 1 of submission form C.

- This figure should match the investment cost as identified on submission form C, annex C1.

$NPV_{10years}$ (O&M Benefits - O&M Costs)

This figure shall be extracted from section 1of submission form C

- This figure should be confirmed by discounting the total operating costs and total operating benefits as declared on section 1 of submission form C. Discounting shall be done in constant, un-inflated terms. The discount rate shall be calculated according to the indication provided in submission form C, annex 1- summary input data for RC and CPUP (i.e. un-inflated).

OC shall be extracted from section 3 of submission form C

And,

$NPV_{10years}$ (Additional Benefits) shall be extracted from section 2 of the submission form C

And

Total projected amount of CO_2 stored in the first ten years shall be extracted from submission form D

CCS Projects (involving construction of an IGCC)
CPUP can be calculated as per the first expression above, then confirmed as follows:

$CAPEX_{CCS}$ shall be extracted from section 1 of submission form C.

$NPV_{10years}$ (O&M Benefits - O&M Costs)

This figure shall be extracted from section 1 on submission form C

OC shall be extracted from section 3 of submission form C

and,

$NPV_{10years}$ (Additional Benefits) shall be extracted from section 2 of submission form C

And

Total projected amount of CO_2 stored in the first ten years shall be extracted from submission form D

3. Calculation of Cost Per Unit Performance –RES Demonstration Projects

Article 8 (2) of the NER300 Decision, as set out in section 5 of this appendix, notes that the CPUP may be calculated as the total request for public funding in Euro, plus the best estimate of the net present value of additional benefits resulting from support schemes, divided by performance, which for RES demonstration projects is the total projected amount of energy produced in the first five years of operation.

This may be expressed as the following algebraic statement:

$$\mathbf{CPUP = \{TRPF + NPV_{5years}(Additional\ Benefits\ schemes)\}/Performance}$$

Where TRPF is the request for public funding in Euro**;** i.e. sum of all contribution from (direct) public sources envisaged to be provided to a project, such as funding from NER300, national sources, state aid in terms of investment aid, etc.

Note: 'Additional benefits' refer to any benefits resulting from support schemes even if they do not constitute state aid within the meaning of Article 107(1) of the Treaty, avoided costs (e.g. avoided carbon costs) and existing tax incentive measures as calculated according to Article 3(5) of the NER300 Decision.

Article 5(3)(b) of the NER300 Decision notes that the factor TRPF may be expanded as the Relevant Costs (RC), minus any contribution to these costs from the operator (OC).

The above statement can therefore be expanded to read:-

$$\mathbf{CPUP = \{RC - OC + NPV_{5years}(Additional\ Benefits)/Performance}$$

Where RC are the relevant costs of the project, and OC is the contribution to these costs made by the operator, and NPV_{5years}(Additional Benefits) refers to any benefits resulting from support schemes even if they do not constitute state aid within the meaning of Article 107(1) of the Treaty, avoided costs (e.g. avoided carbon costs) and existing tax incentive measures as calculated according to Article 3(5) of the NER300 Decision

RC for RES projects are defined in Article 3(3) of the NER300 Decision, again set out in section 5 of this appendix. These may be expressed using the following expression:

$$\mathbf{(2)\ RC_{RES} = CAPEX_{RES} - NPV_{5years}(O\&M\ Benefits\ -\ O\&M\ Costs)}$$

Where:

'$CAPEX_{RES}$' are the investment costs of the RES demonstration project, net of the investment costs of the conventional production, with the same capacity in terms of effective production of energy.

And where:

'O&M Benefits' means all benefits including due to the application of RES including energy sales and any additional benefits resulting from support schemes even if they do not constitute state aid within the meaning of Article 107(1) of the Treaty, avoided costs (e.g. avoided carbon costs) and existing tax incentive measures during the first 5 years of operation.

'O&M Costs' are the best estimate of operating costs arising due to the application of RES during the first 5 years of operation.

(O&M Benefits - O&M Costs) are expressed relative to the conventional production with the same capacity in terms of the effective production of energy.

This may be further expanded as:

$(\text{O\&M Benefits}_{RES} - \text{O\&M Benefits}_{REF}) - (\text{O\&M Costs}_{RES} - \text{O\&M Costs}_{REF})$

The performance is, for the RES demonstration projects, the total projected amount of energy produced in the first five years of operation.

$$\textbf{CPUP} = \{\text{CAPEX}_{RES} - \text{NPV}_{5years}(\text{O\&M Benefits} - \text{O\&M Costs}) - \text{OC} + \text{NPV}_{5years}(\text{Additional Benefits}) / \text{total projected amount of energy produced in the first five years}$$

Special case for bioenergy projects that produce biofuels:
For BIO sub-categories that produce biofuels or bioliquids (BIOd, BIOe; BIOg, BIOh, BIOi), Member States may choose between a physical energy-producing reference plant (regular RES case discussed above) or a fossil fuel reference price (FFRP) to determine the relevant costs. For fossil fuel price as a reference, the relevant costs calculation should be based on the comparison between the cost of the renewable energy produced on the one hand, and the reference price of gasoline or any other fossil fuel reference as considered appropriate on the other.

In these cases, RC should be calculated on the basis of per unit cost of the renewable energy produced, i.e. biofuel/biogas (PUCRE). This should be determined by dividing the NPV of project cost (OPEX & CAPEX) of the NER300 project by the NPV of the production of biofuel. The period to be applied for the NPVs should be the economic lifetime of the project, and is assumed to be 15 years. Benefits from the sale of by-products and benefits from support schemes according to Article 3 (5) of NER300 Decision directly attributable to the project shall be deducted from the annual OPEX before calculating the NPV. The result will be a levelised (discounted) cost of bioenergy:

$$\textbf{PUCRE} = \frac{\textbf{CAPEX} + \textbf{NPV OP Costs} - \textbf{NPV Benefits Byproducts} - \textbf{NPV Additonal Benefits}}{\textbf{NPV Performance}}$$

Discounting shall be done in constant, un-inflated terms. The discount rate shall be calculated according to the indication provided in submission form C (i.e. un-inflated).

The price of gasoline (or any other fossil fuel: e.g. diesel, jet fuel, natural gas) shall be taken from submission form A for each of the 5 years of operation and shall correspond to the forecast refinery factory gate price or any other equivalent reference price (e.g. grid price for natural gas for industrial use) before the application of any taxes.

The difference between the discounted per unit cost of energy of the innovative NER300 project (PUCRE) and the price of gasoline (or fossil fuel) reference price (FFRP) will be used as the basis for the establishment of the relevant costs. The relevant costs will then be determined by multiplying this difference with the performance of the NER300 project in the 5 years of the NER300 period reported in submission form D. No profit margin shall be included in the cost of the production of bioenergy projects.

$$RC = \left(PUCRE \left(\frac{EUR}{MWh}\right) - FFRP \left(\frac{EUR}{MWh}\right) \right) * Performance\ 5\ years\ (MWh)$$

4. Guidance to the EIB assessor on the evaluation of the above formula for a RES demonstration project

$CAPEX_{RES}$ shall be extracted from section 1 of submission form C.

- This figure should match the delta investment cost between the RES plant and the scaled REF plant as identified on annex C.1 to submission form C.

NPV_{5years} (O&M Benefits - O&M Costs)

This figure shall be extracted from section 1 of submission form C

- This figure should be confirmed by discounting the total operating costs and total operating benefits as declared on annex C.1 to submission form C. Discounting shall be done in constant, un-inflated terms. The discount rate shall be calculated according to the indication provided in submission form C – annex 1 – Summary input data for relevant costs and CPUP (i.e. un-inflated).

OC shall be extracted from section 3 of submission form C

$NPV_{5\ years}$ (Additional Benefits) shall be extracted from section 2 of submission form C

And where:

Total projected amount of energy produced in the first five years shall be extracted from section 2 of the submission form D

- This figure should match the total output in MWh tabulated in annex C.1. of submission form C.

5. Guidance to the EIB assessor on the adjustment of RC and CPUP figures (for CCS and RES):

Section 5.2.1 of the second call for proposals establishes that where data and/or calculations carried out by project sponsors and Member States are not compliant with the provisions in the NER300 Decision or with the call for proposals, the relevant figures will be adjusted by the EIB to ensure compliance with the provisions therein. Adjusted relevant costs and adjusted CPUP will be calculated. These adjusted figures will be then used for the initial ranking.

Adjustments may arise through corrections to the calculation of TRPF (see below), scaling of the reference plant, eligible investment costs and operation costs, inclusion of benefits arising from additional support schemes, calculation method applied, correct determination of TRPF, OC, NPV of additional benefits, discount rates, and discount method (year 0, un-inflated 2013 prices) or any other parameter that influences the relevant costs and/or CPUP score.

6. Guidance to the EIB assessor on the calculation and adjustment of TRPF:

The TRPF needs to be indicated by the Member State in section 3 of submission form C.

The TRPF shall reflect the sum of all contributions from (direct) public sources envisaged to be provided to a project, such as funding from NER300, national sources, state aid in terms of investment aid, as well as any others.

TRPF = RC – OC

The NER300 contribution is fixed at 50% of RC (unless TRPF is less than 50% of RC, in which case NER300 (if applicable, combined with EEPR) covers the TRPF; (Recital 6 and Article 2 (3) of the NER300 Decision.

The following table reflects possible scenarios or cases that may apply. In the cases 3 and 4 outlined in the table below, the EIB will analyse the necessary measures, (where appropriate in conjunction with the clarification process), to adjust the RC and CPUP to ensure compliance with Article 2 (3) of the NER300 Decision.

Project case	TRPF	Amount requested from NER300	Compliant with NER300 Decision recital 6 and Article 2(3)	Possible approaches to determine adjusted CPUP
Case 1	> 50% RC	=50%	YES	
Case 2	< 50%	= TRPF (i.e.	YES	

	RC	<50% RC, there is no other public funding)		
Case 3	> 50% RC	< 50% RC	NO	: • Adjust NER300 to 50% RC by maintaining other public funds and estimate operator contribution • Eliminate other public funds and estimate operator contribution to match with NER300 as requested by MS (i.e. <50%)
Case 4	<50% RC	< TRPF	NO	Adjust NER300 to TRPF and estimate operator contribution

Appendix A9: Initial Ranking of projects

1. To be undertaken before submission of the final report to Commission.

   For CCS:

2. A table should be completed by placing all CCS projects which have passed due diligence in order of increasing CPUP. Additional lines may be inserted or deleted as required. The initial ranking will be carried out by using adjusted CPUPs, in the case where the relevant figures have been adjusted in order to comply with the requirements of the NER300 Decision or of the NER300 second call for proposals.

Table 7: List of CCS projects which have passed due diligence

(A) No.	(B) Project Name	(C) Technology Category	(D) Storage option	(E) CPUP
1		Pre-combustion/ Post-combustion/ Oxy-fuel/ Industrial Application	Hydrocarbon reservoir /Saline aquifer	
2		Pre-combustion/ Post-combustion/ Oxy-fuel/ Industrial Application	Hydrocarbon reservoir /Saline aquifer	
3		Pre-combustion/ Post-combustion/ Oxy-fuel/ Industrial Application	Hydrocarbon reservoir /Saline aquifer	
4		Pre-combustion/ Post-combustion/ Oxy-fuel/ Industrial Application	Hydrocarbon reservoir /Saline aquifer	
5		Pre-combustion/ Post-combustion/ Oxy-fuel/ Industrial Application	Hydrocarbon reservoir /Saline aquifer	
6		Pre-combustion/ Post-combustion/ Oxy-fuel/ Industrial Application	Hydrocarbon reservoir /Saline aquifer	
7		Pre-combustion/ Post-combustion/ Oxy-fuel/ Industrial Application	Hydrocarbon reservoir /Saline aquifer	
8		Pre-combustion/ Post-combustion/ Oxy-fuel/ Industrial Application	Hydrocarbon reservoir /Saline aquifer	
9		Pre-combustion/ Post-combustion/ Oxy-fuel/ Industrial Application	Hydrocarbon reservoir /Saline aquifer	
10		Pre-combustion/ Post-combustion/ Oxy-fuel/ Industrial Application	Hydrocarbon reservoir /Saline aquifer	
11		Pre-combustion/ Post-combustion/ Oxy-fuel/ Industrial Application	Hydrocarbon reservoir /Saline aquifer	
'n'		Pre-combustion/ Post-combustion/ Oxy-fuel/ Industrial Application	Hydrocarbon reservoir /Saline aquifer	

For RES:

3. Table 8 should be completed by placing all RES projects which have passed the due diligence assessment under the appropriate technology sub-category in order of increasing CPUP. Additional lines can be inserted or deleted as required.

Table 8: List of RES projects which have passed due diligence

(A) No.	**(B) Project Name**	**(C) Project Sub-category**	**(D) CPUP score**
Bio- energy			
1		[Insert sub-category name]	
2		[Insert sub-category name]	
'n'		[Insert sub-category name]	
Concentrated Solar Power			
1		[Insert sub-category name]	
2		[Insert sub-category name]	
'n'		[Insert sub-category name]	
Photo-voltaics			
1		[Insert sub-category name]	
2		[Insert sub-category name]	
'n'		[Insert sub-category name]	
Geo-thermal			
1		[Insert sub-category name]	
2		[Insert sub-category name]	
'n'		[Insert sub-category name]	
Wind			
1		[Insert sub-category name]	
2		[Insert sub-category name]	
'n'		[Insert sub-category name]	
Ocean			
1		[Insert sub-category name]	
2		[Insert sub-category name]	
'n'		[Insert sub-category name]	
Hydro			
1		[Insert sub-category name]	
2		[Insert sub-category name]	
'n'		[Insert sub-category name]	
Distributed Renewable Management			
1		[Insert sub-category name]	
2		[Insert sub-category name]	
'n'		[Insert sub-category name]	