

 <p style="text-align: center;"><b>CDM project activity crediting period renewal review form (F-CDM-RENr)</b>  <i>(By submitting this form, a Party involved (through the designated national authority) or an Executive Board member may request that a review is undertaken)</i></p>	
<b>Designated national authority/Executive Board member submitting this form</b>	
<b>Title of the proposed CDM project activity submitted for registration</b>	HFC Decomposition Project in Ulsan" (0003)
<p><b>Please indicate, in accordance with paragraphs 49 (a) of the CDM modalities and procedures and paragraph 6 of Annex 43 of the EB 36 Report, which validation requirement(s) may require review. A list of requirements is provided below. Please provide reasons in support of the request for review, including any supporting documentation.</b></p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following are requirements derived from paragraph 49 (a) of the CDM modalities and procedures and paragraph 7 of Annex 13 of the EB 43 Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>X New national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances shall not have an impact on the baseline scenario;</li> <li>x The project participant shall apply an approved baseline methodology for the determination of the continued validity of the baseline or its update, and the estimation of emission reductions for the applicable crediting period.</li> </ul> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There are only minor issues which should be addressed by the DOE / project participants prior to the renewal of the crediting period for the project.</p>	
<p><b>Section below to be filled in by UNFCCC secretariat</b></p>	
Date received at UNFCCC secretariat	23/05/2010

A review is requested to determine whether the renewal has been correctly validated, and in particular whether new national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances are correctly reflected in the baseline scenario and the validity of the baseline or its update has been properly assessed. In particular:

1. The PP and DOE should justify the presumption of lack of change in national and sectoral circumstances, and the current regulatory environment, including with reference to changes in market conditions and technological improvements in production methods, and the phase-out schedule agreed under the Montreal Protocol.

2. Furthermore , given the operating production history of producing at near-cap levels, the PP/DOE should clarify

- Why the variety in the emission levels as observed during the first baseline period was so different (and not continued) during the production period following the Board's decision to register this project,
- Whether the principle of conservativeness has applied in the calculation of emission level,
- Whether the project has been operated as proposed in the original PDD.