

## CDM project activity registration review form (F-CDM-RR) (By submitting this form, a Party involved (through the designated national authority) or an Executive Board member may request that a review is undertaken)

audionity, or an excount a sound monator may request that a review to an actual target	
Designated national authority/Executive Board member submitting this form	
Title of the proposed CDM project activity submitted for registration	1077 Montecristo Hydroelectric Project
Please indicate, in accordance with paragraphs 37 and 40 of the CDM modalities and procedures, 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.	
☐ The following are requirements derived from paragraph 37 o	of the CDM modalities and procedures:
☐ The participation requirements as set out in paragraph:	s 28 to 30 of the CDM modalities and procedures are satisfied;
☐ Comments by local stakeholders have been invited, a summary of the comments received has been provided, and a report to the designated operational entity (DOE) on how due account was taken of any comments has been received;	
activity, including transboundary impacts and, if those imp	entation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project acts are considered significant by the project participants or the host lent in accordance with procedures as required by the host Party;
	in anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases that e proposed project activity, in accordance with paragraphs 43 to 52
The baseline and monitoring methodologies comply w the Executive Board;	ith requirements pertaining to methodologies previously approved by
☐ Provisions for monitoring, verification and reporting are in accordance with decision 17/CP.7, the CDM modalities and procedures and relevant decisions of the COP/MOP;	
☐ The project activity conforms to all other requirements for CDM project activities in decision 17/CP.7, the CDM modalities and procedures and relevant decisions by the COP/MOP and the Executive Board.	
☐ The following are requirements derived from paragraph 40 of the CDM modalities and procedures:	
☐ The DOE shall, prior to the submission of the validation report to the Executive Board, have received from the project participants written approval of voluntary participation from the designated national authority of each Party involved, including confirmation by the host Party that the project activity assists it in achieving sustainable development;	
☐ In accordance with provisions on confidentiality contained in paragraph 27 (h) of the CDM modalities and procedures, the DOE shall make publicly available the project design document;	
☐ The DOE shall receive, within 30 days, comments on the validation requirements from Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC accredited non-governmental organizations and make them publicly available;	
☐ After the deadline for receipt of comments, the DOE shall make a determination as to whether, on the basis of the information provided and taking into account the comments received, the project activity should be validated;	
☐ The DOE shall inform project participants of its determination on the validation of the project activity. Notification to the project participants will include confirmation of validation and the date of submission of the validation report to the Executive Board;	
☐ The DOE shall submit to the Executive Board, if it determines the proposed project activity to be valid, a request for registration in the form of a validation report including the project design document, the written approval of the host Party and an explanation of how it has taken due account of comments received.	
☐ There are only minor issues which should be addressed by	the DOE / project participants prior to the registration of the project.
Section below to be filled in by UNFCCC secretariat	
Date received at UNFCCC secretariat	17/07/2007

The PP/DOE are required to demonstrate the additionality of the project activity by explaining the existence of at least one of the barriers.

- 1. Clarification is required how 13.6% has been justified as the hurdle rate as the PDD only states, "the hurdle rate reflects a creation of value in excess of the cost of equity of 2%". The benchmark analysis uses
- a spot market electricity tariff, which fluctuates over time. Further information should be included how

fixed electricity price has been used in the IRR calculations. Additional explanation should be provided on

how the sensitivity analysis has been conducted.

- 2. It is unclear how technological barriers described in the PDD (varying hydrologic cycles as a result of el
- niño"or "la niña and local deforestation) would prevent this project activity from being implemented, considering other hydro plants have been built on the same river.
- 3. The PDD presents the short-term PPA and spot market tariff as market barriers, and argues that the CDM revenue could stabilize the income flow. However, the variations of these parameters are not clearly
- presented in the current IRR calculations. Further, an analysis of the project IRR without CDM revenues has not been presented to justify the effect of these barriers would be overcome by CDM revenues.
- 4. Since Montecristo plant is supplying the electricity to the grid via a 2.8 km transmission line in 69 kV to
- El Canada substation (registered CDM project 0606), the PDD needs to clearly describe the boundary and state how the energy exported by both project activities would be monitored and accounted separately.