

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

submitted for registration Please indicate, in accordance with paragraphs 37 and 40			
			00224 : Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources at Supa
			of requirements is provided below. Please provide reasons
0	The	e following are requirements derived from paragra	aph 37 of the CDM modalities and procedures:
			agraphs 28 to 30 of the CDM modalities and procedures are
		Comments by local stakeholders have been invand a report to the designated operational entity been received;	ited, a summary of the comments received has been provided, γ (DOE) on how due account was taken of any comments has
		Project participants have submitted to the DOE documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity, including transboundary impacts and, if those impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the host Party, have undertaken an environmental impact assessment in accordance with procedures as required by the host Party;	
X The project activity is expected to result in a reduction in anthropoge gases that are additional to any that would occur in the absence of the with paragraphs 43 to 52 of the CDM modalities and procedures;		gases that are additional to any that would occu	r in the absence of the proposed project activity, in accordance
	X	X The baseline and monitoring methodologies capproved by the Executive Board;	omply with requirements pertaining to methodologies previously
		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;	
	ū	The project activity conforms to all other require modalities and procedures and relevant decision	ments for CDM project activities in decision 17/CP.7, the CDM as by the COP/MOP and the Executive Board.
_	The	following are requirements derived from paragraph 40 of the CDM modalities and procedures:	
		project participants written approval of voluntary	lidation report to the Executive Board, have received from the participation from the designated national authority of each st Party that the project activity assists it in achieving sustainable
	۵	In accordance with provisions on confidentiality procedures, the DOE shall make publicly available	contained in paragraph 27 (h) of the CDM modalities and ole the project design document;
	٥	The DOE shall receive, within 30 days, commen UNFCCC accredited non-governmental organization.	nts on the validation requirements from Parties, stakeholders and ations and make them publicly available;
		After the deadline for receipt of comments, the E the information provided and taking into account	DOE shall make a determination as to whether, on the basis of the comments received, the project activity should be validated;
		The DOE shall inform project participants of its of Notification to the project participants will include validation report to the Executive Board;	determination on the validation of the project activity. Experimental confirmation of validation and the date of submission of the
		for registration in the form of a validation report in the host Party and an explanation of how it has the	it determines the proposed project activity to be valid, a request ncluding the project design document, the written approval of taken due account of comments received.
Section below to be filled in by UNFCCC secretariat			
Date received at UNFCCC secretariat			

Reasons and Background for Request for Review

The project activity (PA) involves the generation of electricity from wind (20 MW) to supply the local grid. The PA uses the methodology ACM002.

The main point is additionality which was also questioned in two public comments. Additionality is mainly based on a barrier analysis: technological and investment. Neither seems to be convincing.

The investment barrier for example is based upon an. IRR of 9% without CDM and 9.4% with CDM to be compared to a hurdle rate of 15%.

The validation report is not sufficiently transparent and clear in assessing the acceptance of the additionality of the project activity (B.3.1 of the validation report). It only reflects that the project correctly applies the prescribed "tool for demonstrating additionality" The DOE should qualitatively address the different aspects of the PDD and not just make a desk study.