

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)

,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,				
		ated national authority/Executive Board r submitting this form		
Title of the proposed CDM project activity submitted for registration			00224 : Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources at Supa	
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.				
a	The	following are requirements derived from paragraph 37 of the CDM modalities and procedures:		
		The participation requirements as set out in paragraphs 28 to 30 of the CDM modalities and proced satisfied;		
			rited, a summary of the comments received has been provided, y (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	<b>X</b> The project activity is expected to result in a reduction in anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases that are additional to any that would occur in the absence of the proposed project activity, in accordance with paragraphs 43 to 52 of the CDM modalities and procedures;		
	X	<b>X</b> The baseline and monitoring methodologies comply with requirements pertaining to methodologies previously approved by the Executive Board;		
		Provisions for monitoring, verification and repor modalities and procedures and relevant decisio	ting are in accordance with decision 17/CP.7, the CDM ns of the COP/MOP;	
		The project activity conforms to all other require modalities and procedures and relevant decision	ements for CDM project activities in decision 17/CP.7, the CDM ns by the COP/MOP and the Executive Board.	
۵	The	following are requirements derived from paragra	d from paragraph 40 of the CDM modalities and procedures:	
		project participants written approval of voluntary	alidation 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 availa	contained in paragraph 27 (h) of the CDM modalities and ble the project design document;	
		The DOE shall receive, within 30 days, commer UNFCCC accredited non-governmental organization.	nts on the validation requirements from Parties, stakeholders and ations and make them publicly available;	
			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 Notification to the project participants will includ validation report to the Executive Board;	determination on the validation of the project activity. e confirmation of validation and the date of submission of the	
		The DOE shall submit to the Executive Board, if for registration in the form of a validation report the host Party and an explanation of how it has	f it determines the proposed project activity to be valid, a request including 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 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. At least this points should have been discussed by the DOE

- No word about the evidence which should enable this early started project to pass step 0
- The DOE rightfully concludes on page 11 that at least two alternatives would have been cheaper than the project activity, but then only refers to the use of the tool for additionality, without providing any details of its assessment
- In chapter B.3.1 of the checklist the DOE only refers to step 4 and notes that the justification by the PP is not adequate. Nevertheless the DOE concludes that this is OK