

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)

authority) or an Executive Board member may request that a review is undertaken)	
Designated national authority/Executive Board member submitting this form	
Title of the proposed CDM project activity submitted for registration	2.76 MW Grid Connected Renewable Energy Project in Rajasthan by Kalani Industries; Project activity 1132
	and 40 of the CDM modalities and procedures, which to frequirements is provided below. Please provide ing any supporting documentation.
☐ The following are requirements derived from paragraph 37 of	the CDM modalities and procedures:
☐ The participation requirements as set out in paragraphs 2	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 impact	ntation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project its are considered significant by the project participants or the host it in accordance with procedures as required by the host Party;
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;	
The baseline and monitoring methodologies comply with requirements pertaining to methodologies previously approved by the Executive Board;	
☐ 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.	
$\ \square$ 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	e DOE / project participants prior to the registration of the project.
Section below to be filled in by UNFCCC secretariat	
Date received at UNFCCC secretariat	03/09/2007

Reason for request:

1. As the barriers listed in the PDD relate to the economic feasibility of the project activity, it should be demonstrated that the project activity was not financially attractive given the financial assumptions made at the time of the decision to proceed with the project activity, given the fact that all the turbines of the project were already commissioned by the end of May 2001 and in business operation until now without stopping for over 6 years, the PP did not provide credible evidence to show the project is taking risk at stopping business operation without support from CDM

- 2. Further evidence is required regarding the difficulty in obtaining finance, in particular it should be validated that the loan could not be obtained without the CDM.
- 3. While utilizing investment barrier to demonstrate additionality, the PDD did not provide financial investment analysis, showing to which extent the financial performance indicator, such as IRR, etc. is lower than the required benchmark value. And also the PP did not show how the additional cash flows from sale of CERs could make the project commercially viable and then feasible.
- 4. As version 10 of the methodology AMS-I.D is used corrections in the PDD, section B.6.1 Explanation of methodological choices, should be made. Further, the DOE should confirm that version 10 of the methodology AMS-I.D has been correctly applied and validated.
- 5. The PDD indicates electricity generation of 6,000 MWh/annum, however the emission reduction calculations are based on 5,476 MWh/annum. This should be clarified.