



**CDM project activity/programme of activities registration request review form (CDM-REGR-FORM)  
(Version 03.0)**

**Section 1. General Information**

**Designated national authority/Executive Board member submitting this form (Name in print)**

**Title and UNFCCC reference number of the proposed project activity or programme of activities (PoA) submitted for registration**

3262 Siam Cement (Thung Song) Waste Heat Power Generation Project (TS46 Project)

**Section 2. Basis for review request**

*Please indicate, in accordance with paragraphs 37 and 40 of the CDM modalities and procedures (the annex to decision 3/CMP.1), which validation requirements may require review. Please tick the appropriate boxes in the list of requirements below. For requesting a review of a proposed afforestation or reforestation project activity or PoA, please refer to paragraphs 12 and 15 of the CDM modalities and procedures for afforestation and reforestation project activities (the annex to decision 5/CMP.1), and tick the equivalent boxes below mutatis mutandis.*

*The following are requirements derived from paragraph 37 of the CDM modalities and procedures:*

- The participation requirements as set out in paragraph 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;
- 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;
- 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.

*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 of 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 3: Comments supporting review request**

*Please elaborate the reason for requesting a review on the requirements you indicated in section 2 above.*

1. The DOE is requested to further substantiate the appropriateness of input values to the investment analysis, in particular, the beta coefficient for benchmark IRR calculation, total static investment, PLF (Kiln utilization factor), electricity tariff and annual O&M costs and its component, in line with the requirements of VVM/ver.1.2. para.110 & 111.
2. The DOE is requested to further substantiate how it has validated that equity IRR calculation is in accordance with the EB 51, Annex 58, para.10.
3. The DOE is requested to further substantiate how it has validated the sensitivity analysis in line with VVM/ver.1.2 para 111(e), in particular, the kiln utilization factor, which is forecasted to be 86% by 2020 in the PDD (p.17) and 89% by the same year in the excel sheet.
4. DOE is requested to further substantiate the appropriateness of the project boundary and facilities included in the boundary, in particular the Kiln 5 and internal grid, in line with the requirements of VVM/ver.1.2, para. 78-80.
5. The DOE is requested to further substantiate why not all possible options of baseline scenarios are considered and assessed in the PDD, in particular, the option requested by the applied methodology in case of ex-ante projected increase in electricity consumption (Step 1.B, second bullet (iii), page 4), which is installation of captive power with different fuel options.
6. The DOE is requested to substantiate: (a) the conservativeness of approach applied for calculation of fuel EF (COEF<sub>fuel,y</sub>) when 12 different types of fuels are combusted in one facility in the pre-project scenario, in line with VVM 1.2., para 92(d); and (b) why a clarification was not requested from the Board on the approach followed by the project participants (Annex 12, EB 31).
7. DOE is requested to: (a) substantiate how it has validated the appropriateness of grid (external vs. internal), (b) grid EF (VVM 1.2, para 91); and (c) provide the excel file for calculations of grid EF.
8. The DOE is requested to substantiate: (a) how it has validated that “annual production of clinker after implementation of project, Oclinker,y” is monitored in accordance with the applied methodology; and (b) if clinker output assessment approach is not in accordance with the approved methodology why the request for deviation has not been submitted, to the Board in accordance with Annex 12, EB 31.
9. The DOE is requested to substantiate how it has validated the monitoring parameters of the monitoring plan, in line with the applied methodology.

**Date received at UNFCCC secretariat**

26 Aug 10