

CDM project activity issuance review form

Designated national authority/Executive Board member submitting this form (Name in print) Title of the proposed CDM project activity for which issuance is requested DOE that requested for issuance and date of request OUE that requested for issuance and date of request OU-07-07 Please indicate, in accordance with paragraphs 65 of the CDM modalities and procedures, for which reason(s) you request review. (Place a cross (X) in front of the reason)	(By submitting this form, a Party involved (through the designated national authority) or an Executive Board member may request that a review is undertaken)	
activity for which issuance is requested and Paper Limited (TNPL), Kagathipuram, Karur District, Tamil Nadu; Project Activity 0124 DOE that requested for issuance and date of request SGS 04-07-07 Please indicate, in accordance with paragraphs 65 of the CDM modalities and procedures, for which reason(s) you request review. (Place a cross (X) in front of the reason) Fraud Malfeasancex Incompetence Please indicate reasons for the request for review and attach any supporting documentation to this request form. (if space is not sufficient please attach further reasons) 1. The project participant calculated the CO2 emissions of the digester auxiliary equipment based on a captive emission factor of 1.25 tCO2/MWh, which was not indicated in the PDD. Further clarification is required on how the DOE has verified this emission factor. 2. The date of the site visit in the summary section of the verification report is different from section 6 of the verification	authority/Executive Board member	
Please indicate, in accordance with paragraphs 65 of the CDM modalities and procedures, for which reason(s) you request review. (Place a cross (X) in front of the reason) FraudMalfeasancex_Incompetence Please indicate reasons for the request for review and attach any supporting documentation to this request form. (if space is not sufficient please attach further reasons) 1. The project participant calculated the CO2 emissions of the digester auxiliary equipment based on a captive emission factor of 1.25 tCO2/MWh, which was not indicated in the PDD. Further clarification is required on how the DOE has verified this emission factor. 2. The date of the site visit in the summary section of the verification report is different from section 6 of the verification	activity for which issuance is	and Paper Limited (TNPL), Kagathipuram, Karur District, Tamil Nadu; Project
you request review. (Place a cross (X) in front of the reason) FraudMalfeasancex_Incompetence Please indicate reasons for the request for review and attach any supporting documentation to this request form. (if space is not sufficient please attach further reasons) 1. The project participant calculated the CO2 emissions of the digester auxiliary equipment based on a captive emission factor of 1.25 tCO2/MWh, which was not indicated in the PDD. Further clarification is required on how the DOE has verified this emission factor. 2. The date of the site visit in the summary section of the verification report is different from section 6 of the verification		
Please indicate reasons for the request for review and attach any supporting documentation to this request form. (if space is not sufficient please attach further reasons) 1. The project participant calculated the CO2 emissions of the digester auxiliary equipment based on a captive emission factor of 1.25 tCO2/MWh, which was not indicated in the PDD. Further clarification is required on how the DOE has verified this emission factor. 2. The date of the site visit in the summary section of the verification report is different from section 6 of the verification		
 form. (if space is not sufficient please attach further reasons) The project participant calculated the CO2 emissions of the digester auxiliary equipment based on a captive emission factor of 1.25 tCO2/MWh, which was not indicated in the PDD. Further clarification is required on how the DOE has verified this emission factor. The date of the site visit in the summary section of the verification report is different from section 6 of the verification 	Fraud Malfeasance	ex_ Incompetence
factor of 1.25 tCO2/MWh, which was not indicated in the PDD. Further clarification is required on how the DOE has verified this emission factor. 2. The date of the site visit in the summary section of the verification report is different from section 6 of the verification	form. (if space is not sufficient please attach further reasons)	
Section below to be filled in by UNFCCC secretariat	factor of 1.25 tCO2/MWh, wh verified this emission factor. 2. The date of the site visit in the report. A correction to the verification of the v	ich was not indicated in the PDD. Further clarification is required on how the DOE has e summary section of the verification report is different from section 6 of the verification ication report is required.

30/07/2007

Date received at UNFCCC secretariat