

 <b>CDM project activity issuance review form</b> <i>(By submitting this form, a Party involved (through the designated national authority) or an Executive Board member may request that a review is undertaken)</i>	
<b>Designated national authority/Executive Board member submitting this form (Name in print)</b>	
<b>Title of the proposed CDM project activity for which issuance is requested</b>	4.5 MW Biomass (low density Crop Residues) based Power Generation unit of Malavalli Power Plant Pvt Ltd. (0298)
<b>DOE that requested for issuance and date of request</b>	Det Norske Veritas
<b>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)</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Fraud</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Malfeasance</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Incompetence</i>	
<b>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)</b>	
<p>There are contradictory statements by the DOE in the Verification/Certification Report that need to be clarified.</p> <p>This is mainly because of the initial verification (Aug. 2006), where two FARs were raised. These FARs were responded by the project participants, but it is not clear that the previous observations were totally solved.</p> <p>Page 3 of the V/C Report, in Section 3 (“Verification Findings”) states that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) “the verification is not able to obtain sufficient evidence for the reported emission reductions...”; and</li> <li>ii) “the verification has identified material misstatements in the reported emission reductions...”</li> </ul> <p>It is not clear if these observations are related with the FAR and how, and if observations with respect to this were lifted.</p> <p>As the emission factor of the grid is determined <i>ex ante</i> in the PDD, the monitoring parameters associated with the calculation of emission reductions are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Net electricity supplied to the grid (key variable). The DOE noticed that the electricity generated was used for calculation and requested for modification to use electricity supplied to the grid, instead. The sales record was checked to confirm the monitored results of the sold amount of electricity to the grid.</li> <li>- Biomass transportation fuel consumption (minor variable for leakage). The DOE verified the values of both variables as well as possible fossil fuel consumption (confirmed that coal was not used at all).</li> </ul> <p>The Meth Expert recommends that a critical analysis of the gap between <i>ex ante</i> estimated CER detailed in the PDD, and the actual CER claimed in the monitoring report, should be provided in the monitoring report by the project participants. Such analysis should also be provided in the verification report by the verifying DOE.</p>	
<b>Section below to be filled in by UNFCCC secretariat</b>	
Date received at UNFCCC secretariat	21/01/2007