

## 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)

Designated national authority/Executive Board member submitting this form	
Title of the proposed CDM project activity submitted for registration	Kina Biopower 11.5MW EFB Power Plant (0385)
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.	
☐ The following are requirements derived from paragraph 37 o	of the CDM modalities and procedures:
☐ The participation requirements as set out in paragraphs	s 28 to 30 of the CDM modalities and procedures are satisfied;
	summary of the comments received has been provided, and a due account was taken of any comments has been received;
activity, including transboundary impacts and, if those imp	entation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project acts are considered significant by the project participants or the essment in accordance with procedures as required by the host
☐The project activity is expected to result in a reduction in are additional to any that would occur in the absence of the of the CDM modalities and procedures;	n anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases that e proposed project activity, in accordance with paragraphs 43 to 52
☑ The baseline and monitoring methodologies comply with the Executive Board;	th requirements pertaining to methodologies previously approved by
☐ Provisions for monitoring, verification and reporting are procedures and relevant decisions of the COP/MOP;	in accordance with decision 17/CP.7, the CDM modalities and
☐ The project activity conforms to all other requirements and procedures and relevant decisions by the COP/MOP a	for CDM project activities in decision 17/CP.7, the CDM modalities and the Executive Board.
$\square$ The following are requirements derived from paragraph 40 c	of the CDM modalities and procedures:
	n report to the Executive Board, have received from the project n the designated national authority of each Party involved, including ists it in achieving sustainable development;
☐ In accordance with provisions on confidentiality contain DOE shall make publicly available the project design docu	ned in paragraph 27 (h) of the CDM modalities and procedures, the ament;
☐ The DOE shall receive, within 30 days, comments on the UNFCCC accredited non-governmental organizations and	
☐ After the deadline for receipt of comments, the DOE shinformation provided and taking into account the comment	nall make a determination as to whether, on the basis of the ts received, the project activity should be validated;
	ination on the validation of the project activity. Notification to the and the date of submission of the validation report to the Executive
	ermines the proposed project activity to be valid, a request for project design document, the written approval of the host Party and ents received.
☐ There are only minor issues which should be addressed by	the DOE / project participants prior to the registration of the project.
Section below to be filled in by UNFCCC secretariat	
Date received at UNFCCC secretariat	15/06/2006

## **Reasons for Request:**

- 1. The PDD does not specify which version of SSC methodologies AMS.I.D and AMS.III.E were used. The Validation Report mentions version 7, which was only valid up to 02 March 2006. Since the Registration Request Form is dated 21 April 2006, the updated version of the methodologies should be used.
- The Validation Report states that "two CDM projects have been proposed by the same project participants, using the same technology and small-scale methodology, i.e., the "Kina Biopower 11.5MW EFB power Plant" and the "Seguntor Bioenergy 11.5MW EFB Power Plant" projects. It has been verified that these two

projects will be located at least 1 km apart. As such, the project cannot be considered a debundled component of a larger project activity". For transparency purpose the Validation Report should state in clear terms the distance between the two projects. Using a statement that at least is as if it is impossible to measure the actual distance.