

## 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	Project 0715 Blended Cement Project with Fly Ash – Lafarge India Private Limited
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 or	f 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;
☐ Comments by local stakeholders have been invited, a s to the designated operational entity (DOE) on how due acc	summary of the comments received has been provided, and a report count was taken of any comments has been received;
activity, including transboundary impacts and, if those impa	entation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project acts are considered significant by the project participants or the host ent in accordance with procedures as required by the host Party;
	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 for and procedures and relevant decisions by the COP/MOP a	or CDM project activities in decision 17/CP.7, the CDM modalities and the Executive Board.
$\square$ The following are requirements derived from paragraph 40 o	f 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 DOE / project participants prior to the registration of the project.	
Section below to be filled in by UNFCCC secretariat	
Date received at UNFCCC secretariat	24/12/2006
	-

The application and interpretation of step 0 and step 3 of the tool for assessment of additionality are not sufficiently substantiated.

The project claims credits retroactively. Neither the PDD nor the validation report is convincing on the documentation which was available at or prior to the start of the project, showing that CDM was seriously considered in the decision to proceed with the project activity. Moreover, since additionality is claimed

based on the need to construct new equipment for PPC Circuit I and a totally new (greenfield) PPC circuit II, the starting dates of the construction of this equipment is missing as well.

In the country a steady trend of increasing additives (hence decreasing the clinker content) is occuring without the assistance of CDM. Nowadays the production of PPC (Portland Pozzolanic Cement) replacing 22 - 25% of clinker by fly ash is current practice in the country. Comparing the project activity to the identified "baseline plants" it remains unclear to which extent the content of fly ash and other additives is increased in the project activity and why this increase would constitute a specific barrier.

No information is provided on the economical benefits of producing PPC (e.g. cost savings as a result of a decreased use of clinker), which makes it difficult to understand why additional investments are to be considered as barriers.