

 <b>CDM project activity registration review form (F-CDM-RR)</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</b>	
<b>Title of the proposed CDM project activity submitted for registration</b>	Methane Capture and use as fuel at Rajaram Maize Products, Chattisgarh (0945)
<p><b>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.</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>The following are requirements derived from paragraph 37 of the CDM modalities and procedures:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The participation requirements as set out in paragraphs 28 to 30 of the CDM modalities and procedures are satisfied;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 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;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 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;</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The baseline and monitoring methodologies comply with requirements pertaining to methodologies previously approved by the Executive Board;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 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;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</li> </ul> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>The following are requirements derived from paragraph 40 of the CDM modalities and procedures:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 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;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 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;</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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;</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 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;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</li> </ul> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There are only minor issues which should be addressed by the DOE / project participants prior to the registration of the project.</p>	
<b>Section below to be filled in by UNFCCC secretariat</b>	
Date received at UNFCCC secretariat	26/03/2007

**Reasons for Request:**

**MAIN PROBLEM COMMENTS ABOUT PERFORMANCE OF DOE (DNV...)**

The barriers presented by the PP/DOE in the additionality analysis should be further substantiated. For example, the "skills" or capacity barrier seems not to have been properly justified in the PDD, nor in the Validation Report. India is a country with a substantial engineering and technical operation capacity at the national level, which reduces the transaction costs related to technical capacity building in relation with developing countries with a less

advanced engineering and technical capacity. This barrier needs to be further justified, e.g., based on factors that affect differences in regional technical capacities, or either withdrawn from the analysis.

2. There was a comment posted in the global stakeholder process (cfr. comment number 2 posted by “:Agg. Individual” on 26<sup>th</sup> August 2006) that seems not to have been properly addressed by the DOE. There was also a comment inserted by peri. individual on 30<sup>th</sup> November 2005, regarding the inexistence of investment barriers for the project activity (see Validation Report, page 10, 3<sup>rd</sup> para of the comment), seems not to have been properly addressed by the DOE. Although it does not affect the arguments of project proponents on additionality, which are based on technology and risk barriers, and lack of common practice, at least a proper explanation should have been sought from project participants.