

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)

authority) of an Executive Board member may request that a review is undertakeny	
Designated national authority/Executive Board member submitting this form	
Title of the proposed CDM project activity submitted for registration	1020 Dan Chang Bio-Energy Cogeneration project (DCBC)
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 c	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;
☐ 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;	
☐ 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;	
XXThe 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;	
☐The baseline and monitoring methodologies comply with requirements pertaining to methodologies previously approved by the Executive Board;	
☐ 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;	
☐ 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.	
☐ The following are requirements derived from paragraph 40 of 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;	
	rmines the proposed project activity to be valid, a request for project design document, the written approval of the host Party and nts received.
$\hfill\Box$ 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	24/05/2007

Further evidence should be provided regarding how a benchmark rate of 12% has been validated. In doing

so it should be noted that the additionaility tool requires that, "project developers shall demonstrate that

this benchmark has been consistently used in the past, i.e. that project activities under similar conditions

UNFCCC/CCNUCC



CDM – Executive Board



developed by the same company used the same benchmark". In particular it should be confirmed how

any risk premiums applied in the calculation of the WACC have been validated in the context of a project

activity with a 21 year firm contract. In addition the assumption that the project is 40% equity financed

does not match with the IRR calculation which indicates 28% equity financing.

The IRR without CDM revenues is quoted as being 8.93% on page 14 of the PDD and 9.2% on page 15.

The validation of the input values for the IRR calculation should be further explained, in particular the

price paid for bagasse as the baseline assumes that excess bagasse is left to decay.