

## 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 all 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	Fuel switch at BSM sugar mills; Project activity 1022
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 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;	
■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;	
■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;	
☐ 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.	
$\hfill \square$ There are only minor issues which should be addressed by t	he DOE / project participants prior to the registration of the project.
Section below to be filled in by UNFCCC secretariat	
Date received at UNFCCC secretariat	12/06/2007

Reasons for request:

- 1. Further evidence regarding how the DOE has validated both the suitability of the investment analysis (Option III) and the input values used should be provided.
- 2. The barriers in the PDD appear to be barriers to market entry rather that to the implementation of this specific project activity type.
- 3. The methodology may not be applicable because the power generated with heat from the boilers, may have increased as a result of the project activity. Therefore, it should be substantiated that:

## **UNFCCC/CCNUCC**



## CDM - Executive Board



page 2

- a) The power generation capacity installed remains unchanged due to the implementation of the project activity and that this is maintained at the pre-project level throughout the crediting period
- b) The annual power generation during the crediting period is not more than 10% larger than the highest annual power generation in the most recent three years prior to the implementation of the project activity.
- 4. The methodology requires that where more than one credible and plausible alternative remains, project participants shall, as a conservative assumption, use the alternative baseline scenario that results in the lowest baseline emissions as the most likely baseline scenario, or conduct an investment analysis. However, two alternative baseline scenarios have been selected for the biomass: burnt in an uncontrolled manner without utilizing them for energy purposes (B3) and used as fertiliser (B6).