

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)

| dutifority) of all Excounte Boar | a 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 | 1060 Pão de Açúcar – Demand side electricity management – PDD 5 |
| 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 | 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 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; | |
| activity, including transboundary impacts and, if those impacts | 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; |
| 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; | |
| XXThe baseline and monitoring methodologies comply approved by the Executive Board; | y with requirements pertaining to methodologies previously |
| XXProvisions 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. | |
| \square The following are requirements derived from paragraph 40 c | 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; | |
| | rmines the proposed project activity to be valid, a request for project design document, the written approval of the host Party and nts received. |
| $\hfill \square$ 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 | 13/06/2007 |

- 1. Further evidence is required to substantiate the start date of the crediting period.
- 2. The investment barrier is not substantiated as it does not demonstrate that "a financially more viable

alternative to the project activity would have led to higher emissions"

3. The technological barrier is not substantiated as it does not demonstrate that "a less technologically

UNFCCC/CCNUCC



CDM - Executive Board

UNFCCC

EB 24 Report Annex 28 page 2

advanced alternative to the project activity involves lower risks", as it does not assess the operational risks associated with future electricity shortages.

- 4. Other barriers presented in the PDD are generic to all energy efficiency projects and not to the implementation of the measures specified in Brazil.
- 5. Further evidence should be provided to support the use of electricity consumption in the year 2000 as

the baseline, particularly given the mandatory reductions required in 2001.

- 6. Paragraph 3 of the approved methodology requires the baseline to be calculated on the basis of "energy
- use of the existing equipment that is replaced". The project activity has set the baseline on the basis of
- total electricity consumption including equipment which has not been affected by the project activity. 7. Further substantiation of how paragraph 6(b) of AMS-II-E has been applied should be provided.
- measurement of total electrical consumption can be influenced by operating conditions separate to the

project activity, including changes in the floor space, opening hours and product ranges of the stores.