



**CDM project activity/programme of activities registration request review form (CDM-REGR-FORM)
(Version 03.0)**

Section 1. General Information

Designated national authority/Executive Board member submitting this form (Name in print)	
Title and UNFCCC reference number of the proposed project activity or programme of activities (PoA) submitted for registration	4298 Paysandú Clean Energy

Section 2. Basis for review request

Please indicate, in accordance with paragraphs 37 and 40 of the CDM modalities and procedures (the annex to decision 3/CMP.1), which validation requirements may require review. Please tick the appropriate boxes in the list of requirements below. For requesting a review of a proposed afforestation or reforestation project activity or PoA, please refer to paragraphs 12 and 15 of the CDM modalities and procedures for afforestation and reforestation project activities (the annex to decision 5/CMP.1), and tick the equivalent boxes below mutatis mutandis.

The following are requirements derived from paragraph 37 of the CDM modalities and procedures:

- ☐ The participation requirements as set out in paragraph 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 of 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 3: Comments supporting review request

Please elaborate the reason for requesting a review on the requirements you indicated in section 2 above.

1) The DOE shall validate the suitability of the project starting date (18 June 2008) in line with the CDM Glossary of Terms and the VVM (version 01.2) para. 99; considering that the PDD (page 22) mentions that the purchase order for the steam turbine and electricity generator is dated 5 June, 2008. Please refer to CDM Glossary of Terms and the VVM (version 01.2) para. 99.

2) The DOE shall validate the suitability of the evidence used to confirm the prior consideration of the CDM (i.e. initial contact with a CDM developer) in line with the VVM para. 102 (a), in particular, that the benefits of the CDM were a decisive factor for the project participant in the decision to proceed with the project activity. Please refer to VVM para. 102 (a).

3) The DOE shall further substantiate the barrier analysis in line with the VVM (ver. 01.2) paras. 115-117, in particular: a) the source of evidence used to validate the prevailing practice barrier, including a confirmation that all the biomass-fuelled power plants connected to the grid have been included in the assessment, and b) the suitability of the “other barriers” presented in line with Guideline 2 of the “Guidelines for Objective Demonstration and Assessment of Barriers” (EB 50, Annex 13). The DOE shall also further substantiate the robustness of this barrier given that spot prices are only indicative (VR, page 26) and further justify the possibility of a zero spot price. Lastly, the DOE shall explain why the PP was unable to enter into a contract with UTE while the similar activities presented in the prevailing practice barrier were able to achieve it. Please refer to VVM (ver. 01.2) paras. 115-117 Guideline 2 of the “Guidelines for Objective Demonstration and Assessment of Barriers” (EB 50, Annex 13).

4) The DOE shall clarify the means of validation used to confirm the validity of the baseline scenario in line with the VVM (ver. 01.2) para. 84, in particular, that the biomass would have been disposed in stockpiles (by MASERLIT or other mills) in the absence of the project activity. In doing so, the DOE should clearly report the sources of evidence used to confirm the baseline scenario for the methane avoidance component. Please refer to VVM (ver. 01.2) para. 84.

Date received at UNFCCC secretariat

10 Oct 11