CDM project activity issuance review form ***(By submitting this form, a Party involved (through the designated national authority) or an Executive Board member may request that a review is undertaken)***	
Designated national authority/Executive Board member submitting this form (Name in print)	
Title of the proposed CDM project activity for which issuance is requested	Generation of electricity through combustion of waste gases from Blast furnance and Corex units at JSW Steel Limited (in JPL unit 1), at Torangallu in Karnataka, India (0325)
DOE that requested for issuance and date of request	**DNV-CUK**
Please indicate, in accordance with paragraphs 65 of the CDM modalities and procedures, for which reason(s) you request review. (Place a cross (X) in front of the reason)	
___Fraud ___ Malfeasance _X__ Incompetence	

Please indicate reasons for the request for review and attach any supporting documentation to this request form. (if space is not sufficient please attach further reasons)
Two monitoring reports are submitted by the PPs: the first and the updated. Parameters for monitoring are correctly **described** in both of them along with the formulas used. Verifiers confirm that they checked everything (all excel sheets) and everything is correctly calculated. Technical details of the power plant are also given in Monitoring Reports. In **the first report** the annual generations (total and net) for the years 2005 and 2006 are presented in Appendix I along with the baseline EF for captive power generation and the efficiency of power generation fixed ex-ante? Final annual results of baseline emissions are also presented. Total **(annual**) quantity of fuel consumed along with the necessary coefficients and calculated annual project emissions for 2005 and 2006 are also there. In **updated monitoring report** the project emission is recalculated and instead of 191 t CO_2 it became 181 t CO_2 for the crediting period. Annual generation and all other coefficients are removed from the updated report and only final **monthly** results of baseline and project emissions for the years 2005 and 2006 are presented. It should be mentioned that according to the monitoring plan the PPs have to measure and record the electricity daily, calorific values monthly, etc. Neither daily nor monthly figures are presented for these parameters. **The efficiency of captive power plant** is measured and fixed ex-ante as it is clearly said in verification report (page 7). This approach is not correct and not so clear from the PDD. The PDD says "As a conservative approach the highest value 33.375% among the **options A** and B is considered for the baseline calculation (page 13). In my reading these A and B options as they are formulated in PDD are not the same A and B from methodology. Option A in PDD is: "Design Efficiency" while in methodology (page 5) for option A we have sub-options 1,2,3 and the highest value should be chosen among them **during monitoring process** because the sub-option 2 requests measuring the efficiency during monitoring though two other sub-options are fixed once ex-ante. Methodology doesn't say "or" among these three sub-options. Taking into consideration that this parameter is correctly insert in the registered monitoring plan (though there is not mentioned record frequency) my opinion is that $Eff_{captive}$ should be measured yearly during the crediting period then compared with two others (fixed ex-ante) and the highest one should be used for calculation of baseline. This parameter could be fixed only in case if option B as in methodology (100% efficiency) is assumed

Section below to be filled in by UNFCCC secretariat	
Date received at UNFCCC secretariat	04/05/2007