



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)

Designated national authority/Executive Board member submitting this form	
Title of the proposed CDM project activity submitted for registration	Ganpati Co-Generation Project at Medak, Andhra Pradesh (0370)

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 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.
- 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	15/06/2006
-------------------------------------	------------

Reasons for request

- Based on information and discussions presented in various section of the PDD, the reduction in GHG emissions does not appear additional to any that would occur in the absence of the proposed activity. The PDD clearly indicates that the bagasse used in the project requesting for CDM registration could have been used for ethanol production. Since ethanol is a GHG free commodity, diverting the use of bagasse from ethanol plant to co-generation plant offsetting grid electricity does not result in GHG mitigation.

- While calculating the approximate operating margin none of the options specified by AMS I.D. has been followed. The project participant could have used option 1 (a 3-year average, based on the most recent statistics available at the time of PDD submission), as necessary data are easily available from the Central Electricity Authority of India. The PDD uses Option 2 (the year in which project generation occurs, if emission factor is updated based on ex post monitoring), but neither the PDD nor the validation report mentions anywhere that the emission factor would be updated based on ex-post monitoring.
- The validation report does not include a validation statement (or opinion). Normally the DOE provides three pieces of document (a protocol, a finding and an assessment) separately, and in this case the main piece stating its opinion or statement (or a conclusion of the validation process) is missing.
- To be clarified: The PDD states that the net thermal energy output from the boiler is less than 45 MWth. Please specify what is the actual thermal energy output capacity of the boiler. Also, how much of the total electricity generation from the project is used for captive use and auxiliary consumption? Since the project is already in operation for a couple of years, these numbers are easily available through monitoring records.
- One of the alternatives to the project activity mentioned in the PDD is: *“Set up a new co-generation power project based on high pressure boiler configuration and develop the project under the CDM”*, which is the proposed CDM project, not an alternative to the project. It should be corrected to: *“Set up a new co-generation power project based on high pressure boiler configuration and develop the project without CDM registration”*.
- Under the monitoring plan, the table listing items to be monitored (e.g., power generation, captive power consumption, export etc), uses unit MW. It should be MWh instead of MW.