

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	Production of blended cement with blast furnace slag at Cimento Mizu (0854)
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 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	28/03/2007

Only a couple of lines (9 in total) of text explain/claim two barriers, without any further substantiation; this is unacceptable. Moreover claiming an increase of production costs as barrier is not sufficient without presenting data on the cost savings of reducing the amount of clinker.

Barrier 1: development of logistics for additives supplying. The use of additives in a reliable and continuous manner required the development and control of a new supply chain in the process involving different sites and suppliers.

Barrier 2: the use of slag increases the production costs of the blended cement because it adds news steps in the production chain, its availability and quality depends on third parties, the maintenance costs increase due to difference in equipment operations, and the performance of the installation decreases (productivity decreases). Also the milling of slag increase production costs because it is harder than clinker requiring more energy in the mills and slag is more abrasive and corrosive than clinker incurring in greater maintenance costs.

The common practice check is just surpassed by claiming:

Project proponents do not have access to information about any other activity implemented previously or currently underway that is similar to the proposed project activity, except for the projects under Votorantim Cimentos which owns Cimento Mizu.

Since Votorantim covers 40% market share in Brazil and owns cement plants in the US and Canada and is a member of SNIC, the National Brazilian Syndicat of the Cement industry in Brazil, to which all large cement producers (Holcim, Lafarge, Cimpor etc) are a member, it is not clear why no more information would be available.