

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)

authority) of an Executive Board member may request that a review is undertakeny		
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	of 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 stothe designated operational entity (DOE) on how due account to the designated operational entity (DOE) on how due account to the designated operational entity (DOE) on how due account to the designation of the designation	summary of the comments received has been provided, and a report count was taken of any comments has been received;	
activity, including transboundary impacts and, if those imp	entation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project acts are considered significant by the project participants or the host nent in accordance with procedures as required by the host Party;	
	n anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases that are oposed project activity, in accordance with paragraphs 43 to 52 of	
The baseline and monitoring methodologies comply w by the Executive Board;	vith requirements pertaining to methodologies previously approved	
Provisions for monitoring, verification and reporting are procedures and relevant decisions of the COP/MOP;	e in accordance with decision 17/CP.7, the CDM modalities and	
☐ The project activity conforms to all other requirements and procedures and relevant decisions by the COP/MOP at	for CDM project activities in decision 17/CP.7, the CDM modalities and the Executive Board.	
\square The following are requirements derived from paragraph 40 c	of the CDM modalities and procedures:	
☐ The DOE shall, prior to the submission of the validation participants written approval of voluntary participation from confirmation by the host Party that the project activity assistance.	n report to the Executive Board, have received from the project in the designated national authority of each Party involved, including sts it in achieving sustainable development;	
☐ In accordance with provisions on confidentiality contain DOE shall make publicly available the project design docu	ned in paragraph 27 (h) of the CDM modalities and procedures, the iment;	
☐ The DOE shall receive, within 30 days, comments on the accredited non-governmental organizations and make the	he validation requirements from Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC m publicly available;	
☐ After the deadline for receipt of comments, the DOE sh information provided and taking into account the comment	hall make a determination as to whether, on the basis of the ts received, the project activity should be validated;	
	ination on the validation of the project activity. Notification to the and the date of submission of the validation report to the Executive	
	rmines the proposed project activity to be valid, a request for project design document, the written approval of the host Party and nts 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 UNECCC secretariat	13/02/2007	

Reasons for Request:

1. Benchmark analysis for best 20%: As the cement type CP III can contain between 35 and 70% of additives (p. 9 of PDD), how can the project developers substantiate that the average additive content of CP III is 35% (as used on p. 50 for the baseline calculation)? The same problem applies for cement type II E (p. 9 specifies 6-34%) This is clearly not conservative. Unless they can provide independent evidence that the average share of additives is lower, 70% of additives have to be used for CP III and 34% for CP II E. The benchmark has to be recalculated accordingly, reducing clinker share from 0.71 to 0.41. (A presentation by Cimento Mizu at the Latin American Carbon Forum in Quito in March 2006 gives an average blending rate for CP III of 60% and 34% for CP II E)

2.	Benchmark analysis 5 highest blending plants: The project developers do not provide the blending share for each of the 5 highest plants, but only a "black box" average figure. The blending share for each plant in the list has to be provided. I also do not understand how the blending share of the five highest blenders is <i>lower</i> than the average blending share derived if one uses the numbers for CP III and CP II E provided at the top of p. 51 and the shares of CP III and CP II E cement in production listed on p. 50 of the PDD.