



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	"Waste Heat Recovery project" at Saraikela, Kharsavan, Jharkhand by M/s Kohinoor Steel Private Limited; Project activity 1296

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	15/11/2007
-------------------------------------	------------

Reasons for request:

1. The PDD states that "the project will relieve the burden on the depleting resources of conventional fuel and hence increasing its availability to the other important processes". Further clarification is required in relation to the real contribution of the project to climate change mitigation as the aim seems to be saving fossil fuels for other alternative uses rather than real, long term and measurable emissions reductions.
2. The PDD shows typographical errors in section A.4.4.



3. Further evidence is required to substantiate the investment barrier analysis as the information provided does not suffice.
4. Further information is required to show how the investment barriers have been validated.
5. The DOE shall further clarify how they have assessed and validated the sensitivity analysis.
6. The technological barriers as per the PDD are related to the risks associated with power supply in steel manufacturing. If such is the case, the project would not be technically feasible and CDM revenues would not ameliorate the risks described. Further clarification is required.
7. The argument in page 17 of the PDD leads to the conclusion that emission reductions in this project activity might not be long term emission reductions, as the market conditions are volatile, the project activity is totally dependent on the upstream sponge iron plant and also to a large extent on the prices of scrap, and there is a risk that the plant might be shut down. Further clarification is required.
8. The common practice analysis should be conducted in accordance with step 4 of the additionality tool by detailing similar projects in the region and explaining the differences between this activity and those similar projects. In this context, further substantiation of the barriers should also be provided.
9. Further information is required to confirm whether or not the AFBC boiler which is supplying steam to the same turbine as the project activity would have been installed in the absence of this CDM project activity, and in addition why this AFBC boiler has not been included in the project boundary.
10. Further explanation is required regarding how the method for calculating EGy described in section B.6.3 of the PDD is consistent with the requirements of the approved methodology, and the monitoring plan proposed for this project activity.