

## 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	Enercon Wind Farms in Karnataka Bundled Project – 33 MW; Project activity 1299
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 c	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;	
activity, including transboundary impacts and, if those impacts	entation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project acts are considered significant by the project participants or the host ent 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 with the Executive Board;	h requirements pertaining to methodologies previously approved by
☐ 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;	
	rmines the proposed project activity to be valid, a request for project design document, the written approval of the host Party and ints received.
☐ There are only minor issues which should be addressed by t	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	21/12/2007

Reasons for request:

- 1. It is required to provide calculations of a project IRR, which should be confirmed to a suitable benchmark following sub-step 2b of the additionality tool.
- 2. Further clarification is required regarding the determination and appropriateness of the benchmark and how it was verified and validated by the DOE.
- 3. Further clarification and validation are required on the decrease in the electricity tariff after 10 years of operation.

- 4. Further justification and validation of the essential distinctions between the project activity and the other projects are required following sub-step 4b of the additionality tool.
- 5. As the land for the wind mills was allotted in 2000 and the wind mills were ordered from January 2003, four years before submission as a CDM project, the need for the CDM incentive requires further substantiation and clarification.
- 6. The plant load factors assumed for this project activity are unrealistically low. Sensitivity analysis should include the values achieved by similar wind farms in the Chitradurga region, as e.g. the Reliance wind farm with a PLF of over 35%. Further clarification is required.
- 7. The answers in the stakeholder consultation twice refer to wind turbines of 0.8 MW, whereas the rest of the PDD refers to 0.6 MW. Further clarification is required on which turbine size has really been used in the project activity.
- 8. The DOE shall further clarify how they have cross checked and validated the assumptions regarding the investment analysis.