

## 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)

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	20MW Bagasse based Cogeneration power project" at Bannari Amman Sugars Limited Sathyamangalam, Tamil Nadu - 1572
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.	
$\square$ 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 contains shall make publicly available the project design document;	ed in paragraph 27 (h) of the CDM modalities and procedures, the DOE
☐ 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	
Data received at LINECCC apprehensit	05 06 2009

- 1. Due to the delay between the project start date and the commencement of validation the DOE is requested to explain why a corrective action request was not raised to require the evidence of prior consideration of the CDM to be detailed in section B5 of the PDD. Furthermore the given time delay, the DOE is requested to describe with what level of assurance it can be stated that the barriers identified are prohibitive (i.e. that the project could not proceed without CDM) given that the project activity was operational for a number of years prior to validation.
- 2. The evidence to support the stated barriers is generic and anecdotal, the barriers must be supported by credible third party evidence.

## UNFCCC/CCNUCC



**CDM - Executive Board** 



EB 24 Report Annex 28 page 2

- 3. The common practice analysis should make reference to similar plants operated by the company and to plants which were planned or in construction at the time of the investment decision.
- 4. The PDD indicates that the project applies scenario 14, the validation report indicates scenario 16. This should be clarified.
- 5. It should be further clarified that the existing cogeneration plant would have operated throughout the proposed crediting period and that the cane crushing capacity of the sugar mill has not been increased.