

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
	37 and 40 of the CDM modalities and procedures, which list of requirements is provided below. Please provide luding any supporting documentation.
☐ The following are requirements derived from paragraph 37	7 of the CDM modalities and procedures:
\square The participation requirements as set out in paragrap	hs 28 to 30 of the CDM modalities and procedures are satisfied;
☐ Comments by local stakeholders have been invited, a the designated operational entity (DOE) on how due according to the design of the desig	summary of the comments received has been provided, and a report to ount was taken of any comments has been received;
activity, including transboundary impacts and, if those im	mentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project nearts are considered significant by the project participants or the host ment in accordance with procedures as required by the host Party;
	in anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases that are proposed project activity, in accordance with paragraphs 43 to 52 of the
☑The baseline and monitoring methodologies comply w Executive Board;	rith requirements pertaining to methodologies previously approved by the
☐ Provisions for monitoring, verification and reporting an procedures and relevant decisions of the COP/MOP;	re in accordance with decision 17/CP.7, the CDM modalities and
☐ The project activity conforms to all other requirements procedures and relevant decisions by the COP/MOP and	s for CDM project activities in decision 17/CP.7, the CDM modalities and d the Executive Board.
\square The following are requirements derived from paragraph 40	of the CDM modalities and procedures:
	on report to the Executive Board, have received from the project m the designated national authority of each Party involved, including sists it in achieving sustainable development;
☐ In accordance with provisions on confidentiality conta shall make publicly available the project design documen	ained in paragraph 27 (h) of the CDM modalities and procedures, the DOE nt ;
☐ The DOE shall receive, within 30 days, comments on accredited non-governmental organizations and make the	the validation requirements from Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC em publicly available;
☐ After the deadline for receipt of comments, the DOE provided and taking into account the comments received	shall make a determination as to whether, on the basis of the information , the project activity should be validated;
	mination on the validation of the project activity. Notification to the project e date of submission of the validation report to the Executive Board;
	termines the proposed project activity to be valid, a request for registration sign document, the written approval of the host Party and an explanation of
☐ There are only minor issues which should be addressed by	y the DOE / project participants prior to the registration of the project.
Section below to be filled in by UNFCCC secretar	riat
Date received at LINECCC secretariat	

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.

UNFCCC/CCNUCC



CDM - Executive Board



page 2

- 2. The evidence to support the stated barriers is generic and anecdotal, the barriers must be supported by credible third party evidence.
- 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.