

	CDM project activity registration review form <i>(By submitting this form, a Party involved (through the designated national authority) or an Executive Board member may request that a review is undertaken)</i>
Designated national authority/Executive Board member submitting this form	
Title of the proposed CDM project activity submitted for registration	4.5 MW Biomass (Agricultural Residues) Based Power Generation Unit of M/s Matrix Power Pvt. Ltd. (MPPL) Project (0281)
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.	
☐ <i>The following are requirements derived from paragraph 37 of the CDM modalities and procedures:</i> ☐ 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; ☒ X 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; ☒ X 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. ☐ <i>The following are requirements derived from paragraph 40 of the CDM modalities and procedures:</i> ☐ 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.	
Section below to be filled in by UNFCCC secretariat	
Date received at UNFCCC secretariat	

Reasons for Request:

The DOE validated the baseline and additionality based on unit cost of service. However, it is not clear whether or not the DOE checked and verified all data, assumptions and the method used to calculate the unit cost of service.

The discussions in the PDD reveal that multiple agricultural residues (e.g., chilli and cotton stalks, paddy husk and juliflora) are being (or are planned to be) used in the power project. Different agricultural residues have different prices and calorific values. It is not clear at what proportions these agricultural residues are being used (planned to be used).

The DOE suggested that the project proponent should change base year from 2000 to 2005. This led to an increase in CERs from 21,773 (PDD GSP version) to 23,213 (PDD). It is not clear why the DOE suggested the change. Note that the project is already in operation since 2001 and carbon emission factor for India's Southern Electricity Grid is available from the Central Electricity Authority of India.

Project participants should identify sources of data and assumptions used in PDD, for example data and assumptions used in investment analysis to demonstrate the additionality.