

## 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	Power Generation (20MW) by utilizing Coke Oven Gas of China Coal and Coke Jiuxin Limited in Lingshi, Shanxi, P. R. China; Project activity 1390
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 o	of the CDM modalities and procedures:
☐ The participation requirements as set out in paragraph	s 28 to 30 of the CDM modalities and procedures are satisfied;
☐ Comments by local stakeholders have been invited, as to the designated operational entity (DOE) on how due acceptable.	summary of the comments received has been provided, and a report count was taken of any comments has been received;
activity, including transboundary impacts and, if those imp	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 wit the Executive Board;	h requirements pertaining to methodologies previously approved by
☐Provisions for monitoring, verification and reporting are procedures and relevant decisions of the COP/MOP;	in accordance with decision 17/CP.7, the CDM modalities and
☐ The project activity conforms to all other requirements and procedures and relevant decisions by the COP/MOP	for CDM project activities in decision 17/CP.7, the CDM modalities and the Executive Board.
$\square$ The following are requirements derived from paragraph 40 $\alpha$	of the CDM modalities and procedures:
	n report to the Executive Board, have received from the project in the designated national authority of each Party involved, including sts it in achieving sustainable development;
☐ In accordance with provisions on confidentiality contai DOE shall make publicly available the project design docu	ned in paragraph 27 (h) of the CDM modalities and procedures, the ment;
☐ 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;	
	nation on the validation of the project activity. Notification to the nd the date of submission of the validation report to the Executive
	rmines the proposed project activity to be valid, a request for project design document, the written approval of the host Party and into 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	24/12/2007

Reasons for request:

- 1. The DOE should explain in detail what steps it has taken to determine that the benchmark proposed by the project participants is the most suitable indicator against which to assess the financial viability of this project activity.
- 2. The DOE should provide information regarding how the key input values of the investment analysis have been validated and determined to reflect the true situation facing the underlying project activity.
- The DOE should clearly state how the applicability condition that "no fuel switch is done in the process" has been validated.

- 4. The methodology requires that "among the alternatives that do not face any prohibitive barriers, the most economically attractive alternative should be considered as the baseline scenario". No such comparison has been conducted in the determination of the baseline.
- 5. The DOE shall further clarify how the appropriateness of the baseline was assessed and validated.