

**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 B member submitting this form	oard
Title of the proposed CDM project activity submitted for registration	1609 Anshan Iron and Steel Group Corporation (Anshan) Blast Furnace Gas Combined Cycle Power Plant Project
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 parage	graph 37 of the CDM modalities and procedures:
☐ The participation requirements as set out in p	paragraphs 28 to 30 of the CDM modalities and procedures are satisfied;
	nvited, a summary of the comments received has been provided, and a report to due account was taken of any comments has been received;
activity, including transboundary impacts and, if	DE documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project those impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the host assessment in accordance with procedures as required by the host Party;
	eduction in anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases that are the proposed project activity, in accordance with paragraphs 43 to 52 of the
The baseline and monitoring methodologies of Executive Board;	comply with requirements pertaining to methodologies previously approved by the
Provisions for monitoring, verification and rep procedures and relevant decisions of the COP/N	orting are in accordance with decision 17/CP.7, the CDM modalities and IOP;
The project activity conforms to all other required procedures and relevant decisions by the COP/N	irements for CDM project activities in decision 17/CP.7, the CDM modalities and MOP and the Executive Board.
☐ The following are requirements derived from parag	graph 40 of the CDM modalities and procedures:
participants written approval of voluntary particip	e validation report to the Executive Board, have received from the project ation from the designated national authority of each Party involved, including tivity assists it in achieving sustainable development;
In accordance with provisions on confidentia shall make publicly available the project design d	lity contained in paragraph 27 (h) of the CDM modalities and procedures, the DOE locument;
The DOE shall receive, within 30 days, commaccredited non-governmental organizations and	nents on the validation requirements from Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC make them publicly available;
After the deadline for receipt of comments, the provided and taking into account the comments in the comments of the commen	ne DOE shall make a determination as to whether, on the basis of the information received, the project activity should be validated;
	its determination on the validation of the project activity. Notification to the project a and the date of submission of the validation report to the Executive Board;
	d, if it determines the proposed project activity to be valid, a request for registration oject design document, the written approval of the host Party and an explanation of ived.
There are only minor issues which should be addre	essed 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	29.05.2008

1. The PP/DOE should clarify the inclusion of the fuel costs in the investment analysis as the waste gas would have been flared in the absence of the project activity.

2. The DOE shall confirm how it has validated the input values used in the investment analysis, taking note of the guidance provided in EB 38 paragraph 54.



3. 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". Clarification should be provided why no such comparison has been conducted in the determination of the baseline.