

**CDM capacity building workshop in Fiji**

**25-28 January 2011**

**Jørgen Fenhann**

**Reasons why some CDM projects  
was stopped in the validation and  
registration process**

# Who some project stopped in the project cycle (1)

*The devil is mostly in the details but some general reasons were:*

## *Methodology*

- The activity do not meet the requirement in the Approved Methodology
- Some applicability conditions were not satisfied
- An old version of the Approved Methodology was used

## *Baseline*

- Not all possible Baseline Scenarios are considered.
- Did not substantiate that the alternatives considered will provide the similar level of output/services as that of the project activity.

## *Input value parameters*

- No explanations for the suitability of the efficiency value applied
- No explanation for the plant load factor

## Who some project stopped in the project cycle (2)

### *Additionality*

- No sensitivity analysis included (the best case must be under the benchmark)
- Why was a benchmark of 10% used, as the observed benchmark for power sector in in the country is 8%,
- The plant load factor was too high
- How the subsidy component of the investment costs was established was not documented
- No explanation that the prevailing practice barrier claimed would prevent the implementation of the project activity
- Request to further substantiate how the proposed tariff for the project activity has been considered suitable, as with the application of the highest tariff issued in accordance with EB 54 Para. 53 for the similar projects in the province the project IRR crosses the benchmark.

# Who some project stopped in the project cycle (3)

## *Emission reduction calculations*

- A transparent spreadsheet for the detailed emission reduction calculation

## *PDD*

- The Project Participants did not inform the host Party DNA in writing of the commencement of the project activity and of their intention to seek CDM status within six months of the project start date.
- The PDD lacks explaining how the generated electricity will be utilised or will be despatched to national grid.

## *Debundling*

- The distance between the project activity and the other hydropower project owned by the same project participants was < 1 km.

# Who some project stopped in the project cycle (4)

## *Emission Factors (grid emission factor)*

- The PDD indicates that the power will be supplied to the southern grid, while the PDD use the grid emission factor for the central grid
- The data on which calculations of OM, BM and Combined Margin were missing
- As per the tool to determine project emissions from flaring, the type of flare and the approach to determine its efficiency was not documented
- Step-by-step application of the methodology for calculating emissions should be documented in a transparent manner to show how the formulae were applied.

## *Leakage*

- Missing documentation that biomass consumption during the project activity implementation will not lead to any leakage related to the competing uses for the biomass.
- Not clear if the project activity will not lead to a diversion of waste heat from use in the preheating process.

## Who some project stopped in the project cycle (5)

### *Emission reduction calculations*

- A transparent spreadsheet for the detailed emission reduction calculation of the complex project activity was missing
- The PDD did not clarify if there were double counting of emission reductions
- Clarify missing whether a hydro reservoir is present for the project activity and hence whether project emission should be considered.

### *Monitoring*

- The fossil fuel consumption in the project activity was not monitored in line with “Tool to calculate project or leakage CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from fossil fuel combustion”.