

Comment 1

18-03-08 1:55am

Name: Raghu **City: Ahmednagar****Organisation: CDMFIRST** **Country: India**

1. PP should demonstrate the social wellbeing and economic wellbeing benefits of the project through facts and figures. It is very easy to conclude the benefits generally based on the common sense but the benefits may not be quantified or realisable. DOE should seek further information on this and should be attached to the published PDD.
2. Reducing the compressor inlet air temperature to improve the compressor work done is a very common method of improving the efficiency. PP should demonstrate how this is a novel approach.
3. PP should provide the detailed calculation of aggregate energy savings out of project activity to prove that it is less than 160 GWhth or 60 GWhe.
4. Heat Rate of the power plant depends on many parameters and not only on the inlet air temperature. PP should demonstrate how this methodology is applicable when the reduction in heat rate is multi parameter dependent and is not solely due to an inlet air temp reduction. This fails to meet one of the criteria of the methodology and hence the applicability. DOE should look in to this aspect very clearly. Why AM0061 is not applicable to this project activity?
6. PP should demonstrate the operational life time of the GT and capacity of the plant as per the suitable international standards or national ones.
7. The technology adopted in the project is very old and well proven one. Moreover, the project was installed long time back (may be in 2003/04) and IGF would have got its money back immediately. It is really amusing to see applying this project for CDM now. This indicates the perception of PP and consultants on CDM and their nature of taking things for granted. For me this looks like 'treasure hunting' for IGF as IGF was successful in registering similar non additional projects previously. DOE should look in to these aspects very strictly. I request EB/RIT team to look in to these aspects mainly for those projects implemented way back in 2003/2004 and still applying for CDM just for the sake of some 'additional money'. PP/consultants should stop looking at these kind of projects and concentrate to produce some good quality CDM projects. In a nut shell, the additionality section is a 'crock of shit' and not at all believable.
8. 'Stakeholder section' is another interesting section wherein PP invited only in house employees and mentioned as no comments received (How negative comments will be received from inhouse employees). It is really frustrating to read these kind of conclusions even after three years of CDM existence legally. DOE should reject project at this stage itself and avoid wastage of time for EB/RIT. This also avoids time waste for PP and consultant in further producing 'fake' documents to prove the arguments in the document.

Comment 2

21-03-08 9:16am

Name: R.P. Sharma **City: Ahmednagar****Organisation: CDM** **Country: India**

As per the section A.4.5 of the PDD, it confirms for no debundling, while the project seems to be debundled component of the large scale project activity, as Indo gulf is having a lot of energy efficiency project within a year.

