



**FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE - Secretariat
CONVENTION - CADRE SUR LES CHANGEMENTS CLIMATIQUES -
Secrétariat**

Date: 28 November 2008
Ref: CDM-EB-44

EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE CLEAN DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM

FORTY-FOURTH MEETING

Report

Date of meeting: 26-28 November 2008

Location: Poznan, Poland

Attendance: The names of members and alternate members present at the forty-fourth meeting are in bold print below. Where only the name of an alternate member is in bold print, the alternate participated as a member.

Member	Alternate
Mr. Samuel Adeoye Adejuwon ¹	Mr. Kamel Djemouai ¹
Mr. Philip M. Gwage ²	Mr. Xuedu Lu ²
Mr. Victor Nicolae ²	Ms. Diana Harutyunyan ²
Mr. Lex de Jonge ²	Mr. Pedro Martins Barata ²
Mr. Akihiro Kuroki ¹	<i>N.N.</i>
Mr. Clifford Mahlun ²	Mr. Tuiloma Neroni Slade ²
Mr. Paulo Manso ²	Mr. Hussein Badarin ²
Ms. Ulrika Raab ¹	Mr. Martin Hession ¹
Mr. Hugh Sealy ¹	Mr. José Domingos Miguez ¹
Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sethi ¹	Ms. Liana Bratasida ¹

¹ Term: Two years (term of service ends immediately before the first meeting in 2009)

² Term: Two years (term of service ends immediately before the first meeting in 2010)

NB: The term of service of a member, or an alternate member, starts at the first meeting of the Executive Board in the calendar year following his/her election and ends immediately before the first meeting of the Executive Board in the calendar year in which the term ends (see Rules of procedure of the Executive Board).

Quorum (in parenthesis required numbers): **10** (7) members or alternate members acting as members present of which **4** (3) from Annex I Parties and **6** (4) from non-Annex I Parties.

WWW broadcasting: < <http://cdm.unfccc.int/EB/Meetings> >.

**Agenda item 1. Membership issues (including disclosure of possible conflict of interest)**

1. Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sethi, Chair of the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism (CDM) (hereinafter referred to as the Board) opened the meeting and asserted that the quorum requirement was met.
2. Members and alternate members made declarations as to whether they had a conflict of interest as to any items on the meeting agenda. Specifically, Mr. Pedro Martins Barata, Mr. Martin Hession, Ms Ulrika Raab and Mr. Hugh Sealy also requested that their signed statements regarding conflict of interest be attached to this report, as contained in annex 1 to this report.
3. The Board took note of the resignation of Ms. Jeanne-Marie Huddleston, member from the Annex I group. It expressed its deep appreciation for her excellent contribution to the CDM.
4. The Board noted that the secretariat was informed that Mr. Hussein Badarin, Ms. Diana Harutyunyan and Mr. Tuiloma Neroni Slade were unable to attend the meeting and had provided proper justification for their absence.

Agenda item 2. Adoption of the agenda

5. The Board agreed to add the agenda item "Privileges and immunities" under other matters. The Board adopted the revised agenda and agreed to the programme of work.

Agenda item 3. Work plan**Agenda sub-item 3 (a): Accreditation of operational entities**

6. The Board took note of the twenty-eighth progress report on the work of the CDM Accreditation Panel (CDM-AP), and an oral report by the Chair, Mr. Martin Hession. The report summarized information relating to the work of the panel including the status of applications and developments with respect to desk reviews, on-site assessments, witnessing activities and other accreditation related issues. The Board also noted and confirmed the voluntary withdrawal of accreditation and designation by British Standards Institution (E-0018) and PricewaterhouseCoopers - South Africa (E-0029).

Case specific

7. The Board considered the recommendation of the CDM-AP, and agreed to accredit and provisionally designate the entity 'RINA S.p.A (E-0037)' for the validation functions for the sectoral scope 13 (Waste handling and disposal).
8. The Board considered the report of the appeal panel established as decided in forty-third meeting of the Board to consider the appeal submitted by a DOE. The Board taking into consideration the recommendation of the appeal panel accepted the decision of the appeal panel to deny the appeal submitted by the DOE.
9. The Board decided to recommend to CMP to suspend the designation of the designated operational entity DNV Certification AS (E-0003). In accordance with paragraph 95 of the Procedures this suspension is with immediate effect.

The Board agreed that DNV Certification AS could continue to process existing activities in relation to requests for registration and issuance which have been submitted to the Executive Board prior to this suspension. DNV Certification AS may therefore:

- (a) Respond to issues related to completeness checks of requests for registration and issuance;



- (b) Respond to issues raised in reviews and requests for reviews of requests for registration and issuance; and
- (c) Submit documentation requested by the CDM Executive Board as part of the outcome of a previous request for review or review.

Until such time as the Board decides to terminate the suspension in accordance with paragraph 99 of the Procedures DNV Certification AS may continue to undertake activities related to validation and verification under existing contracts, except the following:

- (a) Upload PDDs for public comments as part of the validation process;
- (b) Upload monitoring reports as part of the verification process;
- (c) Submit new requests for registration for CDM project activities;
- (d) Submit new requests for issuance of certified emission reductions;
- (e) Submit new requests for renewal of crediting periods; and
- (f) Submit new requests for revision of monitoring plan.

The Board further agreed that the DOE shall undertake corrective actions to address the non-conformities listed in [annex 2](#) within a period of 6 months. Therefore in accordance with paragraph 97 of the Procedures the CDM-AT shall undertake a further on-site assessment to verify the implementation of the corrective actions. The CDM-AP will schedule on site assessment expeditiously on the request of DOE on confirmation of implementation of corrective actions.

10. In case of Japan Consulting Institute (E-0007), following the hearing, the Executive Board reviewed the recommendation of CDM-AP and the oral responses provided by JCI during the hearing. The entity stated that corrective actions in response to the non conformities have been implemented and provided substantial and detailed evidence to support their statement. The Board considered the written submission of the entity and decided, on the basis of the evidence provided for the corrective actions in relation to the non-conformities, to request the CDM-AP to verify the implementation of corrective actions by JCI and revert to the Board with a further recommendation for a final decision by the Board. The Board requested the CDM-AP to expeditiously schedule a further onsite assessment to verify the implementation of the corrective actions.

General guidance

11. The Board adopted the Validation and Verification Manual (VVM), as contained in [annex 3](#) to this report.

12. The Board requested AEs/DOEs to implement the VVM with immediate effect and to fully integrate the requirements of VVM into their management system. The Board further noted that it has been and remains essential for all AEs/DOEs to validate and verify the requirements included in the VVM. The Board also requested the secretariat to explore ways and means to raise the awareness and assist in the implementation of the VVM.

13. The CDM-AP reported the progress on the implementation of streamlining the accreditation process on current accreditation status of entities, and the revisions of the procedure for accrediting the operational entities under the CDM. The Board asked the CDM-AP to present the revised procedure at its forty-fifth meeting.



14. The Chair of CDM-AP presented the elaboration of CDM accreditation requirements contained in the document prepared by the CDM-AP. The Board considered necessary to review the draft in detail and decided to consider it at its forty-fifth meeting.

15. The Board considered the synthesis report of annual activity reports submitted by the DOEs and requested the secretariat to continue follow-up the issues raised by the CDM-AP and requested DOEs to continue to submit their reports in a timely manner.

Further schedule

16. The Board noted that the thirty-ninth meeting of the CDM-AP is scheduled on 14-16 January 2009.

Agenda sub-item 3 (b): Methodologies for baselines and monitoring plans

17. The Board took note of the report of the thirty-fifth meeting of the panel on baseline and monitoring methodologies (Meth Panel), and an oral report by the Chair of the panel, Mr. Akihiro Kuroki, on the work of the panel.

Case specific

18. Taking into consideration the inputs by experts (desk reviewers), the public, and the recommendations of the Meth Panel, the Board agreed to:

19. **Approve cases:**

(a) **AM0073** - "GHG emission reductions through multi-site manure collection and treatment in a central plant", which was proposed as NM0239 (Environmental passive mitigation through the management of the swine manure by a Regional Sanitation Plant in the Santa Catarina State, Brazil) and link it to scope 13 (Waste handling and disposal) and 15 (Agriculture), as contained in the annex 4 of this report;

(b) **AM0074** - "Methodology for new grid connected power plants using permeate gas previously flared and/or vented", which was proposed as NM0270 (Methodology for new grid connected power plants utilizing permeate or associated gas, previously flared (or vented)) and link it to scope 01 (Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources), as contained in the annex 5 of this report.

20. **Not to approve cases:** NM0273, NM0275, NM0279, NM0281, NM0283 and NM0285 which, if revised taking into account comments, can be resubmitted but will require new expert and public input.

Responses to request for clarifications

21. The Board took note of the responses to the requests for clarifications provided by the Meth Panel on the cases AM_CLA_0111, AM_CLA_0112, AM_CLA_0118 to AM_CLA_0124 and AM_CLA_0126.

Responses to requests for revisions and resultant revision of approved methodologies

22. The Board agreed to the responses prepared by the Meth Panel to revisions and the resultant revision of approved methodologies:

(a) Accept request AM_REV_0101 concerning revision of the approved methodology AM0025 to amend the applicability conditions and the calculation of emission reductions in relation to circulating fluidized bed incinerators. See also paragraph 23 below.



- (b) Not to accept request AM REV 0107 concerning revision of the approved methodology AM0048 to include the generation of thermal energy to replace energy produced from the electricity from the grid in the baseline.
- (c) Not to accept request AM REV 0111 concerning revision of the approved methodology AM0058 to extend its applicability to include a new power plant installed at the same time as the start of the operation of the district heating system.
- (d) Not to accept request AM REV 0112 concerning revision of the approved methodology ACM0006 to include a new scenario for project activities that install a new biomass residues fired cogeneration plant at a site where, prior to the implementation of the project activity, an existing cogeneration plant has been operated with a fuel mix composed by biomass residues and fossil fuels.
- (e) Not to accept request AM REV 0114 concerning revision of the approved methodology AM0031 to (i) expand its applicability to include the use of electricity and blended biofuels as the transport fuel and complementary rail-based transport, and (ii) introduce changes in the calculation of baseline emissions and leakage. See also paragraph 23 below.
- (f) Not to accept request AM REV 0117 concerning revision of the approved methodology AM0048 to extend its applicability to include the cogeneration project type of supplying steam and electricity to newly introduced project customers.
- (g) Not to accept request AM REV 0119 concerning revision of the approved methodology AM0058 to expand its applicability to include a cogeneration plant that has been in operation for less than three years.
- (h) Not to accept request AM REV 0120 concerning revision of the approved methodology ACM0006 to include a new scenario for project activities involving the installation of a new biomass residue fired cogeneration plant at a site where prior to the implementation of the project activity an existing captive cogeneration plant has been operated in the baseline case co-firing fossil fuels and biomass residues.
- (i) Not to accept request AM REV 0121 concerning revision of the approved methodology AM0038 to expand its applicability to include electric arc furnaces, supply of electricity from a captive power plant and the calculation of the emission factor on an ex-post basis.
- (j) Accept request AM REV 0122 concerning revision of the approved methodology ACM0002 to amend the calculation of emission reductions for capacity expansion project activities. See also paragraph 23 below.
- (k) Accept request AM REV 0123 concerning revision of the approved methodology AM0066 resulting in the deletion of equations 13,14 and 15 and adjustment of emission reductions based on conservative production value . See also paragraph 23 below.
- (l) Accept request AM REV 0127 concerning revision of the approved methodology AM0030 to adapt it to the newly available data provided by the most recent IAI survey. See also paragraph 23 below.

**Revision of approved methodologies**

23. The Board revised the following approved methodologies:

(a) **AM0009:** The editorial revision is made in response to the request for clarification AM_CLA_0118. The revision includes the deletion of the term ‘transportation’ on page 7 from the section “CH₄ project emissions from venting, leak or flaring of the associated gas”, as transportation fugitive emissions are not accounted for in the carbon mass balance provided in equation (3). The revised approved methodology is contained in [annex 6](#) to this report;

(b) **AM0025:** The revision is made in response to the request for revision AM_REV_0101. The revision includes the following changes in the methodology: the addition of a circulating fluidized bed incinerator as a possible technology in the project activity and clarification on the measurement procedure for fossil-based carbon in the waste. The Board agreed on the recommendation of the Panel on the inclusion of an applicability condition to limit the use of auxiliary fossil fuels in the incinerator, but changed the proposed limit from 20 to 50%. The revised approved methodology is contained in [annex 7](#) to this report.

(c) **AM0030:** The revision is made in response to the request for revision AM_REV_0127. The revision includes the emission factor for CWPB technology, to be determined based on latest IAI survey. The revised approved methodology is contained in [annex 8](#) to this report.

(d) **AM0031:** The editorial revision is made in response to the request for revision AM_REV_0114. The revision to the approved methodology is made in order to correct equation 22 used in the calculation of leakage. The correction is to introduce a previously omitted parameter in the equation. The revised approved methodology is contained in [annex 9](#) to this report.

(e) **AM0065:** The revision is made in response to the request for clarification AM_CLA_0111. The revision includes the clarification that SF₆ consumption is estimated as the lower value between the SF₆ consumption estimated based on IPCC default consumption rate and the estimated based on the monitored value of SF₆ consumption multiplied by the data integrity factor. The revised approved methodology is contained in [annex 10](#) to this report.

(f) **AM0066:** The revision is made in response to the request for revision AM_REV_0123. The revision includes the deletion of equations 13, 14 and 15 and an adjustment of emission reductions based on a conservative production value. The revised approved methodology is contained in [annex 11](#) to this report.

(g) **ACM0002:** The revision is made in response to the request for revision AM_REV_0122. The revision includes the change of baseline equation (9) in case this methodology is applied to project activities that increase the generation capacity at an existing hydropower generation facility when the existing units continue to operate and the configuration permits their generation to be measured separately. The revised approved methodology is contained in [annex 12](#) to this report.

(h) **ACM0012:** The revision is made in response to the request for clarification AM_CLA_0126. The revision introduces the consistency in the description of parameter HG_{j,y} (Net quantity of heat supplied to the recipient plant j by the project activity during the year y). The revised approved methodology is contained in [annex 13](#) to this report.

24. The revised versions of the methodologies referred to in the paragraph above will come into effect on 5 December 2008, 24:00 GMT in accordance with the procedure for the revision of approved



methodologies.

General guidance

25. The Board considered the draft guidance on the barrier “first-of-its-kind” and the draft guidance on the application of common practice analysis, and agreed to further discuss both draft proposals taking into consideration discussions on them, at its forty-fifth meeting.

26. Due to the time constraints the Board did not consider the input received as a response to the call for inputs on the proposal for the enhanced barrier test along with an assessment prepared by the secretariat of approved methodologies and registered project activities, and agreed to discuss these documents in its forty-fifth meeting. The Board requested the Panel to analyse the public comments and the assessment by the secretariat.

27. The Board considered the draft guidance on apportioning emissions from production processes between main product and co- and by-products as prepared by the Meth Panel, and requested the Panel to further work on the document and assess whether this guidance should be an internal working document of the Meth Panel or submitted for approval to the Board.

28. Due to the time constraints the Board did not consider the draft guidance on expansion of industrial gases recovery methodologies to new facilities, and agreed to discuss this document in its forty-fifth meeting.

29. Due to the time constraints the Board did not consider the draft guidance on an accurate plant load factor for wind power project activities applying ACM0002 taking into account the variability of the wind parameters and gaps of data, and agreed to discuss it in its forty-fifth meeting.

30. The Board agreed to launch a call for experts starting on 17 December 2008 and ending on 22 February 2009, 24:00 GMT in order to replace the outgoing members of the Meth Panel with a view to prepare a shortlist of experts for consideration by the Board at its forty-sixth meeting. Members currently serving on the Meth Panel are encouraged to submit their application, for automatic inclusion in the short list, should they wish to continue.

31. The Board agreed to launch a call for experts on the following technical areas required for the consideration of proposed new methodologies: coal mine fires; iron and steel industries, adipic acid production, transport, SF₆, uncertainty, and landfill aeration, starting on 17 December 2008 and ending on 22 February 2009. Those experts identified will be contacted by the secretariat.

Further schedule

32. The Board noted that the thirty-sixth meeting of the CDM Meth Panel is scheduled on 19-23 January 2009. The Board also reminded the project participants that the deadline for the twenty-sixth round of submissions of proposed new methodologies is 17 December 2008. Furthermore, it reminded the project participants that the deadline for submission of requests for revision and requests for clarification for consideration at the thirty-sixth meeting shall be 8 December 2008 24:00 GMT.

Agenda sub-item 3 (c): Issues relating to CDM afforestation and reforestation project activities

33. The Board took note of the report on the work of the twenty-second meeting of the A/R WG and an oral report by its Chair, Mr. José Domingos Miguez, on the work of the group.

*Case specific*

34. The Board considered the recommendation of the A/R WG for the case ARNM0036 and agreed request the A/R WG to reconsider its recommendation at the next meeting of the group in order to request project proponents to simplify the methodological approach applied, in particular to use a deterministic approach in determining the baseline net GHG removals by sinks.

Responses to requests for clarifications

35. The Board took note of the response to request for clarification provided by the A/R WG on the case AR-AM_CLA_0005.

New simplified baseline and monitoring methodologies for small- scale afforestation and reforestation project activities under the clean development mechanism

36. The Board agreed to two new simplified baseline and monitoring methodologies for small-scale A/R project activities under the CDM:

- (a) **AR-AMS0004:** “Simplified baseline and monitoring methodology for small-scale agroforestry - afforestation and reforestation project activities under the clean development mechanism”, as contained in [annex 14](#) of this report; and
- (b) **AR-AMS0005:** “Simplified baseline and monitoring methodology for small-scale afforestation and reforestation project activities under the clean development mechanism implemented on lands having low inherent potential to support living biomass”, as contained in [annex 15](#) of this report.

General guidance

37. The Board agreed that the GHG emissions from the following sources related to A/R CDM project activities:

- (a) Fossil fuel combustion in A/R CDM project activities;
- (b) Collection of wood from non-renewable sources to be used for fencing of the project area; and
- (c) Nitrous oxide (N₂O) emissions from decomposition of litter and fine roots from N-fixing trees

are insignificant in A/R CDM project activities and may therefore be neglected in A/R baseline and monitoring methodologies.

The Board further agreed to request the secretariat to prepare draft revisions to those approved A/R CDM baseline and monitoring methodologies affected by the above guidance, and also in doing so to make the methodologies consistent with each other, especially if they differ in approaches applied for similar issues, for consideration by the A/R WG and thereafter recommendation to the Board for approval.

38. The Board agreed to the “Guidance on the application of the definition of project boundary to A/R CDM project activities”, as contained in [annex 16](#) to this report, which provides the option for fixing the project boundary at the first verification, thereby allowing for more flexibility in delineation of areas of land at registration of the A/R CDM project activity.

39. The Board agreed to launch a call for experts starting on 17 December 2008 and ending on 22 February 2009, 24:00 GMT in order to replace the outgoing members of the A/R WG with a view to



prepare a shortlist of experts for consideration by the Board at its forty-sixth meeting. Members currently serving on the A/R WG are encouraged to submit their application, for automatic inclusion in the short list, should they wish to continue.

Further schedule

40. The Board noted that the twenty-third meeting of the A/R WG is scheduled from 25 to 27 February 2009, as per annex 16 of the forty-third meeting of the Board.
41. The Board reminded project participants that the deadline for the 21st round of submissions of proposed new A/R methodologies is 12 January 2009.
42. The Board reminded project participants that the deadline for consideration of request for revision and request for clarification of A/R methodologies at the twenty-third meeting shall be 13 January 2009.

Agenda sub-item 3 (d): Issues relating to small-scale CDM project activities

43. The Board took note of the report on the work of the eighteenth meeting of the working group to assist the Board in reviewing proposed methodologies for small-scale CDM project activities (SSC WG) and of an oral report by its Chair, Ms. Ulrika Raab, on the work of the group.

Case specific

44. The Board approved a new small-scale methodology “AMS-III.X Energy Efficiency and HFC-134a recovery in residential refrigerators” assigned to sectoral scope 03 and 11 as contained in [annex 17](#) of this report. The methodology is for demand side activities for replacement of existing functional domestic refrigerators with more efficient units utilizing refrigerants and foam blowing agents having no ozone depleting potential (ODP) and low global warming potential (GWP). Baseline refrigerator de-manufacturing (disassembly) and reclamation of refrigerants (e.g. HFC-134a) is an integral part of the project activity applying the methodology.
45. The Board approved a new small-scale methodology “AMS-III.Y Methane avoidance through separation of solids from wastewater or manure treatment systems” assigned to sectoral scope 13 as contained in [annex 18](#) of this report. The methodology comprises activities for removal of (volatile) solids from the wastewater or manure slurry stream using mechanical solid/liquid separation technologies (e.g. stationary, vibrating or rotating screens, centrifuges, hydrocyclones, press systems/screws) and/or thermal treatment technologies thereby avoiding methane production.

Revisions of approved methodologies:

46. The Board agreed to the revised approved methodologies:
 - (a) “AMS-III.K Avoidance of methane release from charcoal production by shifting from traditional open-ended methods to mechanized charcoaling process”, to include a new approach involving helium tracing to determine the baseline methane emission factor in charcoal production, as contained in [annex 19](#) of this report;
 - (b) “AMS II.C Demand side energy efficiency activities through specific technologies”, to clarify the consideration of capacity increase of the project equipment, electricity transmission and distribution (T&D) losses in the baseline and cross effects (interactive effects) of lighting and heating as contained in [annex 20](#) of this report. With regard to equipment containing refrigerants, the proposed revisions clarify the calculations of direct emissions from refrigerants.
 - (c) “AMS-II.J Demand side activities for efficient lighting technologies”, to clarify the project design requirements, consideration of electricity T&D losses in the baseline, frequency of



ex post surveys, and estimation of cross-effects (interactive effects) of lighting and heating as contained in annex 21 of this report.

47. The revised versions of the SSC methodologies referred to in the paragraph above will come into effect on 5 December 2008, 24:00 GMT in accordance with the procedure for the revision of approved SSC methodologies.

General guidance

48. The Board took note that the application of enhanced barrier test may be necessary for small-scale methodologies, particularly for the sectors indicated by the Methodologies Panel, which comprises of all Type I methodologies, AMS-III.P, AMS-III.Q and it may also be necessary for large infrastructure projects under small-scale CDM (e.g. modal shift transport project activity). The Board requested the SSC WG to further work on the definition of large infrastructure projects.

49. The Board clarified that the header of SSC methodologies stating “Project participants shall take into account the general guidance to the methodologies, information on additionality, abbreviations and general guidance on leakage provided at <http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/SSCmethodologies/approved.html>”, which implies attachment C of appendix B is to be applied in conjunction with a SSC methodology *mutatis mutandis*.

50. The Board noted that the emission impact of continued use of displaced equipment outside the project boundary is subject to uncertainty and difficult to quantify. It therefore clarified that leakage from equipment transfer from within to outside the project boundary may be excluded from consideration in SSC methodologies.

51. The Board agreed to launch a call for experts starting 17 December 2008 and ending on 22 February 2009, 24:00 GMT in order to replace the outgoing members of the SSC WG with a view to prepare a shortlist of experts for consideration by the Board at its forty-sixth meeting. Members currently serving on the SSC WG are encouraged to submit their application, for automatic inclusion in the short list, should they wish to continue.

Further schedule

52. The Board noted that the nineteenth meeting of the SSC WG meeting is scheduled on 24-27 February 2008.

Agenda sub-item 3 (d): Matters relating to programme of activities

53. The Board took note of the options prepared by the secretariat to address issues associated with the development of the Programme of Activities (PoA) and difficulties in the validation and submission for registration of a PoA, which takes into account the inputs received from stakeholders in response to a call for public inputs launched by the Board. Due to time constraints the Board could not consider this proposal and agreed to consider it at its next meeting.

Agenda sub-item 3 (e): Matters relating to the registration of CDM project activities

54. The Board took note that 1243 CDM project activities have been registered by 28 November 2008. The status of requests for registration of project activities can be viewed on the UNFCCC CDM website at <<http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/>>.

*Case specific*

55. In accordance with the procedures for review as referred to in paragraph 41 of the CDM modalities and procedures, the Board considered a request for review of twenty-nine (29) requests for registration.

56. The Board agreed to register with corrections the project activities:

- (a) “Yiyang Xiushan Hydropower Project, P.R. China” (1744) if the project participants and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which:
 - (i) Incorporate the explanations submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of the input values to the investment analysis and the differences between the validated PDD and the PDD submitted for registration; and
 - (ii) Applies the data vintage indicated in the PDD submitted for validation to calculate the grid emission factor.
- (b) “Wind power project by HZL in Karnataka” (1824) if the project participants and DOE (BVC Holding SAS) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of suitability of the benchmark and the common practice analysis.
- (c) “Inner Mongolia Duolun Daxishan 30.6 MW Wind Power Project” (1833) if the project participants and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and a revised validation report, which:
 - (i) Incorporate the information submitted on suitability of the input values in response to the request for review; and
 - (ii) Provide further justification on how the DOE has validated the common practice analysis, in particular, the scale of the similar project activity.
- (d) “Xacbal Hydroelectric project” (1834) if the project participants and DOE (AENOR) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which:
 - (i) Incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of barrier analysis and common practice analysis; and
 - (ii) Revise the start date of project activity as 27 December 2006, the date when the Starting Order of the Road Works Contract was executed by the PP to its road works contractor.
- (e) “Zhejiang Cixi Wind Farm Project” (1837) if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submits a revised validation report, which incorporates the information submitted on the sensitivity analysis and common practice analysis in response to the request for review.
- (f) “Jiangxi Liujinba 20 MW Hydro Power Project” (1850) if the project participants and the DOE (JCI) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of the input values and common practice analysis.
- (g) “Wind power project by HZL in Gujarat” (1856) if the project participants and the DOE (BVC Holding SAS) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which include the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of suitability of the benchmark and the common practice analysis.



- (h) “China Fujian Putian LNG Generation Project” (1859) if the project participants and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which:
- (i) Incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of the suitability of the input values and common practice analysis; and
 - (ii) Further substantiate the prior consideration of CDM, in particular, the date when LNG supply contract was signed for this specific project activity and whether this contract was signed before March 2006.
- (i) “Fujian Jinjiang LNG Power Generation Project” (1898) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate:
- (i) Monitoring of the source of LNG/natural gas used for the project;
 - (ii) The information submitted in response to the request for review regarding investment analysis, natural gas availability; and
 - (iii) Further substantiation that the economic comparison of the baseline and project activity are based on supplying similar level of service, i.e. that both are used for peaking purposes and supply equivalent amounts of power to the grid.
- (j) “Methane Recovery in Wastewater Treatment, Project AIN07-W-01, Sumatera Utara (North Sumatera), Indonesia” (1899) if the project participants and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review and the confirmation that CERs will not be requested for the addition of the renewable component to the registered project activity.
- (k) “Listrindo Kencana Biomass Power Plant” (1936) if the project participants and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of the prior consideration of the CDM, project boundary, project emissions and parameters of monitoring.
- (l) “5.8 MW Wind Energy Generation by M/s Patspin India Limited” (2026) if the project participants and the DOE (BVC Holding SAS) submit a revised PDD and a further revised validation report, which incorporate the explanations submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of input values, choice of parameter for the sensitivity analysis, the project start date and the evidence of prior consideration of the CDM.
57. After the submission of the specified documentation, the secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the Board, will check the revised documentation before the activity is displayed as registered.
58. The Board agreed to undertake a review of the project activity:
- (a) “Saldanha Small Hydroelectric Project” (1526) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 22](#) to this report;¹
 - (b) “Roncheng Wind Power Project, 48.75 MW” (1755) submitted for registration by the DOE (SGS) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 23](#) to this report;²
 - (c) “Valdivia biomass power plant” (1787) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as



contained in [annex 24](#) to this report;³

(d) “Fengguang 24.9 MW Hydropower Project in Guangdong Province, China” (1817) submitted for registration by the DOE (JCI) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 25](#) to this report;⁴

(e) “Ceran’s Castro Alves Hydro Power Plant CDM Project Activity” (1819) submitted for registration by the DOE (SGS) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 26](#) to this report;

(f) “Sichuan Kangding Simaiao 24 MW Hydroelectric Project” (1848) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 27](#) to this report;⁵

(g) “Jinji 25.2 MW Hydropower Project (the Project) in Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region, China” (1849) submitted for registration by the DOE (JCI) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 28](#) to this report;⁶

(h) “25.3 MW WHR Project of Zhejiang Leomax Group” (1874) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 29](#) to this report;⁷

(i) “Biomass based Hot Air Generation at Fertilizer Unit of Tata Chemicals Ltd., Haldia, West Bengal” (1890) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 30](#) to this report;⁸

(j) “Energy efficiency improvement of existing Frame V Gas Turbine by steam injection and change of drive (from steam to electricity) of Ammonia cooling water pumps at NFCL” (1893) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 31](#) to this report;⁹

(k) “Duerping Coal Mine Methane Utilization Project” (1900) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 32](#) to this report;¹⁰

(l) “Electrotherm 30 MW combined waste heat recovery and coal based captive power plant at Kutch” (1903) submitted for registration by the DOE (SGS) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 33](#) to this report;¹¹

(m) “Avoidance of methane emissions from Municipal Solid Waste and Food Waste through Composting” (1904) submitted for registration by the DOE (SGS) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 34](#) to this report;¹²

(n) “Generation of power from process waste heat at Hi-Tech Carbon, Tamil Nadu” (1905) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 35](#) to this report;¹³

(o) “Nantong Coalmine Methane” (1929) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 36](#) to this report¹⁴



- (p) “Anaerobic Digestion Swine Wastewater Treatment with Onsite Power Project (ADSW RP2001)” (1951) submitted for registration by the DOE (SGS) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in annex 37 to this report;¹⁵
- (q) “Sichuan Miyaluo Hydroelectric Station” (1966) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in annex 38 to this report;
59. The Board agreed on the nomination of the members of the review teams for the above. The review teams may call on outside expertise in consultation with the Chair of the Board, as appropriate.
60. In accordance with the procedures for review as referred to in paragraph 41 of the CDM modalities and procedures, the Board considered the recommendations of the review teams for eight (8) of the project activities which were placed “Under review” at the forty-third meeting of the Board.
61. In accordance with paragraphs 17 and 18 (b) of the procedures mentioned in paragraph 60, the Board agreed to register, subject to satisfactory corrections, the project activities:
- (a) “28MW Jinkouba Hydropower Project” (1633) if the DOE (TÜV-NORD) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which incorporate the information on the validation of the input values, tariff assumptions and additional spreadsheet submitted in response to the request for review.
- (b) “Anshan Iron and Steel Group Corporation (Anshan) Coke Dry Quenching Power Generation Project” (1670) if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report in which:
- (i) Provide further justification on how the DOE has validated suitability of the input values as EB 38 para 54(c) guidance, in particularly, total investment cost; and
- (ii) Incorporate the information submitted on the potential variation of the input values and its impact on the levelized cost comparison in response to the review team's questions.
- (c) “Anshan Iron and Steel Group Corporation (Yingkou) Coke Dry Quenching Power Generation Project” (1671) if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report in which:
- (i) Further substantiate the operation hours of the proposed project activity as the operation hours validated by the DOE for similar project activity 1670 is higher than the proposed project activity; and
- (ii) Incorporate the information on the suitability of the input values and baseline determination which has been submitted in response to the review team's questions.
- (d) “Xiaoxi Hydropower Project” (1749) if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report in which incorporate the information on validation of the input values to the investment analysis, including the conservative tariff, submitted in response to the review team's questions.
- (e) “Emission reductions through partial substitution of fossil fuel with alternative fuels in three cement plants of Holcim Philippines Inc.” (1806) if the DOE (DNV) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report in which



incorporate a full assessment of the likely evolution of the fuel mix at all three project sites as a potential baseline scenario. The Board is not satisfied with the current means of validation employed by the DOE to assess this baseline scenario and therefore expects a full assessment of the likely evolution of the fuel mix, considering factors such as the impacts of price changes and supply constraints.

(f) “Guangzhou Zhujiang Power Plant Gas (LNG) Combined Cycle Project” (1828) if the DOE (BVC Holdings SA) submits a revised validation report which incorporates the additional information regarding the cross-checking of input values as provided in response to the review team’s questions.

(g) “Longzhou 1st Hydro Power Project” (1858) if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report in which incorporate:

- (i) The information submitted in response to the review; and
- (ii) More detailed validation of the exact method of calculation of $WTE_{estimated,y}$ and the procedure of monitoring the input parameters (average river flow, the corresponding heads, the resulting flow to turbines and corresponding efficiency and operating hours) required by the model to calculate $WTE_{estimated,y}$.

62. In accordance with paragraphs 17 and 18 (c) of the procedures mentioned in paragraph 60, the Board could not register the project activity “Hejiang County Yuanxing Hydro Project” (1804) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) because the DOE and project participant failed to substantiate the additionality of the project activity due to the lack of evidence and information to support the assumption of an 18% gap between power generation and power exported to the grid applied in the investment analysis.

63. In accordance with the clarifications to paragraph 10 of the procedures mentioned in paragraph 60 the Board considered corrected documentation which had been submitted by the DOE (SGS) for the request for registration for the project activity, “Energy Efficiency Measures at Cement Production Plant” (1068) and agreed to undertake a review and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 39](#) to this report.

64. In accordance with the clarifications to paragraph 18 (b) of the procedures mentioned in paragraph 60 the Board considered three (3) project activities for which corrections had been submitted in response to the outcome of a previous review.

65. The Board agreed to register, as corrected, the project activity “20 MW Bagasse Based Co-generation Power Project at Bannari Amman Sugars Limited, Nanjangud, Karnataka” (1574) submitted for registration by the DOE (SGS).

66. The Board could not register the project activities:

(a) “Brasil Central Energia S.A. – Sacre 2 Small Hydro Power Plant Project” (1328) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD), because the corrections submitted by the DOE and project participant did not provide any further substantiation of the issues related to the prior consideration of the CDM as requested in the outcome of a review undertaken by the Board at its forty-first meeting. Therefore, it could not be concluded that the additionality of the project activity has been demonstrated or assessed in accordance with the requirements of the Executive Board.



(b) "Dwarikesh 8 MW Bagasse-Based Power Generation Project, Bijnor, UP India" (1544) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV), because the corrections submitted by the DOE and project participant did not provide any further substantiation of the serious consideration of the CDM as requested in the outcome of a review undertaken by the Board at its forty-first meeting. Therefore, it could not be concluded that the additionality of the project activity had been demonstrated or assessed in accordance with the requirements of the Executive Board.

67. The Board considered one (1) request for deviation from an approved methodology related to a project activity undergoing validation, agreed to answer it, and requested the secretariat to inform the DOE accordingly.

General guidance

68. The Board took note of a revised proposal from the secretariat regarding the standardization of the format of the modalities of communications between project participants and the Board which takes into account the inputs received from stakeholders in response to a call for public inputs launched by the Board. Due to time constraints the Board could not consider further this proposal and agreed to consider it at its next meeting.

Agenda sub-item 3 (f): Matters relating to the issuance of CERs and the CDM registry

69. The Board took note that 225,372,261 CERs have been issued as of 28 November 2008 and that the secretariat, in its capacity as the CDM registry administrator, continues to process requests for opening of holding accounts and for forwarding of CERs. The status of requests for issuance of CERs can be viewed on the UNFCCC CDM website at <<http://cdm.unfccc.int/Issuance>>.

Case specific issues

70. In accordance with the procedures for review as referred to in paragraph 65 of the CDM modalities and procedures, the Board considered a request for review of fourteen (14) requests for issuance.

71. In accordance with paragraph 10 of these procedures, the Board agreed, subject to a check by the secretariat of the revised documentation and in consultation with the Chair of the Board, to instruct the CDM registry administrator to issue CERs for:

(a) "HFC Decomposition Project in Ulsan" (0003), if the DOE (DNV) submits a revised verification report which includes the clarification on low production of HCFC22 and HFC23 in June 2008 and the HFC23 generation during the incinerator downtime period provided in response to request for review.

(b) "CDM Solar Cooker Project Aceh 1" (0218), if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submits a revised verification report which includes the clarification on the statistical representativeness of 82 interviews and the difference on the implemented solar cookers between the monitoring report and the verification report provided in response to request for review.

(c) "Sesa-Waste Heat Recovery Based Power Generation" (0535), if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding verification report which include clarifications on the monitoring of waste gas used and change of the meter for net electricity exported to grid provided in response to the request for review.

(d) "Waste Heat Recovery based captive power generation by SKS Ispat Ltd" (0674), if the revised monitoring report and the revised verification report submitted by the DOE (SGS) in response to the request for review, which incorporate the clarifications on the exclusion of



emission reductions during the days when steam from AFBC boiler was diverted to the common header and additional information regarding check meters, are displayed on the UNFCCC CDM website.

(e) "Improvement in Energy Consumption of a Hotel" (0686), if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report which includes the spreadsheet which contains daily inlet and outlet temperature, total quantity of water and operating hours of the solar heater provided in response to the request for review and a corresponding revised verification report.

(f) "Zámbyza Landfill Gas Project" (0798), the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which:

(i) Incorporate clarifications on the appropriateness of using linear interpolation approach during the time when the recorded data was lost due to failure of data transfer connection;

(ii) Apply 90% default value of the flare efficiency for the period of 14 December 2007 - 14 January 2008;

(iii) Include correction on the description of calibration frequency provided in response to the request for review.

(g) "Waste heat recovery based power plant at Hindustan Zinc Limited, Chanderia" (0855), if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report that include the clarification on the monitoring of fixed carbon percentage and NCV value of coal.

(h) "Malwa Industries, Ludhiana Small Scale Biomass Project" (0919), if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report and a revised verification report, which include clarification on the details of the calibration of the meters provided in response to the request for review.

(i) "Fuel efficiency improvement in glass melting" (1018), if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report and a revised verification report including the clarification on monitoring for MGy (molten glass produced in the furnace), and calibration of weighing scales used for measuring total broken glass and raw meal provided in response to the request for review.

(j) "Aços Villares Natural gas fuel switch project" (1037), if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised monitoring report and a revised verification report, which include clarification on the difference of baseline and project efficiencies provided in response to the request for review.

(k) "KSPCL Waste Heat to Power project, India" (1151), if the DOE (DNV) submits a revised verification report which includes the clarifications on the operation period of the boilers and that the project is not interconnected with other heat sources.



72. In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 10 of these procedures, referred in paragraph 46, the Board agreed to undertake a review of the request for issuance of CERs and to appoint members of the review team for:

- (a) "Yanling Shendu Hydropower Project" (0695), submitted by the DOE (DNV), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in annex 40 to this report;
- (b) "Demand side energy conservation and reduction measures at ITC Tribeni Unit" (0745), submitted by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in annex 41 to this report.
- (c) "Bagasse based Co-generation Project at Nanglamal Sugar Complex" (0804), submitted by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in annex 42 to this report.

73. The Board agreed on the nomination of the members of the review teams for the above. The review teams may call on outside expertise in consultation with the Chair of the Board, as appropriate.

74. The Board considered seventeen (17) requests for deviation related to monitoring reports undergoing verification, agreed to answer them and requested the secretariat to inform the DOEs accordingly.

Agenda item 4. CDM management plan and resources for the work on the CDM

CDM-MAP

75. The Board took note of the presentation by the secretariat on the resources currently needed to support the increasing workload. The Board approved the establishment of five posts currently filled by temporary staff and requested the secretariat to prepare a draft MAP 2009 with the view to discuss and eventually approve it at its forty-fifth meeting.

Resources

76. The Board took note of information provided by the secretariat on the status of resources received as reflected in annex 43. It was noted that since the forty-third meeting of the Board, the income generated by registration fees, share of proceeds and methodology fees has grown by an additional USD 3.9 million as a result of the payment of USD 0.13 million in registration fees, USD 3.78 million in share of proceeds and USD 1,000 in methodologies fees.

Agenda item 5. Other matters

Agenda sub-item 5 (a): Code of conduct

77. The Board considered a draft code of conduct prepared by the secretariat and requested the secretariat to prepare a revised draft based on the discussion with a view to consider this issue at its next meeting.

Agenda sub item 5 (b): Privileges and immunities

78. Due to time constraints the Board did not consider this agenda item.

**Agenda sub-item 5 (c): Regional distribution**

79. The Board took note of a progress report on the study on the potential use of micro financing in support of CDM projects in LDC countries commissioned by the government of Denmark and welcomed the work undertaken in this area.

Agenda sub-item 5 (d): Relations with Designated National Authorities

80. The Board took note of the briefing of the secretariat on the sixth meeting of the CDM DNA Forum held on 27 - 28 October 2008 in Santiago de Chile.

Agenda sub-item 5 (e): Relations with Designated Operational and Applicant Entities

81. The Chair of the Board welcomed Mr. Siddharth Yadav, the incoming chair of the DOE/AE Forum. The chair of the DOE/AE Forum made a presentation on the activities of the DOE/AE forum and its interaction with the Board. DOE/AE raised some issues related to the input received from entity for the consideration of the Board, and sought guidance from the Board. The Board agreed to look into the request and continue the dialogue on the issue.

82. The Chair of Board asked the Chair of DOE/AE Forum to address the issue of time lines of validation and verification of projects which has been with the DOE/AE Forum for sometime now.

83. The Chair of the Board thanked Mr. Flavio Gomes the out going chair of DOE/AE forum for his contribution in the last one year and expressed that the continued communication between the DOEs/AEs through the forum will further the objectives of the CDM process.

Agenda sub-item 5 (e): Relationship with stakeholders, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations (registered accredited observers)

84. The Board met with registered observers for an informal interaction on the last day of the meeting and agreed to continue with such meetings in the afternoon of the last day of its future meetings, unless otherwise indicated. These meetings are available on webcast.

85. The Board further agreed to continue to meet with the same type of arrangement, with space being made available for 70 observers, and to reconsider the issue when necessary. Observers to the forty-fifth meeting of the Executive Board shall have registered with the secretariat by **21 January 2009**. In order to ensure proper security and logistical arrangements, the Board emphasized that this deadline will be strictly enforced by the secretariat.

Agenda sub-item 5 (f): Other business

86. The Board agreed on the provisional agenda for its forty-fifth meeting (11 - 13 February 2009) as contained in [annex 44](#) to this report, with an open session on the 12 - 13 February 2009.

Agenda item 6. Conclusion of the meeting

87. The Chair summarized the main conclusions.

88. The Board expressed its deep appreciation to the outgoing Chair, Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sethi, and Vice-Chair, Mr. Lex de Jonge, for the outstanding leadership and dedication in ensuring that the CDM is operated in an efficient, cost-effective and transparent manner.

89. The Board also thanked all outgoing members and alternate members for their hard work and dedication to the process during their tenure.



90. The Board expressed its deep appreciation to Mr. Kai-Uwe Schmidt, Secretary of the Board, who will leave the UNFCCC secretariat, for the leadership, dedication and outstanding support he provided to the Board and to the CDM since its inception and climate change process since 1995.

Agenda sub-item 6 (a): Summary of decisions

91. Any decisions taken by the Board shall be made publicly available in accordance with paragraph 17 of the CDM modalities and procedures and with rule 31 of the rules of procedure of the Executive Board.

Agenda sub-item 6 (b): Closure

92. The Chair closed the meeting.

Annexes to the report

Membership

Annex 1 - Documents related to conflict of interest

Accreditation

Annex 2 - List of non-conformities of DNV Certification AS

Annex 3 - Validation and Verification Manual (version 01)

Methodologies

Annex 4 - AM0073 “GHG emission reductions through multi-site manure collection and treatment in a central plant” (version 01)

Annex 5 - AM0074 “Methodology for new grid connected power plants using permeate gas previously flared and/or vented” (version 01)

Annex 6 - Revision to AM0009 “Recovery and utilization of gas from oil wells that would otherwise be flared or vented” (version 03.3)

Annex 7 - Revision to AM0025 “Avoided emissions from organic waste through alternative waste treatment processes” (version 11)

Annex 8 - Revision to AM0030 “PFC emission reductions from anode effect mitigation at primary aluminium smelting facilities” (version 03)

Annex 9 - Revision to AM0031 “Baseline Methodology for Bus Rapid Transit Projects” (version 01.1)

Annex 10 - Revision to AM0065 “Replacement of SF₆ with alternate cover gas in the magnesium industry” (version 02.1)

Annex 11 - Revision to AM0066 “GHG emission reductions through waste heat utilisation for pre-heating of raw materials in sponge iron manufacturing process” (version 02)



Annex 12 - Revision to ACM0002 “Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources” (version 08)

Annex 13 - Revision to ACM0012 “Consolidated baseline methodology for GHG emission reductions from waste energy recovery projects” (version 03.1)

Issues relating to CDM afforestation and reforestation project activities

Annex 14 - AR-AMS0004 “Simplified baseline and monitoring methodology for small-scale agroforestry - afforestation and reforestation project activities under the clean development mechanism” (version 01)

Annex 15 - AR-AMS0005 “Simplified baseline and monitoring methodology for small-scale afforestation and reforestation project activities under the clean development mechanism implemented on lands having low inherent potential to support living biomass” (version 01)

Annex 16 - “Guidance on the application of the definition of project boundary to A/R CDM project activities” (version 01)

Issues relating to small-scale CDM project activities

Annex 17 - AMS-III.X Energy Efficiency and HFC-134a recovery in residential refrigerators (version 01)

Annex 18 - AMS-III.Y Methane avoidance through separation of solids from wastewater or manure treatment systems (version 01)

Annex 19 - Revision of AMS-III.K Avoidance of methane release from charcoal production by shifting from traditional open-ended methods to mechanized charcoaling process (ver 04)

Annex 20 - Revision of AMS II.C Demand side energy efficiency activities through specific technologies (version 11)

Annex 21 - Revision of AMS-II.J Demand side activities for efficient lighting technologies (version 02)

Matters relating to the registration of CDM project activities

Annex 22 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1526

Annex 23 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1755

Annex 24 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1787

Annex 25 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1817

Annex 26 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1819

Annex 27 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1848

Annex 28 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1849

Annex 29 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1874

Annex 30 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1890



Annex 31 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1893

Annex 32 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1900

Annex 33 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1903

Annex 34 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1904

Annex 35 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1905

Annex 36 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1929

Annex 37 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1951

Annex 38 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1966

Annex 39 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1068

Matters relating to the issuance of CERs and the CDM registry

Annex 40 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0695

Annex 41 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0745

Annex 42 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0804

Resources

Annex 43 - Status of resources and pledges to support 2008 CDM activities

Other matters

Annex 44 - Provisional agenda for EB45

- - - - -



Endnotes

1. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report which include the response submitted in the request for review with regard to validation of input values, the calculation of the emission factor, and the monitoring plan, and shall also submit the investment analysis in spreadsheet form.
2. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include the information on validation of sensitivity analysis submitted in response to the request for review.
3. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include the information on the validation of barrier analysis submitted in response to the request for review.
4. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report which include the response submitted in the request for review with regard to the validation of the input values and the common practice analysis.
5. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include the response submitted in the request for review with regard to the validation of the input values.
6. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include the response submitted in the request for review with regard to the validation of the project start date, input values to the investment analysis and the emission factor.
7. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include the response submitted in the request for review with regard to the validation of the estimation of the project emissions.
8. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include the response submitted in request for review, including the monitoring of parameters (assumptions) used to calculate the thermal energy displaced by the project activity.
9. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include the response submitted in request for review and a confirmation that there is no double counting of emission reductions between this and the other existing CDM project activities.
10. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include the response submitted in request for review with regard to the validation of the input values to the investment analysis and correct estimation of emission reduction forecast.
11. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include the response submitted in request for review with regard to the validation of the baseline scenario determination and the emission factor calculation.
12. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include the response submitted in request for



review with regard to the validation of the baseline scenario determination, actions to secure CDM status, project start date and increased utilisation of the composting facility.

13. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the revised PDD should update the monitoring plan in accordance with the response submitted in the request for review.
14. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include the response submitted in request for review with regard to the validation of the quantity of available CMM and also monitor the methane destroyed by gas-grid end-users.
15. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include a more accurate baseline determination than the one included in the PDD and a revised monitoring plan stating that the project activity will use an automatic gas analyzer in order to measure the methane content in the biogas.