



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

Ref: CDM-EB-48

**EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE CLEAN DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM
FORTY-EIGHTH MEETING
Report Version 01.1***

Date of meeting: 14 -17 July 2009

Location: St. Georges, Grenada

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

Members	Alternates
Mr. Lex de Jonge ²	Mr. Pedro Martins Barata ²
Mr. Kamel Djemouai ¹	Mr. Samuel Adeoye Adejuwon ¹
Mr. Philip M. Gwage ²	Mr. Xuedu Lu ²
Mr. Martin Hession ¹	Mr. Thomas Bernheim ¹
Mr. Shafqat Kakakhel ¹	Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sethi ¹
Mr. Clifford Mahlun ²	Mr. Noah Idechong ²
Mr. Paulo Manso ²	Mr. Hussein Badarin ²
Mr. Victor Nicolae ²	Ms. Diana Harutyunyan ²
Mr. Hugh Sealy ¹	Mr. José Domingos Miguez ¹
Mr. Peer Stiansen ¹	Mr. Akihiro Kuroki ¹

¹ Term: Two years (term of service ends immediately before the first meeting in 2011)

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> >.

* This version was issued to editorially revise sub-paragraph 51(s).

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

1. Mr. Lex de Jonge, 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. 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. Lex de Jonge, Mr. Martin Hession 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.
2. The Board noted that the secretariat was informed that Mr. Thomas Bernheim, Mr. Kamel Djemouai, Mr. Philip M. Gwage, Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sethi and Mr. Peer Stiansen were unable to attend the meeting and had provided proper justification for their absence.

Agenda item 2. Adoption of the agenda

3. The Board adopted the agenda of the meeting.

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

4. The Board took note of the thirty-second 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, performance assessments and other accreditation related issues.

Case specific

5. The Board considered the recommendations of the CDM-AP, and agreed to:
 - (a) Accredite and provisionally designate the entity 'Ernst & Young Associes (France)' for the validation and verification/certification functions in the sectoral scope 14 (Afforestation and reforestation);
 - (b) Extend accreditation scope of the entity 'Deloitte Tohmatsu Evaluation and Certification Organisation' for verification functions in sectoral scope 1 (Energy industries (renewable- / non-renewable sources));
 - (c) Extend accreditation scope of the entity 'Korean Foundation For Quality' for verification function in sectoral scope 13 (Waste handling and disposal).
6. The Board took note of two (2) notifications submitted by the CDM-AP on the succesful outcome of performance assessment activities for the following two DOEs:
 - (a) Japan Quality Assurance Organization (JQA);
 - (b) Columbian Institute for Technical Standards and Certification (ICONTEC).
7. The Board decided to conduct a spot-check of the DOE 'SGS United Kingdom Limited'. The Board agreed on the scope of the spot-check and requested the CDM-AP to complete the process in an expedited manner and submit its recommendations for the consideration of the Board.
8. The Board noted the progress made in conducting an additional focused on-site assessment as referred to in paragraph 9 of the report of the forty-sixth meeting of the Board. The Board agreed that the six months deadline imposed by this paragraph shall correspond to the actual assessment visit to the



premises of applicant entities.

9. The Board took note that the appeal submitted by a designated operational entity (DOE) against the recommendation of the CDM-AP had subsequently been withdrawn. The Board therefore agreed to dismiss the appeal panel it had established at its previous meeting.

General guidance

10. The Board agreed that an extension of sectoral scopes and functions shall be granted to accredited DOEs upon the successful completion of those on-going witnessing activities that cannot be considered as performance assessment activities.

11. The Board adopted the editorial revision of the "CDM accreditation standard for operational entities", as contained in the [annex 2](#) to this report. The Board also requested that the CDM-AP and secretariat start applying the revised standard with immediate effect in the assessment of operational entities.

12. The Board adopted the revision of 'Procedure for accrediting operational entities by the CDM EB', as contained in [annex 3](#) to this report. The Board requested the CDM-AP and the secretariat to start applying the revised accreditation procedure with immediate effect in the assessment work of operational entities.

13. The Board took note of the workplan containing detailed steps for the updating and improving of the Validation and Verification Manual (CDM-VVM). The Board requested the secretariat also include the timelines for the various steps in the workplan and to update the Board on progress on a regular basis. The Board also requested the secretariat to investigate more frequent updates of the CDM-VVM when minor issues are concerned in between the periodically scheduled comprehensive revisions and updates.

14. The Board considered a presentation by the secretariat on the concepts of materiality and level of assurance and requested the secretariat to do some further work on the concepts and also prepare some examples of the impact of applying these concepts in CDM project activities. The Board agreed to further consider the issue at a future meeting.

15. The Board took note of an update by the secretariat on the preparations of four CDM-VVM workshops. Three, two-day workshops focused on DOEs are tentatively scheduled to take place before the end of 2009 in New Delhi in September, Tokyo in October and Rio in November. The Board also noted that a fourth workshop is being scheduled to take place in Bonn early in 2010. The Board agreed that this workshop will include the participation of all DNAs in order to raise awareness on the CDM-VVM among DNAs.

16. The Board took note of the recommendation prepared by the CDM-AP on allowing DOEs to perform validation and verification/certification functions to the same project activity for some sectoral scopes. The Board agreed to retain the existing policy that was based on the modalities and procedures of the CDM.

17. The Board considered the short-list of candidates received in response to the call for experts to replace one outgoing Accreditation Panel member and one member with methodological expertise. The Board agreed to appoint Ms. Marina Shvangiradze as the panel member and Mr. Adelino Esparta as the panel member with methodological expertise. The Board agreed that the term of these members would be for a period of two years.

*Further schedule*

18. The Board noted that the forty-third meeting of the CDM-AP is scheduled for 17 - 19 August 2009.

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

19. The Board took note of the report of the thirty-ninth meeting of the panel on baseline and monitoring methodologies (Meth Panel), and an oral report by the Vice-Chair of the panel, Mr. Pedro Martins Barata, on the work of the panel.

Case specific

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

Approve cases:

- (a) **AM0082** - "Use of charcoal from planted renewable biomass in the iron ore reduction process through the establishment of a new iron ore reduction system", which was proposed as NM0278 (Use of Charcoal from Renewable Biomass Plantations as Reducing Agent in Pig Iron Mill in Brazil) and link it to scope 9 (Metal production), as contained in the annex 4 of this report.
- (b) **AM0083** - "Avoidance of landfill gas emissions by in-situ aeration of landfills", which was proposed as NM0294 (Avoidance of landfill gas emissions by in-situ aeration of landfills) and link it to scope 13 (Waste handling and disposal), as contained in the annex 5 of this report.

21. The Board considered the draft methodology "Baseline and monitoring methodology for new grid connected power plants using waste gas fired Combined Cycle Gas Turbine technology instead of more GHG intensive technology", which was proposed as NM0292 (Highly efficient power plant fuelled with blast furnace gas at TKCSA, in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil). This proposed new methodology was recommended to the Board's forty-seventh meeting for approval by the Meth Panel at its thirty-eighth meeting. The Board raised issues in its forty-seventh meeting (paragraph 20) on the methodology while sending it back to Meth Panel for its further consideration. The Board was particularly of the view that while addressing the issue related to the waste gas of multiple types and their inter-linkages, the panel should take into account the outcome of ongoing consultancy assignment on waste energy recovery in complex iron and steel industry. The Board considered the revised proposal from the thirty-ninth meeting of the panel and further requested the panel to note that the solution provided in the applicability condition does not address the issue of waste gas inter-linkages in complex industry that can be operated under several configurations. Therefore solution should be provided only after analyzing the consultancy report of ongoing assignment referred above.

22. **Not to approve cases:** NM0267, NM0297, NM0309 and NM0311 which, if revised taking into account comments, can be resubmitted but will require new expert (desk reviews) and public input.

23. The Board considered one request for deviation from the approved methodology ACM0006 related to a project activity undergoing validation, in view of response provided by thirty-ninth meeting of the Panel (MP39, paragraph 36) based on EB47 request related to this deviation. The Board agreed to respond to it, and requested the secretariat to inform the DOE accordingly.

**Responses to requests for clarification**

24. The Board took note of the responses to clarifications provided by the Meth Panel in response to requests AM_CLA_0148 to AM_CLA_0155. The Board did not agree to accept the recommendation provided by Meth Panel in response to request for clarification AM_CLA_0148 on version 1.0 of AM0021. The Board concluded that the clarification provides too extensive interpretation of “installed capacity (measured in tonnes of adipic acid per year) that exists by the end of the year 2004” to an older version of methodology. Instead the Board provided the following clarification to this request. The Board clarified that the cap on adipic acid production of the facilities shall be the validated maximum daily production of adipic acid multiplied by 365 days multiplied by the operational rate. The validated maximum daily production of adipic acid shall be achieved by the end of year 2004.

25. In consideration of the request for clarification AM_CLA_0148, the Board noted that the DoE, in its request, has provided three options for the interpretation of the term "installed capacity (measured in tonnes of adipic acid per year) that exists by the end of the year 2004". The Board would like to caution the DoEs to refrain from intentional or unintentional act of submitting the request for clarification in the language which resembles a request for revision. The Board further advises its panels and working groups to be more cautious while responding to the request for clarification on the older versions of methodology, which may have implications in terms of redefining the requirements of these versions.

Responses to requests for revisions

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

- (a) Not to accept request AM_REV_0088 and AM_REV_0110 concerning revision of the approved methodology AM0021 to expand its applicability to new adipic acid plants.
- (b) Not to accept request AM_REV_0146 concerning a revision to the approved methodology ACM0006. The request sought to expand the applicability of the methodology by the inclusion of a new scenario in which the biomass residues would have been used in the baseline scenario for non-energy purposes, e.g. as fertilizer or as feedstock in processes.
- (c) Not to accept request AM_REV_0150 concerning a revision to the approved methodology AM0061. The request sought to revise the field “Any Comment” in the monitoring table of the parameter CAP_{design} , and to allow the use of national standards as data source for the fuels characteristics and measurement units.
- (d) Not to accept request AM_REV_0151 concerning a revision to the approved methodology ACM0006. The request sought to expand the applicability of the methodology by including a new scenario. In the new scenario, the project activity would be the installation of a new grid-connected biomass residue fired power plant at a site where an existing fossil fuel grid-connected power plant operated. In the absence of the project activity, a new grid-connected fossil fuel power plant with same rated power capacity as the project plant could be identified as a possible alternative to be installed instead of the project plant at the same site.
- (e) Not to accept request AM_REV_0152 concerning a revision to the approved methodology ACM0011. The request sought to expand the applicability of the methodology by the inclusion of project activities with operational history of less than three years.
- (f) Not to accept request AM_REV_0153 concerning revision of the approved methodology AM0014 to expand its applicability to natural gas-based energy generation facilities owned by a third-party and providing power or heat directly to an industrial user.



27. In consideration of the requests for revision AM_REV_0088 and AM_REV_0110, the Board noted that there are several policy issues involved in the consideration of requests for revision of AM0021 to include new adipic production facilities. The Board further decided to put on hold the acceptance of new requests for revision to AM0021 for new adipic acid production facilities and new methodology submissions for new adipic acid production facilities, until further guidance is provided by CMP.

28. The Board agreed to request CMP to consider policy issues, including the use of discounting, related to the inclusion of new adipic acid production facilities under CDM.

29. The Board agreed to partially accept the response prepared by the Meth Panel to the request for revision AM_REV_0142 and the corresponding revision to the approved methodology AM0031. The request sought to expand the applicability of the methodology to situations in which: (i) electricity is used in the transport systems in the baseline scenario and/or in the project scenario; (ii) the baseline public transport system and other public transport options include rail-based systems; and (iii) higher amounts of biofuels are used in the baseline scenario than in the project scenario. The Board decided to accept the revision that includes the rail-based systems in the baseline public transport system and other public transport options in the project boundary, but not to accept the other two revisions. The Board agreed that the safeguards provided for the use of biofuel in the project activity are not acceptable and the treatment of upstream emissions related to the use of electricity was not adequate.

Revision of approved methodologies

30. The Board revised the following approved methodologies:

- (a) **AM0031:** In response to the request for revision AM_REV_0142, the revision expands the applicability of the methodology to situations in which the baseline public transport system and other public transport options include rail-based systems. The revision is contained in annex 6 of this report.
- (b) **AM0034:** The revision includes: (i) the change in the name of the Annex 1; (ii) change in language to ensure that use of EN14181 is not mandatory and provision in methodology that project proponents can use other comparable national or international standards, provided they demonstrate the comparability of the used standard/s with EN14181 in the CDM-PDD. The revision is contained in annex 7 of this report.
- (c) **AM0036:** Based on issues related to AM_CLA_0152, the editorial revision clarifies that in case of fossil fuels co-fired with biomass the fossil fuel amount shall not exceed 50% of the total fuel fired on an energy basis, and that refused derived fuel and refused plastic fuel should be considered as fossil fuels. The revision is contained in annex 8 of this report.
- (d) **AM0061:** Based on issues related to AM_REV_0150, the editorial revision replaces the term "nameplate" power production capacity by the term "design" power production capacity in the monitoring parameters, in order to avoid misinterpretations of the parameter power production capacity, ensuring that it refers to net capacity instead of gross capacity. The revision is contained in annex 9 of this report.
- (e) **ACM0006:** Following paragraph 23 of the report of forty-seventh meeting of the Board, related to a request for deviation in the application of ACM0006 to a project activity undergoing validation, and taking into account paragraph 36 of the report of the thirty-ninth meeting of the Meth Panel, the revision provides new equation 15b that is applicable to scenario 13. The existing equation 15 is also maintained (now 15a) for its applicability to scenarios 9 and 11. The revision is contained in annex 10 of this report.



31. The Board noted the editorial revision of AM0061 with respect to replacing the term "nameplate" power production capacity by the term "design" power production capacity in the monitoring parameters and agreed to request Meth Panel to review the definition for such terms to ensure the consistency across the methodologies and report back to the Board at a later date.

32. The revised versions of the methodologies referred to in the paragraphs above will come into effect on 31 July 2009, 24:00 GMT, in accordance with the procedure for the revision of approved methodologies.

General guidance

33. The Board considered a proposal on various options to be used for the determination of the plant load factor of renewable energy power plants and decided to approve the "Guidelines for the reporting and validation of plant load factors", as contained in [annex 11](#) to this report and requested the secretariat to take it into account in the future revision of the CDM-VVM.

34. Further to request of the Board at its thirty-seventh meeting (paragraph 23) in which the Board requested the methodologies panel to undertake a review of ACM0006, the Board considered the proposed new "Consolidated methodology for electricity generation from biomass residues in power-only plants", prepared by the methodologies panel based on ACM0006, as reflected in the paragraph 35 of the report of the thirty-ninth. However, in view of the decision of the Board reflected in paragraph 35 of this report whereby the Board refers back the proposed revision of the "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality" to the methodologies panel, the Board decided to defer the consideration of the proposed new "Consolidated methodology for electricity generation from biomass residues in power-only plants" because the approval of this proposed new methodology depends on the approval of the revision to the combined tool.

35. The Board decided to refer back the proposed revision to the "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality" to the Meth Panel. The Board identified an issue in the proposed revision related to the outcomes of the investment analysis. This issue relates to cases in which the alternative scenarios to the proposed project activity include the alternative in which no investment is undertaken by the project participants but third party(ies) undertake(s) investments which provide comparable outputs or services to final users. In such cases if the alternative scenarios are technically mutually exclusive, the outcome of the investment analysis as proposed in the revision by the panel, concludes that the project activity is not additional if the project is economically or financially more attractive than the financial benchmark of the project proponents. The Board requested the panel to reconsider this and refer the case back to the Board.

36. The Board took note of the work done as well as ongoing work of the Meth Panel on de-consolidation of ACM0006 as per the request of the thirty-seventh meeting (paragraph 23). The Board further recognized the special efforts taken by the secretariat and the Meth Panel in organizing and participating in two separate 2-3 days workshops to discuss this complex issue, apart from its regular meetings. The Board has requested the Panel to speed up the remaining work on this issue and bring its proposals for the consideration of the Board at the earliest possible date.

37. The Board approved the "Tool to determine the baseline efficiency of thermal or electric energy generation systems" as contained in [annex 12](#) of this report, taking into account the public inputs received. The tool provides various options to determine the baseline efficiency of an energy generation system with the purpose of estimating baseline emissions. Following the approval of the tool, the Board agreed to revise relevant approved methodologies with the view to incorporate the use of the tool.

38. The Board approved the "Guidelines to calculate the fraction of Methane in the landfill gas from periodical measurements" as contained in [annex 13](#) of this report. The guidelines provide procedures to



calculate the fraction of methane in the landfill gas from periodical measurements and is applicable to all the previous version of approved consolidated methodology ACM0001 and methodologies consolidated under ACM0001 (AM0002, AM0003, AM0010, AM0011), where periodical monitoring of methane fraction is an available option. This guideline is not applicable to current version of ACM0001 (version 11), as this version makes continuous monitoring mandatory.

Further schedule

39. The Board took note that the fortieth meeting of the panel will be held from 14 to 18 September 2009 and that the forty-first meeting of Meth Panel will be rescheduled to 19 - 23 October 2009.

40. The Board took note that the deadline for submission of requests for revision and requests for clarification to be considered at the fortieth meeting to be held from 14 to 18 September 2009 shall be 03 August 2009, 24:00 GMT.

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

41. The Board took note of the report on the work of the twenty-first meeting of the working group to assist the Board in reviewing proposed methodologies for small-scale CDM project activities and of an oral report by its Chair, Mr. Hugh Sealy, on the work of the group.

Case specific

42. The Board approved a new small-scale methodology "AMS-III.AE. Energy efficiency and renewable energy measures in new residential buildings" assigned to sectoral scope 3 (Energy demand) as contained in [annex 14](#) of this report. This new methodology is for activities that lead to reduced consumption of electricity in new grid connected residential buildings (single or multiple-family residences) through the use of one or more of the following measures: efficiency building design practices, efficiency technologies and renewable energy technologies. Examples include efficient appliances, high efficiency heating and cooling systems, passive solar design, thermal insulation, and solar photovoltaic systems. It provides two options for emission reduction calculations:

Option (a): Annual ex post comparison of measured electricity consumption of a sample of project residences with calibrated computer simulation model of baseline residences;

Option (b): Annual ex post comparison of measured electricity consumption of a sample of project residences with a sample of baseline residences (comparison group) using regression analysis.

The Board requested the SSC WG to continue to work on the case to include energy efficiency measures for residential thermal energy supply (e.g. fossil fuel savings in space heating or water heating by using solar thermal technologies). It encouraged the project proponents to submit new methodologies in this area.

Revisions of approved methodologies

43. The Board agreed to the revised approved small-scale methodologies:

(a) "AMS II.A Supply side energy efficiency improvements - transmission and distribution", to include an option to determine technical energy losses in rural electricity distribution system using a well established peer reviewed method included in the guidelines of a relevant national level agency (e.g. rural electrification agency in the region/country) as contained in [annex 15](#) of this report;



- (b) "AMS-II.C Demand-side energy efficiency activities for specific technologies", as contained in [annex 16](#) of this report, to clarify the consideration of increased output over the historic average and to clarify the boundary definition. An option to use specific energy consumption for the baseline emission calculations has been added.
- (c) "AMS-III.A Urea offset by inoculant application in soybean-corn rotations on acidic soils on existing cropland", as contained in [annex 17](#) of this report, to include a range of grass-legume combinations for the project. Together with the possibility to have a range of baseline nitrogen fertilizer usage, this change results in expanded applicability of the methodology.
- (d) "AMS III.D Methane recovery in animal manure management systems", as contained in [annex 18](#) of this report, to provide additional guidance on consideration of the storage time of animal manure taking into account the fact that the manure could be transported from other locations than the farm at which the anaerobic digester is located.
- (e) "AMS-III.E Avoidance of methane production from decay of biomass through controlled combustion, gasification or mechanical/thermal treatment", as contained in [annex 19](#) of this report, to include additional guidance on monitoring for project activities involving production and sale of refuse derived fuel (RDF).
- (f) "AMS-III.F Avoidance of methane emissions through controlled biological treatment of biomass", as contained in [annex 20](#) of this report, to expand its applicability for composting of manure. Revisions also clarify that baseline disposal of the composted waste in a solid waste disposal site in the 'region', needs to be demonstrated once ex ante choosing a reasonable radius to define the 'region'. The Board agreed a maximum radius of 200 Km for the region would be applicable however no minimum radius would be required to be considered.
- (g) "AMS-III.H Methane recovery in wastewater treatment", as contained in [annex 21](#) of this report, to include additional eligible technologies for upgrading biogas for bottling or feeding to natural gas distribution grid.
- (h) "AMS-III.I Avoidance of methane production in wastewater treatment through replacement of anaerobic systems by aerobic systems", as contained in [annex 22](#) of this report, to include additional procedures for the determination of baseline methane generation potential based on Biochemical Oxygen Demand ($BOD_{5,20}$) with a view to maintain consistency between AMS-III.I and AMS-III.H. Additional guidelines to demonstrate aerobic conditions in the treatment system is also included. The Board agreed that aerobic conditions in the treatment system shall be demonstrated using one of the two options: monitored operating parameters that are within the design range or the monitored level of dissolved oxygen content that is 1 mg/L or above.
- (i) "AMS-I.D Grid connected renewable electricity generation", as contained in [annex 23](#) of this report, to include additional guidance regarding the monitoring of electricity generated. The revision also includes procedures for calculation of project emissions for geothermal project activities and editorial changes in the methodology.
- (j) "AMS-I.C Thermal energy production with or without electricity", as contained in [annex 24](#) of this report, to clarify procedures for determining efficiency of small thermal appliances used in household or commercial applications (<45kW thermal capacity). The recommended revisions also include procedures for estimation of baseline emission factors for co-fired systems.

44. The revised versions of the SSC methodologies referred to in the paragraph above will come into effect on 31 July 2009, 24:00 GMT in accordance with the procedure for the revision of approved SSC



methodologies.

Further schedule

45. The Board may wish to take note that the twenty-second meeting of the SSC WG will be held from 21 - 24 September 2009, as per annex 66 of the forty-sixth meeting of the Board.

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

46. 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 the programme of activities (POA) "CUIDEMOS Mexico (Campana De Uso Inteligente De Energia Mexico) - Smart Use of Energy Mexico and" (2535) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and agreed to register with corrections the programme of activities if the Coordinating Entity applies and DOE (DNV) revalidates the programme with the provisions of version 9 of the methodology. The Board considered that as the registered PoA will be used to design numerous CPAs in the future, it is important to be consistent with the specific version of the methodology applied in order to avoid confusion in the future.

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

47. The Board took note that 1,727 CDM project activities have been registered by 17 July 2009. 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

48. 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 55 requests for registration

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

(a) "Pengkalan Chepa Renewable Energy Plant" (2132) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submits a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report, which include the information submitted in the response to the request for review, regarding the validation of the efficiencies of the equipments applied in the baseline alternatives and the NCV of all the biomass fuels.

(b) "Straw-fired Power Generation Project in Chuzhou District, Huaian City, Jiangsu Province" (2161) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report, which incorporate the information submitted on:

(i) The suitability of the value used for the assumed electricity tariff and its source, the biomass fuel cost and the net electricity delivered to the grid;

(ii) The parameters used in order to calculate the baseline emissions in section B.6.2; and

(iii) The appropriateness and conservativeness of the default values (transmission and distribution loss-TDL- for electricity consumption, NCV for wheat and rice straw and diesel and emission factors of diesel and fuel).

(c) "Shuangqiao, Banqiao and Longtoushan Bundled Small Hydropower Project in Heilongjiang Province" (2184) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report, which include the information submitted in the response to the request for review, regarding how the DOE has validated the input values in



accordance with EB38 paragraph 54(c) guidance; and the correct LoA.

(d) "Liaoning Faku 1st phase Wind Power Project" (2223) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report, which:

- (i) Include the additional information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the tariffs and further validates that all wind farms in the province were constructed before the power sector reforms of 2002;
- (ii) Include the explanation regarding the common practice analysis, and
- (iii) With the Corrective Action Request related to the updating of the emission factor properly reflected in the revised validation report.

(e) "Inno-Abedon - Palm Oil Mill Waste Recycle Scheme, Malaysia" (2270) if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report, which:

- (i) Incorporate the additional information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of the input values to the investment analysis, the revised "Methane Correction Factor" and the monitoring of the amount of EFB processed by the waste treatment plant (Aj,x) parameter; and
- (ii) Further confirm the suitability of the compost price assumed in the project activity, in line with the market price.

(f) "Korea East-West Power Dangjin small hydro power plant project (5MW)" (2366) if the project participant and the DOE (KEMCO) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the additional information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the operational lifetime of the project activity and the validation of the investment analysis, in particular the sensitivity analysis and input values.

(g) "Suoi Tan hydropower project" (2368) if the project participant and the DOE (KEMCO) submits a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report, which include the information submitted in the response to the request for review, regarding the changes of the input values, the application of tax exemption and the change of the ex-ante emission factor.

(h) "So Lo hydropower project" (2372) if the project participant and the DOE (KEMCO) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which include the response to the request for review, regarding:

- (i) The reason why a 35.11% Plant Load Factor was adopted instead of the value taken from the Feasibility Study Report;
- (ii) The correct project start date; and
- (iii) A revised spreadsheet should be submitted to include the 35.11% plant load factor and fixed O&M costs throughout the project lifetime.

(i) "Fuerza Eolica del Istmo Wind Farm" (2390) if the project participant and the DOE (AENOR) submits a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report, which include the information submitted in the response to the request for review, regarding the validation of the input values to the investment analysis and the start date of the project activity.



- (j) “Renkeng Hydropower Project, Longchuan County, Guangdong Province” (2392) if the project participant and the DOE (JCI) submits a revised PDD and its corresponding validation report, which incorporate the responses given for this request for review regarding the suitability of the benchmark and the common practice analysis.
- (k) “Shandong Penglai Pingdingshan Wind Farm Project” (2397) if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV NORD) submits a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report, which incorporate the additional information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of the tariff applied in the investment analysis.
- (l) “Chile: Lircay Run-Of-River Project” (2417) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review, regarding:
- (i) Suitability of the data source used in identifying alternatives;
 - (ii) Suitability of the input values used in the investment analysis; and
 - (iii) Validation of common practice analysis.
- (m) “Soroosh & Nowrooz Early Gas Gathering and Utilization Project (S&N project)” (2422) if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which:
- (i) Incorporate the additional information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of the investment cost assumed in the investment analysis and the elimination of the alternatives to the baseline scenario;
 - (ii) Include the monitoring of the recovered gas used for electricity generation in the monitoring plan in line with version 03.3 of the AM0009 methodology;
 - (iii) Further substantiate the common practice analysis with information on similar gas fields in Iran that are capturing or have implemented projects to recover and use the gas that would otherwise be flared.
- (n) “Hubei Yunlonghe Hydropower Project of Enshi City, Enshi Prefecture, Hubei Province, P.R. China” (2423) if the DOE (DNV) submits a revised validation report which incorporates the clarifications submitted in response to the request for review regarding validation of the input values and clarification of the type of IRR calculation (project/equity IRR) used in the PDR and PDD.
- (o) “Methane recovery from wastewater generated at Paper manufacturing unit of Sree Sakthi Paper Mills Ltd., Kerala”(2434) if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which incorporate the information provided in the response to the request for review, regarding the calculation of emission reduction and the monitoring details, and apply the default value of 0.21 kg CH₄/kg COD for the methane producing capacity of wastewater.
- (p) “Anhui Anqing 30MW Biomass Power Generation Project”(2440) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the additional information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of the input values to the investment analysis, the default values for the baseline calculation, and the revised monitoring plan.



- (q) "Qingxi 28MW Hydropower Project in Guizhou Province, China" (2448) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the additional information submitted in response to this request for review regarding the validation of the input values and the suitability of the electricity tariff and the investment cost assumed.
- (r) "Guangdong Liucheng 25.5MW Hydro Power Project" (2459) if the project participant 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:
- (i) The input values used in the investment analysis in line with the requirements of EB 38, paragraph 54 (c), in particular, a) total investment, and b) electricity tariff; and
 - (ii) The assumed annual operational hours.
- (s) "Tao River Ewuduo 12 MW Hydropower Project in Gansu Province, the People's Republic of China" (2460) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which:
- (i) Incorporate the additional information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of the input values to the investment analysis, the spreadsheets showing the revised IRR calculation and the suitability of the electricity tariff assumed;
 - (ii) Apply the grid emission factor calculated based on data available at the time of commencement of validation.
- (t) "Hubei Yichang Qilinguan Daquan River Hydropower Station" (2466) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which:
- (i) Provide further clarification on the means of validation undertaken to establish that the project activity is not a de-bundled component of a larger project, in particular, the distance between the project activity and the other hydropower project owned by the same project participants;
 - (ii) Revise the monitoring plan to include separate monitoring of electricity supplied by the project activity as per the requirement of applied methodology i.e. 'monitoring shall consist of metering the electricity generated by the renewable technology'; and
 - (iii) Include the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding validation of input values, emission factor, clarification on Annex 4 and the inclusion of diesel consumption in the monitoring plan.
- (u) "Sarbari-I small hydro project of DSL Hydrowatt Limited (DSLHL), Himachal Pradesh, India" (2482) if the project participant and the DOE (BVC) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the additional information submitted to substantiate the access-to-finance barrier.
- (v) "Shaanxi Provincial Yang County Kafang 12 MW Small-scale Hydro Power Project" (2498) if the project participant and the DOE (JACO) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the additional information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the electricity tariff and the suitability of the



additional investment cost for the transmission line and the rights to the dam.

50. 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.

51. The Board agreed to undertake a review of the project activity:

(a) "CGN Inner Mongolia Zhurihe Phase I Wind Farm Project" (1577) 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 25](#) to this report¹

(b) "Inner Mongolia Huitengliang Phase II Wind Power Project" (1815) submitted for registration by the DOE (BVC) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 26](#) to this report.

(c) "Henan Nanyang Zhenping Cement Waste Heat Recovery and Utilization for Power Generation Project" (2095) submitted for registration by the DOE (BVC) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 27](#) to this report;²

(d) "Huadian Kulun 201MW Wind Farm Project" (2100) 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 28](#) to this report.³

(e) "Heilongjiang Yilan Hezuolinchang Phase II Wind Power Project" (2117) 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.

(f) "Guohua Hebei Huanghua 49.5 MW Wind Farm Project (Phase I)" (2125) 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.⁴

(g) "V.P. Farms Pig Manure Methanisation, Methane Recovery and Energy Production Project" (2218) 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 31](#) to this report.⁵

(h) "73 MW Tonghua Iron & Steel Waste Gas and Heat Power Generation Project" (2304) 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 32](#) to this report.⁶

(i) "Heilongjiang Yilan Jiguanlazishan Wind Farm Project" (2360) submitted for registration by the DOE (BVC) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 33](#) to this report.

(j) "Heilongjiang Dongning Dajiazishan and Xidagang Wind Farm Project" (2361) submitted for registration by the DOE (BVC) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 34](#) to this report.

(k) "GHG emission reductions through waste gas based power generation at Visa Steel Limited" (2369) 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 35](#) to this report.

(l) "Salto Small Hydro Power Plant Project - A Brascan Energética S/A Project Activity" (2380) 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 36](#) to this report.

(m) "Jiangsu Qishuyan Natural Gas Based Power Generation Project" (2382) 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 37](#) to this report.⁷

(n) "Jiangsu Wangting Natural Gas Based Power Generation Project" (2383) 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 38](#) to this report.⁸

(o) "Angelina Small Hydro Power Plant Project - A Brascan Energética S/A Project Activity" (2393) 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 39](#) to this report.

(p) "Salto Quimobã;nicos HFC Recovery and Destruction Project (plant 2)" (2398) 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 40](#) to this report;⁹

(q) "Leak Reduction in Above Ground Gas Distribution Equipment in the KazTransgaz-Tbilisi Gas Distribution System- Tbilisi, Georgia" (2404) 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 41](#) to this report.

(r) "Santa Cruz I Hydroelectric Power Plant" (2405) 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 42](#) to this report.¹⁰

(s) "Sichuan Liangtan Hydropower Station Second Phase Project" (2410) 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 43](#) to this report.¹¹

(t) "Xinjiang Huadian Xiaocaohu the 2nd phase of No.1 Wind Farm project" (2413) 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 44](#) to this report.¹²

(u) "Hubei Yihua Fertilizers Company Waste Heat Recovery and Utilization Project" (2416) 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 45](#) to this report.¹³

(v) "Tianfu Coalmine Methane Project" (2418) 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 46](#) to this report.¹⁴

(w) "Controlled combustion of municipal solid waste (MSW) and energy generation in Linyi City, Shandong, China" (2419) submitted for registration by the DOE (JQA) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 47](#) to this report.¹⁵

(x) "Inner Mongolia Keshiketeng County Wutaohai South Wind Farm 49.5 MW Project" (2420) submitted for registration by the DOE (JQA) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 48](#) to this report.¹⁶

(y) "Addition of a power generation micro unit at the 5 de Noviembre Power Plant" (2425) 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 49](#) to this report.¹⁷

(z) "El Platanal Hydropower Plant" (2426) 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 50](#) to this report.¹⁸

(aa) "Jiangxi Gongge 15MW Hydropower Project, China" (2433) submitted for registration by the DOE (TECO) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 51](#) to this report.¹⁹

(ab) "Jilin Xijingou Hydropower Project" (2435) 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 52](#) to this report.²⁰

(ac) "Skopje Cogeneration Project" (2437) 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 53](#) to this report.²¹

(ad) "Zhangjiagang Nature Gas Power Generation Project" (2439) 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 54](#) to this report.²²

(ae) "Shanxi Wulushan 1st phase Wind Power Project" (2441) 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 55](#) to this report.²³

(af) "Zhejiang Wenling Donghaitang Wind Power Project" (2449) 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 56](#) to this report.

(ag) "Xilinguole Huitengliang Wind Power Project Guotai Phase I" (2450) 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 57](#) to this report.²⁴

52. 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.

53. 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 12 of the project activities which were placed "Under review" at the forty-seventh meeting of the Board.

54. In accordance with paragraphs 17 and 18 (b) of the procedures mentioned in paragraph 53, the Board agreed to register, subject to satisfactory corrections, the project activities:

(a) "Inner Mongolia Erlanhaote Phase I Wind Farm Project" (1662) if the project participant and DOE (BVC) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information on the appropriateness of tariff applied in the PDD submitted for request for registration, submitted in response to the review team's questions.

(b) "Guohua Tongliao Kezuo Zhongqi Phase II 49.5 MW Wind Farm Project" (1825) if the project participant and DOE (BVC) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information on the appropriateness of tariff and gap between electricity generated and supplied to the grid which have been submitted in response to the review team's questions.



- (c) "Yunnan Yingjiang Mangya River 2nd Hydropower Station" (2238) if the project participant and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which:
- (i) Provide further validation of the input values to the investment analysis in line with the requirements of EB 38, para 54(c) as it is unclear on which basis the four reference projects have been selected and why other reference projects have been excluded; and
 - (ii) Include the information on the appropriateness of tariff which have been submitted in response to the review team's questions;
- (d) "Rural Education for Development Society (REDS) CDM Photovoltaic Lighting Project" (2279) if the project participant and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which correct the calculations of baseline emissions reflecting the replacement of three (3) kerosene lamps per household instead of five (5).
- (e) "Displacement of the electricity of the national electric grid by the auto-generation of renewable energy in the Cañaveralejo Wastewater Treatment Plant of EMCALI in Cali, Colombia" (2285) if the project participant and the DOE (RINA) submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which incorporate the clarifications provided in response to the review team's questions regarding the project start date and the real and continuing actions to secure CDM status.
- (f) "Yichun Xiaochengshan wind power Project " (2312) if the project participant and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which:
- (i) Confirm that the reductions in applicable tariffs between 2002 and the start date of the project activity have not resulted in a reduction of the incentive for investment in wind power, i.e. it should be confirmed that the return on investment has not been substantially lowered as a result of the reduction in the tariff;
 - (ii) Crosscheck the investment costs against invoices and real expenses pertaining to this specific proposed project activity; and
 - (iii) Validate the investment analysis using fixed operational cost (1222×10^4 RMB/year) from the year 2 to the year 21;
- (g) "Introduction of the recovery and combustion of methane in the existing sludge treatment system of the Cañaveralejo Wastewater Treatment Plant of EMCALI in Cali, Colombia" (2341) if the project participant and the DOE (RINA) submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which incorporate:
- (i) The clarifications provided in response to the review team's questions regarding the project start date and the real and continuing actions to secure CDM status; and
 - (ii) The monitoring of the operation of the flare in accordance with the manufacture's specification, and electricity consumed by the project activity, as required by the methodology.



- (h) "Zhumadian Zhongyuan Gas-Steam Combined Cycle Power Project in Henan China" (2344) if the project participant and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) if the project participant and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which incorporate:
- (i) The clarifications provided in response to the review team's questions regarding the validation of input values in the investment analysis; and
 - (ii) Further validation of the applicability of the methodology through an assessment of the supply/demand balance of natural gas in the region to confirm that the project activity will not constrain the future development of a similar sized project activity.
- (i) "7.5 MW Bundled Small Hydropower Project in Qiandongnan Autonomous Region, Guizhou Province, P. R. China" (2359) if the project participant and DOE (JACO) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the response to the review team's questions regarding the investment analysis, in particular, the suitability of the assumed tariff and coefficient of effective power supply, and the comparison of investment cost with those of the non-CDM projects.
55. In accordance with paragraphs 17 and 18 (c) of the procedures mentioned in paragraph 53, the Board could not register the following project activities:
- (a) "Santa Rosa Hydropower Plant Project" (2101) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) because the DOE and the project participant have failed to: (a) substantiate that alternative 3, opting to proceed with the alternative of not investing in the project activity, is a credible baseline, and (b) provide significant reasons for not opting to proceed with the alternative of not investing in the project activity (baseline scenario), which has been indicated as the most economically attractive alternative with or without the CDM benefits to demonstrate the additionality of the project activity.
 - (b) "Monjolinho Energética S.A.'s CDM Project" (2362) submitted for registration by the DOE (BVC) because the PDD submitted for validation and the project design have undergone major changes without the DOE issuing Corrective Action Requests, and therefore a recommencement of the validation is required.
 - (c) "Ningxia Yinchuan No. 1 Natural Gas Cogeneration Project" (2373) submitted for registration by the DOE (JQA) because the DOE and the project participant have failed to substantiate that the project activity meets the requirements of the applied methodology as the proposed CDM project activity does not deliver the same output services as the alternatives i.e. the project activity is a co-generation power plant while the alternatives are coal based power generation plants without heat component. Further, the Board noted that the DOE did not provide sufficient validation on the costs/revenue associated with the waste heat recovery component of the plant and the investment analysis based on the entire plant.
56. In accordance with the clarifications to paragraph 10 of the above-mentioned procedures the Board considered two project activities for which corrections had been submitted in response to the outcome of a previous review.
57. The Board agreed to undertake a review of the project activity:
- (a) "Phuoc Hiep I sanitary Landfill gas CDM project in Ho Chi Minh City" (1913) 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 58](#) to this report.



(b) "Yunnan Yingjiang Wakuhe Hydropower Station" (2052) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-NORD) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 59](#) to this report.

58. 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.

59. In accordance with the clarifications to paragraph 18 (b) of the above-mentioned procedures the Board considered one project activity for which corrections had been submitted in response to the outcome of a previous review.

60. The Board could not register the project activity "Emission reductions through partial substitution of fossil fuel with alternative fuels in three cement plants of Holcim Philippines Inc" (1806) as the DOE (DNV) failed to submit the requested corrections within the 12 weeks deadline required by the "Clarifications to facilitate the implementation of the Procedures for review". The corrected documentation was submitted 22 weeks after the request was sent to the DOE. The Board does not consider that the suspension of this DOE at the forty-fourth meeting of the Board is a sufficient reason for a delay in submitting the requested corrections as the terms of the suspension expressly allowed the DOE to continue with this process. Furthermore the Board did not consider that the revised validation report explained what additional validation activities the DOE had undertaken after the review of this request for registration was completed at the forty-fourth meeting of the Board.

General guidance

61. In response to the request by the CMP through its decision 2/CMP4 to develop criteria for decision making during the review process, the Board considered a presentation from the secretariat on the need to update and to restructure the procedures and guidelines related to registration and issuance. The Board requested the secretariat to proceed with the drafting of the required documents for consideration at a future meeting and, in particular, to draft "Guidelines for the decision making during the review process" for consideration by the Board at its forty-ninth meeting.

62. The Board agreed to the "Guidelines on completeness checks of requests for registration", as contained in [annex 60](#) to this report, to improve the efficiency of the processing of requests for registration and to provide DOEs with a clearer understanding of the expected quality standard. The Board requested the secretariat to apply these guidelines to new requests for registration submitted as of 1 September 2009.

63. The Board agreed to the "Guidelines on demonstration and assessment of the prior consideration of the CDM" (version 02) and the form "F-CDM-Prior consideration" (version 01), as contained in [annex 61](#) and [annex 62](#) respectively, to standardize the means of notification of prior consideration and provide for an online database of such notifications.

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

64. The Board took note that 313,088,608 CERs have been issued as of 17 July 2009 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

65. 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 7 requests for issuance.



66. 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) "Rio Taquesi Hydroelectric Power Project" (1031), if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit:

(i) The revised monitoring report and spreadsheets submitted in response to the request for review;

(ii) A corresponding verification report including clarification on the calculation of the emission factor including the spreadsheet called "EF10%"; and

(iii) A new request for issuance form which corresponds to the corrected emission reductions;

(b) "Generation of electricity from 9.6 MW capacity wind mills by Sun-n-Sand Hotels Pvt. Ltd. at Bhambarwadi, Maharashtra" (1542), if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which incorporate:

(i) Clarification regarding electricity generation data from the project WECs in the spreadsheet;

(ii) Clarification regarding total electricity generated from the other wind turbines; and

(iii) The revised spreadsheet submitted in response to the request for review.

(c) "Generation of electricity from 12.8 MW capacity wind mills by Avinash Bhosale group at Bhambarwadi, Maharashtra" (1550), if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which incorporate:

(i) Clarification regarding the monitoring of total electricity generation by all windmills and electricity generation by non-CDM wind turbines Σ EGm,y, and the revised spreadsheet, provided in response to the request for review;

(ii) Correction of the statement in the verification report on how EGm,y values are obtained.

(d) "Fuel Switching Project of the Aqaba Thermal Power Station (ATPS)" (1758), if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which incorporate the clarification regarding an increase in emission reductions beyond the estimates in the PDD, as provided in response to the request for review.

67. In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 10 of these procedures referred in paragraph 65, the Board agreed to undertake a review of the request for issuance of CERs and to appoint members of the review team for:

(a) "Energy efficiency through steam optimisation projects at RIL, Hazira" (0261), submitted by the DOE (DNV), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 63](#) to this report.

(b) "São João Landfill Gas to Energy Project (SJ)" (0373), 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 64](#) to this report.



- (c) "Tianji Group Line 3 N₂O Abatement Project"(1441), submitted by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in annex 65 to this report.²⁵
68. 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.
69. In accordance with the procedures for review as referred to in paragraph 65 of the CDM modalities and procedures, the Board considered the recommendation of the review team for ten requests for issuance which were placed "Under review" at the forty-seventh meeting of the Board.
70. The Board agreed to instruct the CDM registry administrator to issue CERs, subject to satisfactory corrections, for:
- (a) "Usinas Itamarati Cogeneration Project" (0211) for the monitoring period 01 June 2006 - 31 July 2007 if the project participant and the DOE (BVC) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which incorporate clarification as provided in the response to review regarding:
- (i) The increased emission reduction due to electricity generation sold to spot market started earlier than anticipated in the PDD; and
 - (ii) How the impact of this selling the electricity to the spot market to IRR and the barriers established at the registration.
- (b) "Usinas Itamarati Cogeneration Project" (0211) for the monitoring period 01 August 2007 - 31 August 2008 if the project participant and the DOE (BVC) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which incorporate clarification as provided in the response to review regarding:
- (i) The increased emission reduction due to electricity generation sold to spot market started earlier than anticipated in the PDD; and
 - (ii) How the impact of this selling the electricity to the spot market to IRR and the barriers established at the registration.
- (c) "Aleo Manali 3 MW Small Hydroelectric Project, Himachal Pradesh, India" (0244) for the monitoring period 01 September 2007 - 01 September 2008 if the project participant and the DOE (BVC) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which incorporate clarifications to justify that the project activity is implemented as planned and described in the PDD and is capable of producing electricity continuously beyond the rated capacity.
- (d) "Lages Methane Avoidance Project" (0268) for the monitoring period 01 June 2007 - 31 May 2008 if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which incorporate:
- (i) The clarification regarding the increased number of the spot market provided in the review; and
 - (ii) Confirmation that 74 spot market which supplied wood wastes during this monitoring period only supply materials originated from the main planted forest in the State of Santa Catarina.



- (e) "Reduction in steam consumption in stripper reboilers through process modifications" (0340) for the monitoring period 15 May 2006 - 03 February 2008 if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised monitoring report, a corresponding revised verification report, revised CER calculation spreadsheet and a new request for issuance form which incorporate the clarifications regarding:
- (i) The application of IPCC default values for CO₂ emission factor of fuel oil as provided in response to the request for review;
 - (ii) The application of baseline SSCR for CDU-II by conducting test on CDU-I in February 2007 as provided in response to the request for review; and
 - (iii) The calculation of emission reductions as per the provisions of the methodology for those days when the production output of the stripper is beyond -5% range of the nameplate capacity as provided in response to the review.
- (f) "Repowering Small Hydro Plants (SHP) in the State of São Paulo, Brazil" (0489) for the monitoring period 01 January 2008 - 31 December 2008 if the project participant and the DOE (BVC) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which incorporate the clarification regarding the installed capacity of São Joaquim plant and a documentary evidence from ANEEL which indicates no objection of the operation of São Joaquim plant whose installed capacity is higher than ANEEL RESOLUTION No 469.
- (g) "RIMA Fuel Switch in Bocaiuva" (0889) for the monitoring period 01 April 2008 - 31 January 2009 if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit:
- (i) A revised monitoring report, revised CER calculation spreadsheet and a new request for issuance form with corrected number of CERs, including the clarification regarding the efficiency improvement as provided in response to the review questions;
 - (ii) A revised verification report including the clarification regarding the efficiency improvement and also confirming the source from where the values for the baseline situation have been taken for doing the comparative efficiency calculations.
- (h) "N₂O Emission Reduction in nitric acid plant Paulínia, SP, Brazil" (1011) for the monitoring period 04 March 2008 - 14 September 2008 if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV SÜD) submit a revised monitoring report, a revised spreadsheet, a revised corresponding verification report, and a new request for issuance form which incorporate the corrected baseline N₂O emission factor.
- (i) "Catalytic N₂O destruction project in the tail gas of the nitric acid plant PANNA 3 of Enaex S.A." (1229) for the monitoring period 26 June 2008 - 26 September 2008 if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV SÜD) submit a revised monitoring report including the data spreadsheet showing the originally monitored data and the recalculations, and a corresponding revised verification report that:
- (i) Correct the calculation of emission reductions to consider the volumetric expansion factor as proposed by the PP, and to deduct the leaked N₂O using the leaked volume of gas and the N₂O concentration at the destruction facility (DF) inlet, should such a possibility exist that N₂O may be contained in the leak;
 - (ii) Incorporate the clarifications provided by the PP/DOE in response to the request for review and review as to how the DOE has verified the cross-checking between the tail gas flow rates at the destruction facility inlet and outlet.



71. The Board could not approve the requests for issuance of CERs for "Santa Lúcia II Small Hydro Plant" (0663), submitted by the DOE (SGS) for the monitoring period 01 January 2008 -31 December 2008 since the project participant and the DOE could not satisfactorily justify the reasons for the significant increase in the electricity generation which resulted in the 58% higher emission reductions than the estimation in the PDD, in particular

(a) The responses by the PP/DOE indicate that the electricity generation in the PDD is based on the assumption that the project is connected to isolated system and the increase is due to project interconnection to the grid in the year 2006, which is the same year when the project was requested for registration. However it has been noted in the PDD that even though the project interconnection with the grid in the early 2006 was known the corresponding increased electricity generation due to this interconnection was not appropriately included in the calculations of IRR and the emission reductions; and

(b) The PP/DOE responses do not adequately provide the reasons for installing capacity much higher than what is required to cater the demand of an isolated system.

72. The Board considered sixteen requests for deviation related to monitoring reports undergoing verification, agreed to answer them and requested the secretariat to inform the DOEs accordingly.

General guidance

73. With regard to matters relating to changes from project description in the registered PDD and procedures to address such changes, the Board agreed on the following:

(a) Procedures for notifying and requesting approval of changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD, as contained in [annex 66](#) to this report;

(b) Guidelines on assessment of different types of changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD as contained in [annex 67](#) to this report.

The Board further agreed to the effective implementation of the procedures and the guidelines as of 1 October 2009. To facilitate the implementation of paragraph 4 of the above procedures, the Board requested the secretariat to compile relevant information based on the submissions received every 3 months and to report to the Board on the types of changes from the project description in the PDD which could be considered minor in nature, at the next available meeting.

74. The Board discussed a proposal from the secretariat on "Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements", and requested to secretariat to revise the document, taking into account the various views expressed by members, including the need for appropriate examples, for further consideration at its forty-ninth meeting.

75. The Board agreed to the "Guidelines for conducting completeness checks of request for issuance", as contained in [annex 68](#) to this report, to improve the efficiency of the processing of requests for issuance and to provide DOEs with a clearer understanding of the expected quality standard. The Board requested the secretariat to apply these guidelines to new requests for issuance submitted as of 1 September 2009.

76. The Board took note of the assessment by the secretariat on the current "Procedures for requests for deviation to the Executive Board" and "Procedures for revising monitoring plans in accordance with paragraph 57 of the Modalities and Procedures of the CDM". The Board requested the secretariat to prepare draft revisions to these procedures including indicative timelines and also indicate the resource implications of the implementation of these procedures, for consideration of the Board at a future meeting.



77. In relation with paragraph 100 of the report of forty-seventh meeting of the Board, for project activities where the automated monitoring system (AMS) for the measurement of N₂O is subject to compliance with EN14181 as stipulated in the applied methodologies, the Board further clarified that the suitability test QAL 1 for the AMS by any entity is acceptable provided that a documentary evidence is submitted which confirms the measures and method conducted are in accordance with the provisions specified in ISO14956.

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

Resources

78. The Board took note of information provided by the secretariat on the status of resources received as reflected in [annex 69](#). It was noted that since the thirty-seventh meeting of the Board, the income generated by registration fees, share of proceeds and methodology fees has grown by an additional USD 6.4 million as a result of the payment of USD 2.1 million in registration fees, USD 4.3 million in share of proceeds and USD 10,961 in methodologies fees.

79. The Board, acknowledging the on-going efforts and progress made by the secretariat in filling the positions approved in the 2009 CDM-MAP and recognizing the skill shortage in the market for specific expertise, expressed its concerns and requested the secretariat to continue to expeditiously complete the filling of the current vacancies and to report on the status at its next meeting.

Agenda item 5. Other matters

Agenda sub-item 5 (a): Requests by CMP to the Board

80. In conjunction with its policy retreat held prior to the meeting, the Board considered an analysis by the secretariat of the inputs received in response to the call for inputs on efficiency in the operation of the CDM and opportunities for improvement. The Board agreed to continue to consider this issue in a second policy retreat to be held back to back with its forty-ninth meeting with a view to deciding on measures to be implemented directly and agreeing on further recommendations to the CMP at that meeting.

Agenda sub-item 5 (b): Regional distribution

81. In response to the request by the CMP through its decision 2/CMP.4 paras 53 and 54, the Board considered submissions received by DNAs in response to its call for inputs and had an initial discussion on possible ways to address the CMP requests. The Board requested Board members to send inputs on this issue to the secretariat by latest 1 September in order that the secretariat can prepare draft recommendations to CMP, taking into account the views expressed and inputs received, for consideration by the Board at its fiftieth meeting.

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

82. The Board took note of the update by the secretariat on the preparations of the eighth meeting of the CDM DNA Forum to be held on 26-28 October 2009 in Singapore, in parallel to the Carbon Forum Asia, providing the opportunity to DNAs to interact with the private sector.

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

83. The Board took note of the report by the Chair of the CDM DOE/AE Coordination Forum; and provided feedback to the forum, as appropriate.



84. The Chair of the DOE/AE Coordination Forum elaborated the input received from entities for the consideration of the Board, and sought guidance from the Board on the following:

- (a) Concepts of materiality and level of assurance;
- (b) Guidance on reviewing additionality at verification/issuance stage;
- (c) Retroactive application of revisions to approved methodologies for registered project activities.

85. The Chair of the Board thanked Mr. Siddharth Yadav and stressed the need for the forum to also identify possible answers to the questions raised by the Board members, during its next interaction.

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

86. 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.

87. 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-ninth meeting of the Executive Board shall have registered with the secretariat by **18 August 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

88. The Board agreed to the revised calendar of meetings for 2009, which is contained in [annex 70](#) to this report.

89. The Board agreed on the provisional agenda for its forty-ninth meeting (8 - 11 September 2009) as contained in [annex 71](#) to this report, with an open session on the 9 - 11 September 2009.

Agenda item 6. Conclusion of the meeting

90. The Chair summarized the main conclusions and thanked the government of Grenada for hosting the meeting and its overall support as well as the Saint Georges University for providing the excellent meeting facilities and services.

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 issues

Annex 1 - Documents related to conflict of interest

**Accreditation**

Annex 2 - Editorial revision of the "CDM accreditation standard for operational entities"

Annex 3 - Revision to the "Procedure for accrediting operational entities by the CDM EB"

Methodologies

Annex 4 - AM0082 "Use of charcoal from planted renewable biomass in the iron ore reduction process through the establishment of a new iron ore reduction system" (version 01)

Annex 5 - AM0083 "Avoidance of landfill gas emissions by in-situ aeration of landfills" (version 01)

Annex 6 - AM0031 "Baseline Methodology for Bus Rapid Transit" (version 02)

Annex 7 - AM0034 "Catalytic reduction of N₂O inside the ammonia burner of nitric acid plants (version 03.3)

Annex 8 - AM0036 "Fuel switch from fossil fuels to biomass residues in boilers for heat generation (version 02.2)

Annex 9 - AM0061 "Methodology for rehabilitation and/or energy efficiency improvement in existing power plants" (version 02.1)

Annex 10 - ACM0006 "Consolidated methodology for electricity generation from biomass residues in power and heat plants" (version 09)

Annex 11 - "Guideline for the reporting and validation of plant load factors (version 01)

Annex 12 - "Tool to determine the baseline efficiency of thermal or electric energy generation systems" (version 01)

Annex 13 - "Guidelines to calculate the fraction of Methane in the landfill gas from periodical measurements" (version 01)

Small-scale

Annex 14 - "AMS-III.AE. Energy efficiency and renewable energy measures in new residential buildings" (version 01)

Annex 15 - "AMS II.A Supply side energy efficiency improvements – transmission and distribution" (version 10)

Annex 16 - "AMS-II.C Demand-side energy efficiency activities for specific technologies" (version 13)

Annex 17 - "AMS-III.A Offsetting of synthetic nitrogen fertilizers by inoculant application in legumes grass rotations on acidic soils on existing cropland" (version 02)

Annex 18 - "AMS III.D Methane recovery in animal manure management systems" (version 15)

Annex 19 - "AMS-III.E Avoidance of methane production from decay of biomass through controlled combustion, gasification or mechanical/thermal treatment" (version 16)

Annex 20 - "AMS-III.F Avoidance of methane emissions through controlled biological treatment of biomass" (version 08)

Annex 21 - "AMS-III.H Methane recovery in wastewater treatment" (version 13)



Annex 22 - “AMS-III.I Avoidance of methane production in wastewater treatment through replacement of anaerobic systems by aerobic systems” (version 08)

Annex 23 - “AMS-I.D Grid connected renewable electricity generation” (version 14)

Annex 24 - “AMS-I.C Thermal energy production with or without electricity” (version 15)

Matters relating to the registration of CDM project activities

Annex 25 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1577

Annex 26 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1815

Annex 27 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2095

Annex 28 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2100

Annex 29 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2117

Annex 30 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2125

Annex 31 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2218

Annex 32 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2304

Annex 33 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2360

Annex 34 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2361

Annex 35 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2369

Annex 36 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2380

Annex 37 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2382

Annex 38 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2383

Annex 39 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2393

Annex 40 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2398

Annex 41 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2404

Annex 42 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2405

Annex 43 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2410

Annex 44 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2413

Annex 45 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2416

Annex 46 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2418

Annex 47 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2419

Annex 48 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2420

Annex 49 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2425

Annex 50 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2426



Annex 51 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2433

Annex 52 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2435

Annex 53 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2437

Annex 54 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2439

Annex 55 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2441

Annex 56 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2449

Annex 57 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2450

Annex 58 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1913

Annex 59 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2052

Annex 60 - Guidelines on completeness checks of requests for registration (version 01)

Annex 61 - Revision to "Guidelines for the demonstration and assessment of prior consideration of the CDM" (version 02)

Annex 62 - Standardized form for the notification for the prior consideration of the CDM (F-CDM-Prior consideration) (version 01)

Matters relating to the issuance of CERs and the CDM registry

Annex 63 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0261

Annex 64 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0373

Annex 65 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 1441

Annex 66 - Procedures for notifying and requesting approval of changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD (version 01)

Annex 67 - Guidelines on assessment of different types of changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD (version 01)

Annex 68 - Guidelines on completeness check of requests for issuance

Management plan and resources for the work on the CDM

Annex 69 - Status of resources and pledges to support 2009 CDM activities

Other matters

Annex 70 - Revised calendar of meetings for 2009 (version 04)

Annex 71 - Provisional agenda for EB49



Endnotes

1. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the revised PDD and the corresponding validation report should incorporate the responses submitted in response to the request for review on the validation of the input values.
2. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which include the response submitted to the request for review, regarding IRR benchmark, common practice analysis and validation of waste gas.
3. If the Board ultimately decides to register this project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised documentation which includes the explanation regarding the differences in the input values between that of the project activity and PA 2153.
4. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which include the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of other input values and other expenses.
5. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report, which incorporate the amended grid emission factor using data available at the time of commencement of validation.
6. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which include the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the combined margin emission factor.
7. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report that includes the response submitted in request for review with regards to the revised calculation (including the procedure and formulas used) of the baseline emission factor for upstream fugitive methane emissions (EFBL,upstream,CH4) and the leakage emissions.
8. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report that includes the response submitted in request for review with regards to the revised calculation (including the procedure and formulas used) of the baseline emission factor for upstream fugitive methane emissions (EFBL,upstream,CH4) and the leakage emissions.
9. If the Board ultimately decides to register this project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which include the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the differences between Plant #1 and Plant #2.
10. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report that includes the response submitted in request for review with regards to the validation of the input values, including the investment costs and the electricity tariff. The Board does not consider that the prevailing practice is a credible barrier for the hydropower sector in Peru.
11. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and a corresponding validation report which incorporates the information submitted in the response to the request for review regarding: (a) the revised tariff used in the PDD and; (b) the investment cost.



12. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the revised Validation Report should include the clarification on the monitoring plan submitted in response to the request for review.
13. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which include the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the benchmark, IRR calculation and investment analysis.
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 information submitted in response to the request for review regarding project description and gas supply in pre-project scenario.
15. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit clean version of revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report.
16. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which include the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of input values to the investment analysis and the sensitivity analysis.
17. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP and the DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which include the information submitted for the response to the request for review, regarding the monitoring of emission reduction.
18. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and a corresponding validation report that includes the responses submitted in this request for review regarding the validation of the input values and benchmark.
19. If the Board ultimately decides to register the this project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised documentation which (a) includes the explanation submitted regarding the validation of input values in line with EB 38 para. 54 (a) and (b) and the validation of the investment cost and O&M costs in line with EB 38, para.54(c) and (b) confirms the tariffs for small hydropower plants from 2004 to 2008.
20. If the Board ultimately decides to register this project, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised documentation which (a) incorporates the additional information provided in response to the request for review regarding the investment cost and effective electricity supply coefficient; (b) confirms the response provided by the project participant regarding the low PLF of the project activity; and (c) properly reflects the CAR for the change in the income tax rate to 33% between the PDD made available for public consultation and the PDD submitted for registration in the revised validation report.
21. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised documentation that includes the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding (a) the benchmark, (b) the validation of the decrease in natural gas price and increase in the production of electricity, heat and steam that would make the IRR reach the benchmark., and (c) the availability of natural gas.
22. If the Board ultimately decides to register this project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised documentation which includes the explanation and information submitted in the response to the request for review regarding (a) the validation of input values in line with EB 38 paragraph 54(a) (b) the specialized pipeline for the project, (c) the residual value of the assets; (d) the electricity tariff; and (e) the natural gas price.



23. If the Board decides to ultimately register the project activity, the revised validation report should incorporate the additional information on the tariffs and the clarification on the common practice analysis submitted in response to the request for review.
24. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which include the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of sensitivity analysis.
25. If the Board ultimately decides to issue the CERs the PP/DOE need to submit (i) a revised monitoring report and a revised verification report including the clarification provided in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of the Automated Measuring System (AMS);
(ii) a revised monitoring report and a revised verification report including the clarification provided in response to the request for review regarding the time lag between baseline and the project campaign;
and
(iii) a revised excel sheet containing the revised calculation of the baseline emission factor by applying hours corresponding to the normal campaign length instead of the total operating hours of the campaign and a revised request for issuance form corresponding to the changes in the calculations.