

**REPORT OF THE TWENTY-SECOND MEETING  
OF THE SMALL-SCALE WORKING GROUP**

UNFCCC Headquarters, Bonn, Germany  
21–24 September 2009

**Report Version 01.1\***

**RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE SSC WG TO THE EXECUTIVE BOARD**

**A. Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda**

1. The Vice-Chair of the Small-Scale Working Group (SSC WG), Mr. Peer Stiansen, opened the meeting and welcomed the members.
2. The agenda was adopted as proposed.

**B. Revision of the simplified modalities and procedures  
for small-scale CDM project activities**

3. The SSC WG considered submissions requesting revisions to, or clarifications of approved SSC methodologies as well as requests for the creation of new methodologies. The detailed responses provided by the SSC WG are made publicly available at:  
<<http://cdm.unfccc.int/goto/SSCclar>> and  
<<http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/SSCmethodologies/NewSSCMethodologies/index.html>>. They can also be accessed by clicking the hyperlinked submission number in the table below.

<b>Proposed new methodologies</b>		
<b>Submission number</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<a href="#">SSC-NM024-rev2</a>	Methodology for using recycling material instead of raw material	(WIP) (See paragraph 26)
<a href="#">SSC-NM028-rev2</a>	Avoidance of methane emissions through controlled biological treatment of partially decayed MSW	(See paragraph 4)
<a href="#">SSC-NM030</a>	Grid connected biomass based co-fired electricity generation	(See paragraph 22)
<a href="#">SSC-NM031</a>	Avoidance of methane emissions through the chemical treatment of industrial wastewater	(See paragraph 7)
<a href="#">SSC-NM032</a>	Emission reductions through recovery of spent sulphuric acid	(See paragraph 21)
<a href="#">SSC-NM033</a>	Avoidance of conventional fossil fuels use by production and sale of renewable biomass products	(See paragraph 23)
<a href="#">SSC-NM034</a>	Emission reductions due to avoided transportation through the creation of a new facility nearer to a market	(See paragraph 24)
<a href="#">SSC-NM035</a>	Emission reductions through replacement of cement plaster with alternate industrial waste based plaster	(See paragraph 25)
<a href="#">SSC-NM014-rev</a>	AMS-III.AG Switching from high carbon intensive grid electricity to low carbon intensive fossil fuels	(See paragraph 5)
<a href="#">SSC_250</a>	AMS-III.AH Shift from high carbon intensive fuel mix ratio to low carbon intensive fuel mix ratio	(See paragraph 6)

\* This version was issued to editorially revise the cross-reference of SSC-NM024-rev2 to paragraph 26 and SSC\_346 to paragraph 10. Additionally, in the title of AMS-III.AF (see paragraph 4), the word ‘wastes’ was changed to ‘waste’.

<b>Requests for revisions</b>		
<a href="#">SSC 329</a>	Inclusion of avoided transportation emissions due to reduced use of fossil fuel in project activity in AMS-I.C	(See paragraph 8)
<a href="#">SSC 346</a>	Revision of AMS-I.C to include monitoring of thermal energy output of household-biogas stoves	(See paragraph 10)
<a href="#">SSC 349</a>	Revision of AMS-I.C to include isolated mini-grids in the baseline scenario and plant oil as a fuel source	(See paragraph 9)
<a href="#">SSC 331</a>	Inclusion of commercial facilities with district heating and cooling systems in the methodology AMS-II.D	(See paragraph 11)
<a href="#">SSC 350</a>	Determining the measured value for $O_i$ by conducting a survey of project devices in AMS-II.J	(See paragraph 12)
<a href="#">SSC 347</a>	Revision of AMS-III.B to incorporate cases when the energy output cannot be measured directly	(See paragraph 13)
<a href="#">SSC 348</a>	Revision of AMS-III.B for project activity that displaces grid electricity	(See paragraph 14)
<a href="#">SSC 343</a>	Applicability condition under AMS-III.F for measures limited to those resulting in emission reductions of less than or equal to 60 kt CO <sub>2</sub> equivalent annually	(See paragraph 15)
<a href="#">SSC 335</a>	Revision of AMS III.O to include natural gas as feedstock and other non-CO <sub>2</sub> emitting sources of hydrogen	(See paragraph 16)
<a href="#">SSC 317</a>	Revision of AMS-III.Q to include recovery of waste pressure that is not vented or released into the atmosphere	(See paragraph 18)
<a href="#">SSC 330</a>	Revision of AMS-III.Q for project activities that utilize abandoned electricity	(See paragraph 19)
<a href="#">SSC 345</a>	Revision of AMS-III.Q to include project activity involving enhanced waste heat recovery	(See paragraph 20)
<a href="#">SSC 322</a>	Revision of AMS-III.Z to provide clarity on nationally approved laboratories and level of service of the product	(See paragraph 17)

<b>Requests for clarifications</b>		
<a href="#">SSC 321</a>	Clarification regarding project activity whose annual emission reduction exceeds Type III SSC limit (60 ktCO <sub>2</sub> /y)	(See paragraph 33)
<a href="#">SSC 323</a>	Applicability of AMS-I.D to a small scale hydro-electric project activity with power density less than 10 W/sq.m	(See paragraph 34)
<a href="#">SSC 325</a>	Consideration of sectoral regulations that came after Nov 11, 2001 for determining the baseline scenario	(See paragraph 35)
<a href="#">SSC 326</a>	Applicability of AMS-II.D for project activity involving steam savings in an industrial process	(See paragraph 36)
<a href="#">SSC 332</a>	Clarification regarding baseline and monitoring requirement for project activity generating electricity and hot air	(See paragraph 37)
<a href="#">SSC 333</a>	Clarification on methane producing capacity ( $B_o$ ) for industrial wastewater in AMS-III.H	(See paragraph 38)

<a href="#">SSC_334</a>	Calculation of fcap where it is not possible to measure the waste energy (heat) of WECM and therefore there is no historic data available for these cases	(See paragraph 39)
<a href="#">SSC_336</a>	Clarification on the applicability of AMS-I.C regarding a back-up unit for consideration of installed capacity limit	(See paragraph 40)
<a href="#">SSC_344</a>	Clarification on the operation of stand-by units in a centralized cogeneration system applying AMS-I.C	(See paragraph 40)
<a href="#">SSC_337</a>	Clarification on substantiation of the “Access-to-finance” barrier for demonstration of additionality	(See paragraph 41)
<a href="#">SSC_338</a>	Clarification on the 15 MW eligibility limit for small-scale renewable energy projects	(See paragraph 42)
<a href="#">SSC_339</a>	Clarification on the definition of “appliances” in AMS-I.E	(See paragraph 43)
<a href="#">SSC_341</a>	Eligibility of improved recovery in the flotation process through the use of inert grinding media in the IsaMill (AMS-II.D)	(See paragraph 44)
<a href="#">SSC_342</a>	Clarification about project boundary in the application of AMS-III.B	(See paragraph 45)
<a href="#">SSC_351</a>	Clarification regarding eligibility of Greenfield projects under AMS-III.Q	(See paragraph 46)
<a href="#">SSC_352</a>	Clarification regarding definition of existing facility in AMS-III.Q	(See paragraph 46)
<a href="#">SSC_316</a>	<i>Clarification on the applicability of AMS-II.B to project activity switching from high ash content to low ash content coal blend fuel</i>	(See paragraph 27)
<a href="#">SSC_320</a>	<i>Clarification on the comparability of project emission estimation in AMS-III.D and AMS-III.R</i>	(See paragraph 28)
<a href="#">SSC_324</a>	<i>Applicability of AMS-I.D to a small scale hydro-electric project activity with power density less than 10 W/sq.m</i>	(See paragraph 29)
<a href="#">SSC_327</a>	<i>Clarification on the requirement to store scrapped refrigerators prior to verification</i>	(See paragraph 30)
<a href="#">SSC_328</a>	<i>Clarification on leakage in project activity using animal litter</i>	(See paragraph 31)
<a href="#">SSC_340</a>	<i>Clarification regarding the addition of bedding material to manure streams in AMS-III.F</i>	(See paragraph 32)

### C. Proposed new methodologies

4. In response to SSC-NM028-rev2, the SSC WG agreed to recommend a new methodology titled “AMS-III.AF Avoidance of methane emissions through excavating and composting of partially decayed municipal solid waste (MSW)” as contained in annex 1. The methodology is for methane avoidance from closed landfill through sequential measures including an aerobic pre-treatment to create a safe operation environment for subsequent excavation and separation of inert and non inert materials. Composting of the non-inert material and proper soil application of the compost are also included.

5. In response to SSC-NM014-rev, the SSC WG agreed to recommend a new methodology titled “AMS-III.AG Switching from high carbon intensive grid electricity to low carbon intensive fossil fuels” as contained in annex 2. The methodology is applicable for switching from grid

electricity to a single low carbon intensive energy source in existing industrial, residential, commercial, and institutional or energy producing applications.

6. In response to SSC\_250 and taking into account the guidance from the Board (see paragraph 59 of EB 47 report), the SSC WG agreed to recommend a new methodology titled “AMS-III.AH Shift from high carbon intensive fuel mix ratio to low carbon intensive fuel mix ratio” as contained in annex 3. The methodology is for project activities that result in increased share of low GHG intensive fossil fuel in an elemental process of an industrial, residential, commercial, and institutional or electricity generation application that uses a mix of fossil fuels.

7. In response to the submission SSC-NM031, requesting a new methodology for methane avoidance through chemical treatment of industrial wastewater, the SSC WG agreed to recommend a revision of AMS-III.Y as contained in annex 4. The proposed revisions expand the applicability of AMS-III.Y to allow the use of flocculent in the pre-separation phase to improve the efficiency of the subsequent mechanical solid-liquid separation, the relevant procedures to take into account the project and leakage emissions from the use of flocculent is included accordingly.

#### **D. Revisions & requests for revision of approved methodologies**

8. Revision of AMS-I.C: in response to the submissions SSC\_329, the SSC WG agreed to indicate that for a small scale methodology it may not be appropriate to include upstream emissions related to transportation of fossil fuel in the baseline. It further agreed to clarify that emissions related to transport of biomass is only required if these are transported over a distance of more than 200 kilometres.

9. In response to SSC\_349, requesting revision of AMS I C to include plant oil as a renewable fuel source to produce electricity and heat in a cogeneration unit to displace fossil fuel based electricity in a mini-grid in the baseline, the SSC WG agreed to seek further clarification on the source of biomass.

10. In response to the submission SSC-346 requesting a revision of AMS-I.C monitoring requirements to enable determination of thermal energy generation of the project activity based on the reduction of coal consumption, the SSC WG agreed not to recommend the revision as savings in coal consumption is associated with many uncertainties that are beyond the control of the project proponent (e.g., coal price, household occupancy). The SSC WG also clarified that such an issue can be possibly addressed by either introducing the monitoring and/or independent research based default values by the project proponent or following a sample based procedure detailed in its response.

11. Revision of AMS-II.D: in response to SSC\_331 requesting a revision in the context of a project activity to expand an existing facility to supply heating, cooling and electricity needs in a commercial building, the SSC WG agreed not to recommend a revision of AMS-II.D. However project proponent may consider submitting a revision of AMS-II.H.

12. Revision of AMS-II.J: in response to SSC\_350, the SSC WG agreed to indicate that lamp operating hours during the crediting period can be determined with surveys of either baseline or project residences. It also clarified the approaches for establishing both ex-ante and ex-post operating hour values by describing the three options available in AMS II.J.

13. Revision of AMS-III.B: in response to the submission SSC\_347 requesting a revision in the context of a fossil fuel switch project activity in a reheating furnace in steel plant, the SSC WG agreed not to recommend the proposed revision as AMS-III.B is intended for project activities whose primary output is energy and not the product (e.g., steel, brick etc.). For the latter, the variation in other parameters (such as input raw materials, output quality, etc) may also affect the

fuel consumption and therefore project proponents shall consider submitting a new methodology for the underlying project activity.

14. In response to SSC\_348, requesting a revision to expand AMS-III.B to include natural gas based cogeneration to displace grid electricity, the SSC WG agreed not to recommend the revision as AMS-III.B is intended for an element process generating a single output (such as electricity or steam) by using a single energy source in which the baseline is either heat or electricity but not both. However the project proponent may consider submitting a revision of AMS-II.H.

15. Revision of AMS-III.F: in response to SSC\_343 requesting a revision of AMS-III.F to change the Type III SSC project limit (i.e., 60 kt CO<sub>2</sub>e per year) to the average annual basis, the SSC WG agreed not to recommend such a revision. The SSC WG further agreed to clarify that a project is eligible as a small-scale project only if *ex ante* calculations show that emissions reductions do not exceeds the applicable SSC thresholds in any of the seven or ten years of the crediting period. The project proponent may consider using a large-scale methodology.

16. Revision of AMS-III.O: in response to SSC\_335 requesting a revision for a project activity producing hydrogen from a non-biogenic source, the SSC WG agreed not to recommend a revision of AMS-III.O since the gas that is rich in H<sub>2</sub>, having intrinsic value, may not be considered a waste-gas.

17. Request for revision of AMS-III.Z: in response to SSC\_322, the SSC-WG agreed to clarify the testing procedures to comply with the requirements of the methodology for equivalent service level in the baseline and project.

18. Revision of AMS-III.Q: in response to SSC\_317 requesting a revision for a project activity where waste pressure is not released into the atmosphere i.e., energy is produced by excess pressure available due to replacement of a pressure reducing valve with a back-pressure steam-turbine, the SSC WG agreed not to recommend a revision of AMS-III.Q as the related project/leakage emissions are not addressed by the submission.

19. In response to SSC\_330, the SSC WG agreed not to recommend the revision as the situation where electricity could be wasted seems very specific to the project situation, and a procedure to establish a credible baseline scenario for such a situation to show that it would have been truly wasted in the absence of the project activity would be difficult. Such a methodology would require a more rigorous methodological approach than a typical small scale methodology.

20. In response to SSC\_345 requesting a revision of AMS III Q for enhanced heat recovery in an atmospheric distillation unit of an oil refinery facility, the SSC WG agreed not to recommend the revision because of the potential signal-to-noise ratio<sup>1</sup>, as the proposed project being a sub-component of an integrated large industrial process (refining) and the distillation unit is linked with other processes which are not included into the project boundary.

#### **E. Response to requests for new methodologies**

21. In response to SSC-NM032, proposing a new methodology for recovery of spent sulphuric acid thereby avoiding CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from its neutralisation with hydrated lime in manufacturing of chemicals, dyes, pigments, drugs etc., the SSC WG agreed to seek further clarifications from the project proponents on several issues, e.g., energy balance of the recycling facility, further details on neutralization process and the procedure to determine the biodegradability of pollutant contained in spent sulphuric acid.

---

<sup>1</sup> Significant project emissions relative to emission reductions.

22. In response to SSC-NM030 proposing a new methodology for project activities for fuel switch from coal to biomass in an existing grid connected co-fired (biomass and coal) power plant, the SSC WG agreed not to recommend the methodology because submission failed to establish a credible baseline for example the project activity proposed a hypothetical baseline citing local regulations on fuel mix.

23. In response to SSCNM033, for activities avoiding use of conventional fossil fuels through production and sale of solid-biomass fuels, the SSC WG agreed not to recommend the proposed methodology because of fundamental flaws. The end-users are not included in the project boundary, and it is not the production of the biomass fuel that produces emission reduction but the combustion of it and its displacement of fossil fuel.

24. In response to SSC-NM034 proposing a new methodology for emission reduction through avoided transport by creating a new facility nearer to the market, the SSC WG agreed not to recommend the approval of this methodology because of fundamental flaws. The proposed methodology does not take into account either the baseline manufacturing facility emissions or the project facility emissions. It is not sufficient to simply assume that the project manufacturing facility will have lower emissions than the baseline facility. Thus, the new facility, while possibly reducing transport emissions, might result in a significant overall increase in emissions. In addition, since the proposed methodology is related to logistics all the activities pertaining to production and transportation of products should be included to the boundary, including the transportation of any raw materials. Thus, the SSCWG recommends no further consideration of this methodology until the project boundary is defined to include the sites where baseline and project product production takes place and all transport to and from these locations.

25. In response to SSC-NM035 proposing a new methodology for avoiding the use of cement by using alternative wall plaster material thereby avoiding emissions related to the production of cement, the SSC WG agreed to seek further clarifications related to the inclusion of the users/consumers of the product in the project boundary and monitoring of the actual use/consumption of product used/consumed.

26. In response to SSC-NM024-rev, intended for recycling facilities to recover material e.g., recovering HDPE and LDPE plastic residues to displace virgin inputs (e.g., pellets) for the production of finished or intermediary plastic products, the SSC WG agreed to continue to consider the case and finalize the recommendation at the next meeting taking into account expert inputs.

#### **F. Response to request for clarification - considered prior to the meeting<sup>2</sup>**

27. SSC\_316 requested clarification on the applicability of AMS-II.B to a project activity switching from high ash content to low ash content coal blend fuel. The SSC WG clarified AMS-II.B is not applicable as the described project activity is neither a retrofit/replacement of an existing facility nor is it a new facility for which AMS-II.B would be applicable.

28. SSC\_320 requested clarification on the comparability of project emission estimation in AMS-III.D and AMS-III.R. The SSC WG agreed to clarify that AMS-III.R and AMS-III.D are consistent to each other and 100% destruction of biogas is assumed in both the methodologies for the portion of biogas that is combusted in an engine, power plant or a stove.

29. SSC\_324 requested clarification on the determination of the flare efficiency for project activity involving combustion and/or flaring of recovered methane. The SSC WG, taking into account the inputs in the submission and public comment received, agreed to clarify that, as in the

---

<sup>2</sup> Considered in accordance with paragraph 8 of annex 6 of the thirty-fourth report of the Board.

case of AMS-III.D, if the biogas is combusted for a gainful use of the released energy as in an engine or a power plant, a destruction efficiency of 100% can be used for the portion of biogas that is combusted when applying AMS-III.H.

30. SSC\_327 requested clarification on requirement to store scrapped refrigerators prior to verification in AMS-III.X. The SSC WG agreed to clarify that because the methodology itself requires the de-manufacturing, storing the data on the refrigerators recorded at the recycling facility and making it available for independent verification by a DOE, without having to store the physical refrigerators prior to sending them to the recycling facility would meet the requirement in paragraph 25 of AMS-III.X.

31. SSC\_328 requested clarification on leakage in project activity using animal litter. The SSC WG agreed to clarify that chicken litter shall be considered as biomass and leakage assessment shall be done as per the provisions of 'General guidance on leakage in biomass project activities'.

32. SSC\_340 requested clarification on the addition of bedding material to manure streams in AMS-III.F. The SSC WG agreed to clarify that blending materials can be added to the compost to ensure an efficient composting process (e.g., to achieve a specific C/N ratio or free air space value), provided that the measurements of the quantity of manure collected from the barn and the values of volatile solids (in case the developed country values are not used) are carried out before the addition of the blending materials.

#### **G. Response to request for clarification - considered at the meeting**

33. In response to SSC\_321, requesting a clarification on the consideration of the size of an AMS-III.E project before and during the crediting period as well as at the time of renewal of the crediting period, the SSC WG agreed to clarify that:

- (a) The project is eligible as a small-scale project only if ex ante calculations show that emissions reductions do not surpass the applicable SSC thresholds in any of the seven or ten years of the crediting period;
- (b) If the emission reductions during any monitored year of a registered project activity exceeds the SSC thresholds by chance, then a cap applies to the reductions that can be claimed as per the guidance of EB 20 paragraph 58 (a);
- (c) If the size of the project exceeds the SSC threshold as per the applicable version of the methodology at the time of renewal of the crediting period (see EB 46, Annex 11), project participant shall consider applying a new methodology or submitting a request for deviation through a DOE as defined in the procedures.

34. In response to SSC\_323, requesting a clarification on the consideration of project emissions relative to power density of small scale hydropower projects, the SSC WG agreed to recommend a revision of AMS-I.D as contained in annex 5 to include the procedures to calculate project emissions as specified in Annex 5 of EB 23.

35. In response to SSC\_325 requesting clarification on the consideration of national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances in assessment of baseline scenarios, the SSC WG clarified that the policies described by the submission did not qualify as E- (as defined in paragraph 6 of EB 22 Annex 3) and consequently needs to be taken into account in the assessment of the baseline scenarios.

36. In response to SSC\_326, requesting clarification on use of specific energy consumption approach (e.g., TJ Coal / TJ steam) in AMS-II.D in the context of a salt manufacturing process, the SSC WG agreed to clarify that AMS-II.D is not applicable to the described project activity as the methodology does not adequately capture baseline and project emissions associated with the described project and the effect of interrelated variables on overall facility fuel consumption and emissions.
37. In response to SSC\_332, requesting clarification on applicability of AMS-II.H for an activity displacing captive fossil fuel based hot air generation with a cogeneration plant including a gas turbine coupled with a heat recovery system, the SSC WG clarified that the project is eligible to apply AMS II H and the energy content of the hot air is to be monitored based on flow rate of the exhaust on a sample basis (with 90% confidence level at 10% precision) and continuous measurement of temperature of the exhaust.
38. In response to SSC\_333, requesting clarification on the default value of methane producing capacity (Bo) for industrial wastewater to use in applying AMS-III.H, the SSC WG agreed to clarify that 0.25 kg CH<sub>4</sub>/kg COD or 0.6 kg CH<sub>4</sub>/kg BOD can be used with conservativeness factor of 0.89 in equation 2 of AMS-III.H.
39. In response to SSC\_334, requesting a clarification on parameter fcap to be determined based on method-3 of ACM0012 when applying AMS-III.Q, the SSC WG agreed to clarify that the issue is under the consideration of the Meth Panel and the project proponent shall follow the progress accordingly.
40. In response to SSC\_336 and 344, requesting clarification on operation of stand-by units in applying AMS-I.C for a centralized cogeneration system, the SSC WG specified the conditions under which the back up units can be operated (e.g., no simultaneous operation with main unit, no larger capacity than the main unit and no emission reduction attributed to the operation of the back-up unit).
41. In response to SSC\_337, requesting clarification on the applicability and substantiation of the “Access-to-finance barrier” outlined in the “Non binding best practice examples to demonstrate additionality for SSC project activities” (EB 35, Annex 34), the SSC WG agreed to clarify the issue presented pertains to validation and is not a SSC methodological issue.
42. In response to SSC\_338 requesting clarification on the installed capacity of small scale hydro power project, the SSC WG agreed to clarify that the installed capacity shall be based on the installed capacity of the generator determined as the product of nameplate MVA and power factor.
43. In response to SSC\_339, requesting clarification on the applicability of AMS-I.E to a project activity that involves introduction of sustainably produced charcoal in existing stoves to substitute charcoal produced from non renewable biomass sources, the SSC WG agreed to clarify that AMS-I.E in its current form is not applicable as introduction of new equipment/appliance is the requirement of the methodology. However, considering that combustion of non-renewable and renewable biomass in the same existing appliance may potentially be an emission reduction activity with significant potential for replication, SSC WG also agreed to further consider the issue in its subsequent meetings.
44. In response to SSC\_341, requesting clarification on an activity involving installation of energy efficient technology for comminution and beneficiation of mineral ore in a metal production facility, the SSC WG agreed to clarify that the described project activity is not applicable under AMS-II.D as the submission has not substantiated the issue that the energy savings due to the project activity can be clearly distinguished from changes in energy use due to other variables not influenced by the project activity.

45. In response to SSC\_342, requesting clarification on applicability of AMS-III.B for a natural gas based cogeneration project activity displacing high carbon-intensive grid electricity and fuel oil for heat generation in the adjacent industrial plant, the SSC WG indicated that the project proponent may consider submitting the proposal as a revision of AMS-II.H.

46. In response to SSC\_351 and 352, requesting clarification on eligibility of Greenfield projects and existing facility, SSC WG clarified the definition of “existing facility” in AMS-III.Q while reiterating that AMS-III.Q is not applicable to Greenfield projects and projects with hypothetical baselines.

#### **H. General guidance**

47. As requested by the Board at its forty-seventh meeting (see paragraph 64, EB 47), the SSC WG, taking into account the public inputs<sup>3</sup> and expert inputs, agreed to recommend a general guidelines for sampling and surveys for SSC project activities as contained in annex 6. While the focus of the guidelines is on end-use energy efficiency applications, its application is not limited to just these applications.

48. The guidelines elaborate the sampling documentation requirements and the sampling plan evaluation criteria. Sampling precision and confidence requirements for SSC project activities are also specified. Guidance on sampling application and sampling practices are also included.

#### **I. Schedule of meetings**

49. The SSC WG agreed to schedule its twenty-second meeting from **27–30 October 2009** taking into account the schedule of the Board. The deadline for new methodology submissions to this meeting was **01 September 2009** and the deadline for submitting requests for clarifications/revisions for this meeting is **29 September 2009**.

#### **J. Desk Reviews**

50. The SSC WG noted the satisfactory completion of the desk reviews undertaken for the proposed new SSC methodologies considered at the meeting.

---

<sup>3</sup> Six inputs were received in response to a call for public input by the Board that invited suggestions to enhance the practical application and user friendliness of the draft document starting from 1 June 2009 ending by 1 July 2009.

**External annexes to the twenty-second meeting of the SSC WG**

- Annex 1: AMS-III.AF Avoidance of methane emissions through excavating and composting of partially decayed municipal solid waste (MSW)
- Annex 2: AMS-III.AG Switching from high carbon intensive grid electricity to low carbon intensive fossil fuels
- Annex 3: AMS-III.AH Shift from high carbon intensive fuel mix ratio to low carbon intensive fuel mix ratio
- Annex 4: Revision of AMS-III.Y
- Annex 5: Revision of AMS-I.D
- Annex 6: Draft general guidelines for sampling and surveys for Small-Scale CDM project activities