



CLEAN DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM EXECUTIVE BOARD

PROPOSED AGENDA AND ANNOTATIONS

Twenty-sixth meeting

UNFCCC Headquarters
Bonn, Germany
26 - 29 September 2006

CONTENTS

- I. PROPOSED AGENDA
- II. ANNOTATIONS TO THE PROPOSED AGENDA

Annex 1: Avoidance of fossil fuel combustion for carbon dioxide production to be used as raw material for industrial processes

Annex 2: Draft procedure for requesting changes to registered monitoring plans.

Annex 3: Draft design of the CDM catalogue of decisions

Annex 4: Equitable distribution of clean development project activities - analysis of submission



I. PROPOSED AGENDA

1. Membership issues (including disclosure of possible conflict of interest)
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Work plan:
 - (a) Accreditation of operational entities
 - (b) Methodologies for baselines and monitoring plans
 - (c) Issues relating to CDM afforestation and reforestation project activities
 - (d) Issues relating to small-scale CDM project activities
 - (e) Matters relating to the registration of CDM project activities*
 - (f) Matters relating to the issuance of certified emission reductions and the CDM registry**
 - (g) Modalities for collaboration with the Subsidiary Bodies
4. Management plan and resources for the work on the CDM
5. Other matters
6. Conclusion of the meeting

*For more information please visit the page CDM Project activities “under review” and “review requested” of the UNFCCC CDM website (http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/under_review.html) and (<http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/review.html>).

**For more information please visit the “issuance of CERs” section of the UNFCCC CDM website (<http://cdm.unfccc.int/Issuance>).



II. ANNOTATIONS TO THE PROPOSED AGENDA

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

1. The Chair shall ascertain whether (a) the members present constitute a quorum, and (b) the absence of any member or alternate member is “without proper justification”¹.

2. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to consider information provided by any member and alternate member, including with respect to any potential conflict of interest, and take action, as appropriate.

Background: The Chair shall request, at the beginning of each meeting of the CDM Executive Board, members and alternates to disclose whether they consider to have any conflict of interest relating to the work of the Board.

2. Adoption of the agenda

3. ► **Action:** Members may wish to adopt the proposed agenda for the twenty-sixth meeting.

Background: The Board agreed, at its twenty-fifth meeting, on items to be included in the provisional agenda for its twenty-sixth meeting. In accordance with rule 21 of the rules of procedure of the Executive Board, subsequent additions or changes to the provisional agenda by members and/or alternate members were to be incorporated in the proposed agenda. No suggestions for changes were received. The proposed agenda was transmitted to the Board on 5 September 2006 and thereafter posted on the UNFCCC CDM website.

3. Work plan

(a) Accreditation of operational entities

4. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to take note of the thirteenth progress report on the work of the CDM accreditation panel (CDM-AP), and an oral report by its Chair, Mr. Hernan Carlino, on the work of the panel.

Background: The CDM-AP held its twenty-third meeting on 4 - 6 September 2006. The CDM-AP tentatively scheduled its twenty-fourth meeting on 13 - 15 October 2006.

General guidance

5. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to consider a document elaborating a process to define the scope of the re-accreditation assessment work which is taking into consideration the performance of the DOEs.

6. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to adopt the revised procedure for accrediting operational entities by the Executive Board of the CDM.

Background: The Vice-Chair of the CDM-AP, at the twenty-fourth meeting of the Board, presented the draft revised accreditation procedure. The Chair informed the Board members that the revision of the procedures has been undertaken by taking into consideration the relevant decisions and clarifications of the Board, inputs received from public. The Board provided guidance to the CDM-AP for further revision in particular to further clarify the process to define the scope of re-accreditation of DOEs taking into consideration the performance of DOEs.

Case specific

7. ► **Action:** No case specific recommendations have been forwarded to the Board by the CDM-AP. Information on progress of work on specific cases will be provided in the meeting under confidentiality.

¹ Please refer to rules 28 and 7 of the rules of procedures of the Executive Board.

**(b) Methodologies for baselines and monitoring**

8. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to take note of the report on the work of the twenty-second meeting of the Methodologies Panel on baseline and monitoring methodologies (Meth Panel), and an oral report by its Chair, Mr. Rajesh Sethi, on the work of the panel.

Background: The Meth Panel held its twenty-second meeting in Bonn, Germany from 4 September to 9 September 2006 and undertook its work in two parallel groups. The Chair, Mr. Rajesh Sethi, with the assistance of the Vice Chair, Mr. Jean Jacques Becker, chaired the meeting with the support from Board members Mr. Lex de Jonge and Mr. Xuedu Lu. The Board thanked the outgoing members Mr. Stanford Johanne Mwakasonda, Mr. Paata Janelidze, and Mr. Zhihong Wei for their dedication and service to the work of the Meth Panel. The Meth Panel also welcomed the new members Mr. Jan-Willem Martens and Mr. Vijay Kumar Mediratta to the Meth Panel who were selected by the Board at its twenty-fifth meeting. The Meth Panel dealt with general issues relating to case-specific issues process, methodological clarifications, guidance and other issues, as specified below.

Case specific

9. ► **Action:** Taking into consideration the inputs by experts (desk reviewers) and the public, the Board may wish to consider and agree to the recommendation provided by the Meth Panel on the following cases as referred in paragraph 7 of the Meth Panel report (MP22):

- (a) Approve cases NM0135, NM0140-rev, NM0145, NM0146, NM0147 and NM0163, as contained in the annexes 1 to 6 of the Meth Panel report (MP22);
- (b) Forward cases NM0121, NM0144, NM0155, NM0159, NM0160, NM0165 and NM0166, for revision to the project participants and for resubmission without the need for further experts and public input. If project participants wish to have the revised proposals considered at the twenty-fourth meeting of the Meth Panel (27 November - 1 December 2006), they shall exceptionally submit them by 20 October 2006;
- (c) Not to approve cases NM0108-rev, NM0129-rev, NM0134-rev, NM0138-rev, NM0162, NM0169, NM0173, NM0175, NM0177, NM0182 and NM0183 that, if revised taking into account comments, can be resubmitted but will require new expert and public input.

Background: Information on methodologies currently under consideration by the Board and the Meth Panel are available on the UNFCCC CDM website (<http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/publicview.html>). The Meth Panel agreed on preliminary recommendations to project participants for proposals NM0110-rev, NM0142-rev, NM0152-rev, NM0170, NM0171, NM0172, NM0174, NM0176, NM0178, NM0179, NM0180 and NM0181.

In addition work on cases NM0133-rev, NM0141-rev, NM0151, NM0158 and NM0161 was not concluded and will be considered at the next meeting of the Meth Panel.

Responses to clarifications

10. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to agree to the responses to clarifications provided by the Meth Panel, as referred in paragraph 9 of the Meth Panel report (MP22):

- (a) Not accept clarification AM_CLA_0029 concerning the eligibility of the DOE to submit the registration request based on an approved methodology linked to a sectoral scope to which the DOE is accredited, but referring to the use of another approved methodology to whose sectoral scope the DOE is not accredited.



- (b) Not accept clarification AM_CLA_0031 concerning applicability of the methodology ACM0001 for a project activity that aims to collect LPG and upgrade to CPLG.

Background: Information on the clarification to methodologies is available on the UNFCCC CDM website (<<http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/Clarifications>>).

Responses to requests for revision of approved methodologies:

11. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to consider and agree to the responses to revisions provided by the Meth Panel, as referred to in paragraph 9 of the Meth Panel report (MP22):

- (a) Not accept revision AM_REV_0016 concerning AM0001 requesting the broadening of the applicability conditions to swing plants, which produced only CFC in the past but were to be converted to produce HCFC 22 as per previous agreement.
- (b) Accept revision AM_REV_0017 concerning AM0028 requesting the broadening of the applicability conditions to include caprolactam production process, which resulted in the revision of the methodology, as contained in the annex 9 of the Meth Panel report (MP22). Unrelated to the request, the approved methodology was amended to include the monitoring of N₂O to using the standard EN1418, as in the approved methodology AM0034
- (c) Not accept revision AM_REV_0020 concerning AM0009 to expand the applicability to other possible uses for flared gas.
- (d) Not accept revision AM_REV_0021 concerning AM0029, where the project participants have requested to amend the name in the source section of the approved methodology. The ‘source’ section of an approved methodology is based on information included in the CDM-PDD section titled “Date of completion of the application of the baseline study and monitoring methodology and the name of the responsible person(s)/entity(ies)” of draft CDM-PDD submitted by project participants when proposing a new methodology. The Board may wish to clarify that only the information provided in the above mentioned section of the CDM-PDD be included in the ‘source’ section of the approved methodology and provide further guidance, if needed.

Background: Information on the revisions to methodologies is available on the UNFCCC CDM website (<<http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/Revisions>>). The revised approved methodology AM0028 is referred to in paragraph 13 and is provided in annex 9 of the Meth Panel report (MP22). The work on the requests for revision AM_REV_0018 concerning ACM0002 and AM_REV_014, AM_REV_015, and AM_REV_019 all related to approved methodology ACM0006 could not be concluded due to time constraints and will be considered at the next meeting of the Meth Panel.

Revisions of approved methodologies:

12. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to consider and agree to the revisions of the following methodologies, as contained in the annexes 7 and 8 Meth Panel report (MP22):

- (a) **AM0025:** to incorporate the scope of the approved methodology AM0012. The draft revised methodology is now applicable to project activities that use anaerobic digestion to treat municipal solid waste, which in absence of the project activity would have been disposed in a landfill and are implemented in country which have mandatory regulation to treat the biodegradable part of the municipal solid waste before disposing the waste in a landfill, but the regulation is not implemented.
- (i) The draft revised methodology includes a reference to the draft Methodological Tool to determine methane emissions avoided from dumping waste at a solid waste disposal site in which the parameters used in the equation to estimate baseline



methane emissions were updated in accordance with the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories. The Board may therefore wish to first consider the draft Methodological Tool proposed in paragraph 17 below.

- (ii) Furthermore, the Board may wish to withdraw the approved methodology AM0012 as agreed at its twenty fourth meeting after the revision of approved methodology AM0025.

- (b) **AM0027:** to clarify the applicability to project activities where the generation of CO₂ from fossil or mineral sources in the baseline is only for the purpose of producing CO₂ used for the production of inorganic compounds and there is no energy by-product of CO₂ production from fossil source and its consumption in the baseline.

Background: The Board, at its twenty-fourth meeting, requested the Meth Panel to revise the approved methodology AM0025 by integrating the approved methodology AM0012. Furthermore, the Board at its twenty-fifth meeting requested the Meth Panel to compare the consistency of the approved methodology AM0027 and the proposed draft small scale indicative methodology III.J. In addition, the Board agreed at its twenty-fourth meeting, that after the revision of the approved methodology AM0025, the approved methodology AM0012 shall be withdrawn. Information on the revisions to methodologies are available on the UNFCCC CDM website (<<http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/Revisions>>).

Consolidation of approved methodologies:

13. **Action:** The Board may wish to consider and approve the draft consolidated methodology based on AM0006 and AM0016 and withdraw the approved methodologies AM0006 and AM0016.

Background: The Board, at its twenty-fifth meeting, requested the Meth Panel to prepare a draft consolidated methodology based on approved methodology AM0006 and AM0016. It also asked the Meth Panel to take into account the public comments received, in response to a call for inputs launched by the Board at its twenty fourth meeting, and similarly the input by an expert on the approved methodologies AM0006 and AM0016, as agreed by the Board at its twenty-fourth meeting. The Meth Panel prepared a draft consolidated methodology, attached as annex 10 to Meth Panel report (MP22).

General guidance

14. **Action:** The Board may wish to consider a draft on double counting in project activities using blended biofuel for energy use, as contained in annex 11 of the Meth Panel report (MP22).

Background: A number of proposed new methodologies are under consideration by the Meth Panel, particularly for project activities that replace fossil fuel use in transportation sector by using biofuels. The Meth Panel had recommended draft guidance on addressing double counting in such project activities which was discussed by the Board at its twenty fourth meeting. The Meth Panel continued their deliberations on the issue at its twenty first meeting and had informed the Board of the broad approach it planned to undertake. At its twenty second meeting the Meth Panel took into account the issues raised by the Board at its twenty fourth meeting in the proposal by the Meth Panel concerning double counting in blended biofuel methodologies.

15. **Action:** The Board may wish to make a recommendation to COP/MOP taking into consideration the draft recommendation prepared by the Meth Panel based on the qualitative consideration of the Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage (CCS) cases NM0167 and NM0168 and the small scale methodology submission on ocean storage, as contained in annex 12 of the Meth Panel report (MP22).

Background: The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol, at its first session (COP/MOP1) requested the Executive Board to consider proposals for new methodologies for carbon dioxide capture and storage (CCS) as clean development mechanism project



activities with a view to making recommendations to the COP/MOP at its second session, on methodological issues, in particular with regards to project boundary, leakage and permanence. The Board further clarified, at its twenty third meeting, that the Meth Panel shall consider all relevant methodologies, with the possibility to invite technical clarifications from project participants, to provide to the Board a qualitative assessment that the Board shall use to prepare its recommendation on methodological issues related to CCS as CDM project activities, in particular on boundary, permanence and leakage as requested by COP/MOP, for consideration by COP/MOP at its second session. The Meth Panel prepared qualitative assessments of these cases, which are available on the UNFCCC CDM website <http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/publicview.html> and a report where it requests guidance, highlights and issues and suggests possible options. This report was considered by the Board at its twenty fifth meeting and requested the Meth Panel to prepare a revised recommendation, based on the cases NM0167, NM0168 and SSC_038 taking into account the following:

- (a) The experts review of the proposal on a carbon dioxide capture and ocean storage submission for small-scale project activities;
- (b) A provision in the methodologies for adequate procedures for monitoring the actual volume of CO₂ in the reservoir to ensure that emission reductions are real and measurable;
- (c) A provision to ensure project boundary not be limited to the injection site of captured CO₂, but includes the complete physical boundary of the reservoir to ensure monitoring of the seepage from the reservoir; and
- (d) The affect of corrosivity of CO₂ on seepage from reservoir.

The Meth Panel, at its twenty-second meeting, revised the recommendation taking into account the issues and observations made by the Board.

16. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to agree to a proposal on the definitions to distinguish between a “bundle”, a “programme” and a “policy” as well as alternative definitions of a “programme”, as referred in paragraph 26 of the Meth Panel report (MP22) and contained in its annex 13. In particular the Board may want to consider and agree to keeping the definition of “project activity” unchanged, and to add to the already-agreed definition of “bundle”. Furthermore the Board may want to provide clarification with regard to decisions relating to the implementation of 7/CMP.1, in particular:

- (i) whether:
 - implementing a policy or a standard can be eligible under the CDM, and if so, whether this holds for all policies (including mandatory policies or standards); or
 - enforcing a policy or a standard can be eligible under the CDM, and if so, whether this holds for all policies (including mandatory policies or standards).
- (ii) whether a programme of activities:
 - that implements a policy or standard can be eligible under the CDM (risk of perverse incentives versus risk of free riders);
 - that measurably accelerates the enforcement of a policy or standard can be eligible under the CDM (risk of perverse incentives versus risk of free riders).



Background: The Board, at its twenty-fifth meeting, requested the Meth Panel to prepare options and implications of the questions raised in the table of issues and in particular to prepare a list of options for definitions (i.e. bundle and a program), boundary, monitoring, additionality, crediting period (i.e. staggered) and approaches to address a large project bundle and guidance for bundling. The Board also requested the Meth Panel to take into account the public comments received in preparing its recommendation to the Board for consideration at the next meeting of the Board.

The Meth Panel noted that the words “programme” and “policy” are widely used, where various COP decisions or recommendations by the Board on the CDM have referred to “project activities”, “policies” and “bundles”. Decision 7/CMP.1 refers to “project activities under a programme of activities”. The UNFCCC refers to both “programmes” and “policies”. This different wording implies that a “programme” is different from a “policy”, “project activity” and “bundle”. However, in some cases it can be difficult to differentiate between e.g. a “programme” and a “bundle”, or a “programme” and a “policy”. Further, not all these terms have been defined in the UNFCCC context. Definitions are also required for “programme of activities” and “policy” as various definitions can have very different impacts on the scope of possible “programmes” and the potential level of non-additional emission reductions credited as a result of the registration of programmes of activities under the CDM. Furthermore definitions should be consistent with guidance given by the Board on policies and regulations in the baseline scenario.

The Meth Panel agreed to further work on the implications of each definition on the various methodological components as well as validation, registration and verification of such project activities

17. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to approve the draft Methodological Tool to determine methane emissions avoided from dumping waste at a solid waste disposal site, which may be referred to in methodologies, in a similar fashion to referencing the “tool for assessment and demonstration of additionality” in approved methodologies, as contained in annex 14 of the Meth Panel report (MP22).

18. ► **Action:** The Board also may wish to agree to one of two options in the draft Tool:

Option 1: credit emission reductions for waste disposed during the year y, at end of year y+1, which is consistent with the IPCC 2006 guidelines.

Option 2: credit emission reductions for waste disposed during the year y, at end of year y, which is consistent with the formulae in the current approved version of the methodology AM0025.

Background: In order to further improve the consistency between methodologies and to facilitate the development of new baseline and monitoring methodologies, the Meth Panel agreed to develop A “*catalogue of methodological components*” (methodological modules), which project participants could draw upon when developing new baseline and monitoring methodologies, by making cross-references to these methodological components. The Meth Panel considered a draft version of three methodological modules, viz., first order decay method for estimating methane emissions from waste disposed in landfill sites; estimation of combined margin emission factor for an electricity grid; and estimation of methane flare efficiency. The models provide a standard structure that can be used in any proposed methodology, thus enabling consistency across submissions.

The approach of the proposed Tool is based on the approved methodology AM0025, with parameters used in the equation to estimate baseline methane emissions, updated in accordance with the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories. The Meth Panel also noted that the new parameters, may increase or decrease the calculated emissions, depending on the composition of the waste

19. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to confirm the nomination by the Meth Panel of Mr. Braulio Pikman member of the Meth Panel, to participate as a representative in the A/R WG meetings. The Board may wish to also thank Mr. Lambert Schneider for his dedication and service to the A/R WG.



Background: The Board, at its eighteenth meeting, requested the Meth Panel to nominate a representative of the panel to participate in the meetings of the A/R WG in order to ensure consistency between methodology recommendations. The Meth Panel at its sixteenth meeting had nominated Mr Lambert Richard Schneider to participate in the A/R WG meetings, who after 18 months of excellent work requested to be relieved of this responsibility.

20. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to take note that the Meth Panel postponed six agenda items at its twenty-second meeting due to a lack of time. These included: (i) the use of IPCC carbon emission values for fuels; (ii) proposal on leakage from replacement of old equipment; (iii) proposal on the consideration of upstream emissions; (iv) proposal on the consideration of CDM projects in the estimation of emissions factors; (v) draft guidance on the reasons for consolidations and revisions of approved methodologies (vi) a report prepared by an expert on addressing uncertainty in the estimation of emission reductions.

Further schedule:

21. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to take note that the twenty third Meth Panel meeting is to take place on 9 - 11 October 2006. The Meth Panel meeting will take place over three days with no informal day but instead a mid-meeting working day in order to complete in meeting tasks.

Background: Due to the close proximity of the next (twenty third) meeting of Meth Panel, the Meth Panel exceptionally recommended that technical clarifications to preliminary recommendations proposed at the Meth Panel at the twenty second meeting, will only be considered at the twenty-fourth meeting of the Meth Panel and not as per the procedures for submission and consideration of proposed new methodologies.

For notification by the Board

22. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to take note that the Meth Panel will undertake work on preparing a module for estimating emissions from cultivation of biomass and draft guidance for consideration of pre-project activities for cultivation of biomass with in the project activity.

Background: The Meth panel observed, while considering proposed new methodologies for project activities where biomass is produced within the project activity either for power generation or for production of biofuels, that emissions related to cultivation of biomass are not consistently treated across the proposed new methodologies. The Meth Panel would therefore undertake work on preparing a module for estimating emissions from cultivation of biomass to develop draft guidance for consideration of pre-project activities for cultivation of biomass with in the project activity.

23. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to take note that the Meth Panel continued its work in the developing a streamlined combined tool to account for all potential scenarios while maintaining simplicity and agreed to further work on the tool with the view to providing a final proposal to the Board at its twenty-third meeting.

Background: As requested by the Board at its twenty-fourth meeting, the Meth Panel considered expert proposals on the merging of the latest version of the “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality” (additionality tool) and the draft baseline decision tool (combined tool), taking into account improvements as provided in the public inputs and an analysis of the use of additionality tool in project activities, which have been registered or requested registration.

(c) Issues relating to afforestation and reforestation project activities

24. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to take note of the report on the work of the tenth meeting of the Afforestation and Reforestation Working Group (A/R WG) and an oral report by its Chair, Mr. Phillip Gwage, on the work of the group.



Background: The A/R WG held its tenth meeting (A/R WG 10) in Bonn (Germany) from 29 to 30 August 2006.

The A/R WG expressed its deep appreciation to the outgoing Vice-Chair of the A/R WG, Mr. Masaharu Fujitomi, and the outgoing representative of the Methodology Panel, Mr. Lambert Schneider for their outstanding dedication and support to the working group, and welcomed Mr. Akihiro Kuroki, as the new Vice-Chair of the A/R WG.

The A/R WG dealt with case specific issues as well as general issues related to process and methodological clarifications, as specified below.

Case specific

25. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to agree to the recommendation provided by the A/R WG on the following cases as referred in paragraph 8 of the A/R WG report (A/R WG 10):

- (a) Not to approve cases ARNM012-rev and ARNM0027 that, if revised taking into account comments, can be resubmitted but will require new expert and public input;
- (b) Approve case ARNM0019, as contained in the annex 1 of the A/R WG report (A/R WG 10);
- (c) Forward cases ARNM0015, ARNM0020, ARNM0021 and ARNM0024, for revision to the project participants and for resubmission without the need for further experts and public input. If project participants wish to have the revised proposals considered at the eleventh meeting of the A/R WG (5 to 6 December 2006), they shall submit them **by 30 October 2006**.

Background: Information on methodologies currently under consideration by the Board and the Meth Panel are available on the UNFCCC CDM website (<http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/ARmethodologies/publicview.html>).

Revisions of approved methodologies

26. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to approve the revised A/R approved methodology - AR-AM0003, as contained in the annex 2 of the A/R WG report (A/R WG 10), which further clarifies the monitoring of the boundary of proposed A/R CDM project activities to reflect a literal application of the definition of project boundary and to correct the formula for the calculation of leakage due to the displacement of fuel wood collection.

Background: In a response to request by a member of the A/R WG, the A/R WG considered and recommended to revise the approved methodology. Information on the revisions to A/R methodologies are available on the UNFCCC CDM website.

27. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to approve the revised approved SSC A/R methodology - AR-AMS0001, as contained in the annex 3 of the A/R WG report (A/R WG 10), which corrected the equation for estimation of the belowground biomass and include some minor editorial changes.

Background: In a response to request by a member of the A/R WG, the A/R WG considered and recommended to revise the approved small scale A/R methodology. Information on the revisions to A/R methodologies are available on the UNFCCC CDM website.

*General guidance*

28. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to revise the procedures to define the eligibility of lands for afforestation and reforestation project activities and its title, as contained in annex 4 of the A/R WG report (A/R WG 10).

Background: The A/R WG noted that project participants faced difficulties in applying the existing procedures. The revised procedures provides more practical guidance to project participants on how to demonstrate the eligibility of lands and further clarifies the application of the definition of forest, consistent with the specifications in the IPCC Good Practice Guidance for LULUCF.

29. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to revise the forms: Project Design Document Form for Afforestation and Reforestation Project Activities (CDM AR-PDD), Proposed New Baseline and Monitoring Methodologies for A/R (CDM-AR-NM) and the Guidelines For Completing the Project Design Document for A/R and the Proposed New Methodology for A/R, as contained in annexes 5, 6 and 7, respectively, of the A/R WG report (A/R WG 10).

Background: The A/R WG noted the recent revision of the equivalent forms used by the Meth Panel as approved by the Board. The recommended revisions to the A/R CDM forms reflect these recent developments and assist in making more transparent the selection of an approved methodology for a proposed A/R CDM project activity.

For notification by the Board

30. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to take note that the A/R WG considered a proposal on guidance on emissions of indirect N₂O from fertilizer application consistent with the specifications in the IPCC Good Practice Guidance for LULUCF. The A/R WG recommended that only direct, and not indirect, emissions of N₂O from application of fertilizer within the project boundary shall be accounted for in A/R project activities. If the only source of N₂O emissions from leakage activities is due to the application of fertilizer in nurseries supplying seedlings to the A/R project activity, any leakage emissions of N₂O (either direct or indirect) can be considered negligible.

Further schedule

31. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to note that the next meeting of the A/R WG is to take place on **5 to 6 December 2006** taking into account the schedule of the Board.

32. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to note that the deadline for the **twelfth round of submissions** of proposed new A/R baseline and monitoring methodologies is **18 December 2006**.

Background: The tentative schedule for meetings in 2006/2007 will be available at the UNFCCC CDM website at <<http://cdm.unfccc.int/Panels/ar>>.

(d) Issues relating to small-scale CDM project activities

33. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to take note of the report of the seventh meeting of the working group to assist the Executive Board in reviewing proposed methodologies for small-scale CDM project activities (the SSC WG) and of an oral report by its Chair, Ms. Gertraud Wollansky, on the progress of the group.

**Case specific**

34. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to create a new category for project activities avoiding fossil fuel combustion for carbon dioxide production to be used as raw material for industrial processes as contained in annex 1 of these annotations.

Background: The Board had requested the SSC WG to revise the draft category SSC III.J taking into account the situation where the CO₂ in the baseline is produced as a by-product and the other by-product is used for energy generation purposes. In this regard the Board had also requested the Meth Panel to conduct a consistency check of the corresponding large scale methodology AM0027 and to provide a recommendation to the SSC WG and to the Board, if required. The SSC WG agreed to consider the recommendation of the Meth Panel electronically and based on that input to prepare its recommendations to the Board at its twenty sixth meeting.

35. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to confirm that the SSC WG is to refrain from considering submissions relating to the saving non-renewable biomass until such time as the Board, and/or the COP/MOP, provide relevant guidance.

Background: The SSC WG has received two submissions (SSC_056 and SSC_061) requesting creation of new categories for saving non-renewable biomass. The Board at its twenty-third and twenty-fifth meetings had considered the recommendations of the SSC WG proposing the creation of new categories for project activities saving non-renewable biomass. The Board did not approve these proposed draft methodologies as reflected in its twenty-fifth meeting report. The SSC WG therefore did not consider these submissions.

Revisions of approved methodologies:

36. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to approve the revised AMS I.D to clarify the eligibility limits of project activities adding renewable energy capacity, as contained in annex 1 of the SSC WG report (SSC WG07). Further the Board may wish to clarify that the revision will only affect project activities where renewable energy capacity is added to the existing electricity generation capacity.

Background: The SSC WG agreed to recommend a revision of the approved methodology AMS I.D in response to request from DOEs and Project Participants.

General guidance

37. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to consider the proposed definition of “same technology/measure”, for inclusion in the CDM glossary of terms, as follows:

(a) Two different project activities will be considered to be applying the same technology if they provide the same kind of output and use the same kind of equipment and conversion process.

(b) Two different project activities will be considered to be using the same measure if they constitute the same course of action and result in the same kind of effect (e.g. two projects using the same management practice such as fuel switch).

Background: The SSC WG has received a request for clarification (SSC_062) concerning the definition of “same type of technology/measure” in the context of guidelines for determining the occurrence of “debundling”. The request entailed two project activities in a fertiliser production plant using the same methodology (i.e. AMS II.D) where one project activity involves recovering of waste heat from flue gases by preheating the combustion air of the service boiler, while the other uses a plate type heat exchanger to preheat the combustion air of the primary reformer.



38. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to consider the recommendations on revisions to the definitions of small-scale CDM project activities referred to in paragraph 31 of decision 7/CMP.1. The SSCWG proposed two options below and as described in annex 2 of the SSC WG 07 report.

(a) Option 1: Small scale CDM project activities are those “project activities that result in emissions reductions of less than or equal to 60 ktCO₂e/yr”, which is based on the analysis of the maximum emissions reductions estimated under type I projects submitted for registration or registered.

(b) Option 2: Small scale CDM project activities are those:

(i) Renewable energy project activities with a maximum output capacity equivalent of up to 15 megawatts (or an appropriate equivalent);

(ii) Energy efficiency improvement project activities, which reduce energy consumption, on the supply and/or demand side, by up to the equivalent of 40 gigawatt hours (GWh) per year;

(iii) Other project activities that result in emissions reduction of less than or equal to 50 kilotonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent annually;

Background: As requested by the Board at its twenty third meeting and according to additional guidance given at its twenty fifth meeting the SSC WG provided two options as recommendations. The SSC WG was of the view that the main strength of the option 2 is related to the use of verifiable and legally enforceable industry standards, which will result in consistent application of the limits globally at any time.

39. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to request the SSC WG to commission additional expert review of new small scale submissions when deemed necessary by the responsible member of the SSC WG, as reflected in paragraph 20 of the SSC WG report (SSC WG 07).

Background: The SSC WG took note of the increase in the complexity of submissions for creating new indicative small scale methodologies. In view of this and to maintain consistency between approved indicative methodologies for small scale CDM categories, the SSC WG recommends expert review of the new submissions.

40. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to recommend that for the purpose of determination of the ‘maximum output’ of a solar collector a conversion factor of 700 Wth/m² of aperture area of the collector or a maximum limit of 64000 m² collector aperture area shall be used, as detailed in annex 3 of the SSC WG report (SSC WG 07).

Background: As requested by the Board at its twenty fifth meeting the SSC WG recommended a conversion factor for the conversion factor to convert output capacity of the solar collectors to the area of the collector to determine the eligibility of thermal applications of solar energy projects activities, supported by a detailed analysis.

41. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to clarify that wherever the most recent IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories’ are referred to in small scale methodologies, that these be the latest published version of these IPCC guidelines. Should only a pre-publication version be available the Board may wish to provide an effective date for referring to these guidelines..

Background: The SSC WG considered to clarify the meaning of references to IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories in the SSC methodologies and recommended the proposed action.

*For notification by the Board*

42. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to take note of the following items that the SSC WG agreed to bring to the attention of the Board:

(a) The SSC WG considered that the proposed limits for type I and II referred to above, while being appropriate for small scale project activities, might constitute a limitation for sufficient very small renewable energy and energy efficiency project activities to achieve critical mass when bundling. It may be noted that these project activities may have significant sustainable development benefits as well as possible influence on regional balance.

(b) As requested by the Board the SSC WG started developing categories under type III not capped to 25ktCO₂e/yr, particularly focusing its effort on AMS III E. The SSC WG agreed to continue to work in this regard and make recommendations at its next meeting. It also noted that the recommendation of the Board and the decision of the COP/MOP on the recommendation of the SSC WG on the revision of the definition of small scale project activities would have implications on this work in progress.

(c) The SSC WG, as requested by the Board at its twenty-fifth meeting, discussed the revision of the methodology AMS III. I to allow its use in situations where in some months of the year the ambient temperature is below the threshold of 15⁰C. The SSC WG agreed to continue the work on the revision of the methodology taking into account 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories.

Further schedule:

43. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to note that the next meeting of the SSC WG takes place on 5 and 6 December 2006 taking into account the schedule of the Board.

Background: The tentative schedule for meetings in 2006 will be available at:
<http://cdm.unfccc.int/Panels/ssc_wg>.

(e) Matters relating to the registration of CDM project activities

44. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to take stock on the progress of registration.

Background: The information available in the section on “Project Activities” on the UNFCCC CDM website (<<http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects>>), indicates the status of project activities submitted for registration. The main information, as of 12 September 2006, can be summarized as follows:

- (a) Registered CDM project activities: 299 (two hundred and ninety nine);
- (b) Request for registration: 71 (seventy one);
- (c) Request for review: 9 (nine);
- (d) Corrections requested: 4 (four);
- (e) Under review: 7 (seven)
- (f) Rejected CDM project activities: 4 (four)
- (g) Withdrawn: 2 (two).

*Case specific*

45. ► **Action:** The Board shall consider the requests for review of the 9 requests for registration listed in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Projects for which a review has been requested by three of more Board members or one Party involved.

<i>Ref No.</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>
114	Rickli Biomass electricity generation project	?	?	?
401	Imbituva Biomass Project	?	?	?
447	Generation of electricity from 6.25 MW capacity wind mills by Sun-n-Sand Hotels Pvt. Ltd at Soda Mada Rajasthan	?	?	?
410	Cosipar Renewable Electricity Generation Project	?	?	?
446	PetroSA Biogas to Energy Project	?	?	?
427	Electricity generation at 8 MW captive power plant using enthalpy of flue gases from blast furnace	?	?	?
443	Capex S.A. – Agua del Cajón thermal power plant – open to combined cycle conversion	?	?	?
474	Aços Villares Natural gas fuel switch project	?	?	?
505	Methane recovery and power generation in a distillery plant	?	?	?

Background: Three (3) or more members of the Executive Board or a Party involved requested a review of the requests for registration of the cases listed in Table 1 above. In accordance with “Procedures for review referred to in paragraph 41 of the modalities and procedures for a clean development mechanism”, for each case the Board shall decide whether to register the project activity as requested (case A in Table 1), request that changes be made in the project documentation prior to registration (case B in Table 1), or undertake a review (case C in Table 1). If the Board agrees to undertake a review of these requests for registration it shall also decide on the scope of the review and the composition of the review team for each case.

46. ► **Action:** The Board shall consider the recommendations of the Review teams for the seven (7) project activities listed in Table 2 which were placed under review at EB25.

Table 2: Projects which were placed “Under review” at EB25

<i>Ref No.</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>
304	GACL Blended Cement Projects in India	?	?	?
315	125 MW Wind Power Project in Karnataka, India	?	?	?
323	Krubong Melaka LFG Collection & Energy Recovery CDM Project	?	?	?
358	Rosslyn Brewery Fuel- Switching Project	?	?	?
372	7.5 MW Biomass (Mustard crop residue) based	?	?	?



	Power Project at RIICO Industrial area, Rajasthan by M/s Amrit Environmental Technologies Pvt. Ltd.			
400	2x5 Radhanagari Hydro Electric Project	?	?	?
396	Satyamaharshi 6 MW Biomass Power Project	?	?	?

Background: At its twenty-fifth meeting the Board decided to place the project activities identified in Table 2 above under review. In each case a review has been conducted by a review team and recommendations have been circulated to the Board. In accordance with the “Procedures for review referred to in paragraph 41 of the modalities and procedures for a clean development mechanism”, for each case the Board shall decide whether to register the project activity (case A in Table 2), to request the DOE and project participants to make corrections (case B in Table 2), or to reject the project activity (case C in Table 2).

47. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to provide guidance in relation to requests for deviation submitted by DOEs.

Background: At its twenty-fifth meeting the Board referred one (1) request for deviation to the Methodologies Panel. The Methodologies Panel agreed to recommendations for consideration by the Executive Board with respect to this request. In addition, 4 request(s) for deviation have been submitted by a DOE to the Board since its twenty-fifth meeting for consideration by the Board at its twenty-sixth meeting.

Registration procedure:

48. ► **Action:** The Board shall select ten members for the Registration and Issuance Team (RIT), taking fully into account the consideration of regional balance.

Background: The Board agreed to the revised terms of reference and procedures for a Registration and Issuance Team to assist Board members in their task to consider requests for registration of projects and issuance of CERs submitted to the Board by DOEs, as contained in annex 43 of EB 25 Report. The revision pertains to, *inter alia*, the increase of the number of members to 20 based on applications to a public call for experts with a deadline of 8 September 2006, with 39 applications received. The secretariat compiled a list of applications received and a short list of applicants for consideration by the Board.

49. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to take note of the compilation of electricity grid emission factors prepared by the secretariat and provide feedback, as appropriate.

Background: At its twenty-fifth meeting the Board requested the secretariat to prepare a compilation of electricity grid emission factors used in the PDDs of project activities registered to date. This compilation will be made available to the Board before its twenty-sixth meeting.

(f) Matters relating to the issuance of certified emission reductions and the CDM registry

50. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to take stock on the progress of issuance and the operation of the CDM registry.

Background: The information available in the section on “Issuance of CERs” on the UNFCCC CDM website (<http://cdm.unfccc.int/Issuance>), indicates the status of request for issuance. The main information, as of 12 September 2006, can be summarized as follows:

- (a) CERs Issued: 67 issuances, aggregate 14,445,133 CERs
- (b) Requests for Issuance: 8 requests, 1,612,347 aggregate CERs
- (c) Requests for review: 5 requests, 187,311 aggregate CERs



- (d) Under review: 3 requests, 1,526,304 aggregate CERs

Case specific

51. ► **Action:** The Board shall consider requests for review of the 5 requests for issuance listed in Table 3.

Table 3: Requests for issuance for which a review has been requested by three or more Board members.

Ref. no.	Title	No. of CERs	A	B
150	AWMS GHG Mitigation Project, MX05-B-07, Sonora, México	3 301	?	?
163	AWMS GHG Mitigation Project, MX05-B-09, Nuevo León, México	2 345	?	?
075	Clarion 12MW (Gross) Renewable Sources Biomass Power Project	47 716	?	?
085	Hapugastenne and Hulu Ganga Small Hydropower Projects	107 008	?	?
198	San Jacinto Tizate geothermal project	26 941	?	?

Background: Three (3) or more Board members requested a review of the requests for issuance listed in Table 3 above. In accordance with the “Procedures for review referred to in paragraph 65 of the modalities and procedures for a clean development mechanism”, for each case the Board shall decide whether to instruct the CDM registry administrator to issue the requested CERs (case A in Table 3) or to undertake a review of the request for issuance (case B in Table 3). If the Board agrees to undertake a review of these requests for issuance it shall also decide on the scope of the review and the composition of the review team for each case.

52. ► **Action:** The Board shall consider the recommendations of the Review teams for the three (3) requests for issuance listed in Table 4 which were placed under review at EB25.

Table 4: Requests for issuance which were placed “Under review” at EB25

Ref. no.	Title	No. of CERs	A	B	C
0183	“Optimal Utilization of Clinker” project at Shree Cement Limited (SCL), Beawar, Rajasthan	293 299	?	?	?
0164	Bandeirantes Landfill Gas to Energy Project (BLFGE)	1 189 657	?	?	?
0341	6.5 MW biomass based (rice husk) power generation by M/s Indian Acrylics Ltd. and replacement of electrical power being imported from state electricity grid/ surplus power supply to grid.	43 348	?	?	?

Background: At its twenty-fifth meeting the Board decided to place the project activities identified in Table 4 above under review. In each case a review has been conducted by a review team and recommendations have been circulated to the Board. In accordance with the “Procedures for review referred to in paragraph 65 of the modalities and procedures for a clean development mechanism”, for each case the Board shall decide whether to approve the proposed issuance of CERs (case A in Table 4), to request the DOE to make corrections based on the findings from the review before approving the issuance of CERs (case B in Table 4), or to decline to approve the proposed issuance of CERs. (case C in Table 4).



General Guidance

53. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to adopt procedures to facilitate the changes in monitoring plans of registered CDM project activities in accordance with paragraph 57 of the modalities and procedures of the CDM, as contained in annex 2 to these annotations.

Background: The Board, at its twenty-fifth session, requested the secretariat to prepare draft procedures to facilitate the changes in monitoring plans of registered CDM project activities in accordance with paragraph 57 of the modalities and procedures of the CDM for consideration by the Board at its twenty-sixth meeting.

(g) Modalities for collaboration with the Subsidiary Bodies

54. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to (a) take note of progress on the issues related to HFC23 and International Transaction Log (ITL), as appropriate.

Background: Noting decision 8/CMP.1 the SBSTA had invited Parties, admitted observers and relevant intergovernmental organizations to submit to the secretariat, by 4 August 2006, their inputs elaborating practical solutions to address the implications of the issuance of certified emission reductions (CERs) for the destruction of hydrofluorocarbon-23 (HFC-23) at new hydrochlorofluorocarbon-22 (HCFC-22) facilities, which may lead to higher global production of HCFC-22 and/or HFC-23 than would otherwise occur, and that the clean development mechanism (CDM) should not lead to such increases. These inputs, contained in document FCCC/SBSTA/2006/MISC.11 will be considered by the SBSTA at its twenty-fifth session with a view to preparing a draft decision providing guidance to the Executive Board of the CDM for adoption by the COP/MOP at its second session (November 2006).

With regard to the International Transaction Log (ITL), the secretariat during the month of August has awarded the contract to build the electronic infrastructure required for settling emission trades under the Kyoto Protocol. The ITL is scheduled to become fully operational by April 2007 and the CDM registry will be the first one to be tested and connected.

4. Management plan and resources for the work on the CDM

55. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to: (a) following the one-day retreat that preceded this meeting of the Board, consider and eventually formally approve suggestions and recommendations for a revised CDM-MAP to cover 2007 including specifications for operational needs to become more Executive as well as the development of management indicators for the Board's work, (b) take note of the report by the secretariat on the status of resources; (c) consider in particular the revenue received from the share of proceeds for administrative expenses determined in 7/CMP.1 with a view to accruing resources to cover administrative expenses for operational functions as of 2008; (d) discuss, based on a proposal from the Secretariat, new arrangements for the payment of the Board's travel, remuneration and local support, (e) indicate its appreciation to Parties which have generously contributed resources for the work on the CDM; (f) alert Parties to the need for endowing the CDM, in a timely fashion, with resources for its activities in the 2006-2007 including by the conversion of pledges into contributions; (g) take further action, as necessary.

Background: The Board, at its twenty-fifth meeting, took note of information provided by the secretariat on the status of resources in 2006 as at 21 July 2006 which indicated a total income of USD 9.22 million received since 1 January 2006. Since July 2006, contributions have been received from Portugal (USD 38,163) and from 5 applicant entities (USD 67,457) bringing the total income to USD 9.33 million (as of 7 September 2006). The Board took also note that, with a view to accruing resources to cover administrative expenses for operational functions as of 2008, the total income received from 1 January 2006 to 21 July 2006 amounted to USD 6.16 million. Since July 2008, a further USD 1.81 million was received from 37 project registration fees, USD 6,945 from 7 methodologies fees and USD 259,483 from the SOP



bringing the total resources available to USD 8.54 million (as of 7 September 2006). This represents an operating cushion of approx. 10 months of expenditure currently foreseen to support the CDM process in 2008. If the same level of share of proceed and of fees for project registration can be expected till the end of 2007, the operating cushion would amount to approx. 2 years of expenditure providing the CDM support a stable and sound basis of operation as implicitly provided for in decision 7/CMP.1.

Resource requirements for supporting the work on the CDM in the biennium 2006-2007 currently amount to USD 22.63 million. Of this amount, USD 4.56 million are included in the proposed UNFCCC programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007. The remaining USD 18.07 million would need to be covered from supplementary resources. As a result of the above income, the gap in supplementary resources for the remainder of the biennium 2006-2007 amounts to USD 8.67 million for the biennium 2006-2007.

5. Other matters

(a) Catalogue of decisions

56. **Action:** The Board may wish to agree to the draft design of the catalogue of decisions prepared by the secretariat, as contained in annex 3 of this annotations and request the secretariat to proceed with the implementation process.

Background: The COP/MOP, at its first session, requested the Board through its decision 7/CMP.1, to develop a catalogue of, and user's guide to, its decisions, including on clarifications and guidance provided, to facilitate accessibility to information. The secretariat with the assistance of a consultant prepared a draft design seeking input from stakeholders and from examples of other catalogues. The secretariat is preparing for implementation of the catalogue of decision with the design features as proposed and can adjust this planning, as necessary.

(b) Relations with Designated National Authorities

57. **Action:** The Board may wish to note the status of preparation for the first meeting of the CDM DNA Forum to be held on 27 - 28 October 2006 in Bonn, Germany, in conjunction with twenty-seventh meeting of the Board and that it will avail itself for an interaction with forum on 28 October 2006 in the morning.

Background: The COP/MOP at its first session requested the Board, in relation to regional distribution and capacity-building, to broaden the participation in the CDM, including through meetings with a designated national authorities forum in a regular basis in conjunction with meetings of COP/MOP and its subsidiary bodies. The Board, at its twenty-third meeting, agreed to establish the CDM DNA forum and requested the secretariat to provide support to this forum. The secretariat will provide an oral update regarding the status of preparation of the forum.

(c) Regional distribution of project activities²

58. **Action:** The Board may wish to consider the analysis, contained in annex 4, prepared by the secretariat of the submissions received from Parties and in response to its own call for public input on the regional distribution of CDM project activities, with a view to preparing its recommendation on regional distribution of CDM project activities for consideration by COP/MOP 2.

Background: By its Decision 7/CMP.1 (paragraph 32), COP/MOP 1 requested Parties to submit to the secretariat, by 31 May 2006, their views on systematic or systemic barriers to the equitable distribution of clean development mechanism project activities and options to address these barriers, for consideration by COP/MOP 2. Such submissions from Parties are contained in document FCCC/KP/CMP/2006/MISC.1. By

² Statistics relating to registered CDM project activities can be found at <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Statistics>



its Decision 7/CMP.1 (paragraph 33), COP/MOP 1 also requested the Board to report to COP/MOP 2 information on systematic or systemic barriers to the equitable regional and subregional distribution of clean development mechanism project activities, and options to address such issues. The Board also opened a public call for inputs on regional distribution of CDM project activities in March 2006³. The secretariat was requested to prepare an analysis of the above-mentioned submissions and inputs for consideration by the Board at its twenty-sixth meeting.

(d) Relations with Designated Operational and Applicant Entities

59. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to (a) to take note of the report by the Chair of the forum; and (b) provide feedback to the forum, as appropriate.

Background: Views on issues to be addressed to the Board by the CDM DOE/AE Coordination Forum are being sought from the DOEs and AEs. The Chair of the forum will present these orally to the Board for its consideration at the twenty-fifth meeting.

(e) Relations with stakeholders, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations

60. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to (a) agree to avail itself for informal briefings with registered observers in the afternoon of 29 September 2006; and (b) invite members and alternates to share information on events in which they participated.

Background: On the occasion of its twenty-fifth meeting, the Chair and other members of the Board met with registered observers for an informal briefing.

Board members and alternates continued receiving communications from the public and invitations to participate in CDM-related events.

(f) Other business

61. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to take note of communications submitted by the public and agree on any actions, as appropriate.

Background: At its twenty-first meeting the Board agreed on procedures for public communication with the CDM Executive Board as contained in annex 27 to its report. These procedures shall be followed with respect to all unsolicited submissions.

The Board has received the following communications from DOEs/AES and the general public prior to the twenty-sixth meeting of the Board:

- (a) Letter from Mr. Frits Welling from Van der Wiel Stortgas BV in Drachten, The Netherlands, related to methodologies issues and sent to the Board on 6 July 2006;
- (b) Letter from Mr. Andrei Marcu from International Emissions Trading Association (IETA) in Geneva, Switzerland, related to methodologies issues and sent to the Board on 6 July 2006;
- (c) Letter from Mr. Andrei Marcu from International Emissions Trading Association (IETA) in Geneva, Switzerland, related to methodologies issues in small-scale projects and sent to the Board on 6 July 2006;
- (d) Letter from Mr. Ben Richardson from MDL Ambiente in London, United Kingdom, related to methodologies issues and sent to the Board on 6 July 2006

³ Submissions from the public can be viewed at <http://cdm.unfccc.int/public_inputs/reg_distri>



- (e) Letter from Mr. Henk Sa, EcoSecurities in The Hague, The Netherlands, related to methodologies issues and sent to the Board on 6 July 2006;
- (f) Letter from Mr. Leo S. Perkowski from AgCert International in Dublin, Ireland, related to methodologies issues and sent to the Board on 11 July 2006;
- (g) Letter from Mr. Lasse Ringius from World Bank, related to methodologies issues, and sent to the Board on 11 July 2006;
- (h) Letter from Ms. Berverly Plum, Solar Cookers International in Granada, Spain, related to small-scale issues and sent to the Board on 18 May 2006;
- (i) Letter from Letter from Triveni Engineering and Industries Limited (TEIL) in Khatauli, India, through Mr. Michael.Rumberg, TÜV SÜD in Germany related to methodologies issues and sent to the Board on 18 July 2006;
- (j) Letter from Mr. Jorge Cortina, Gamesa Energia in Madrid, Spain, through Mr. Eduardo García related to registration of a project activity and sent to the Board on 18 July 2006;
- (k) Letter from Mr. Albrecht von Ruffer, N Serve in Hamburg, Germany, through TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH related to methodologies issues and sent to the Board on 18 July 2006;
- (l) Letter below by Mr. Guillermo Calderon Aguilera from Metrobus, Gobierno Del Distrito Federal in Mexico related to methodologies issues and sent to the Board on 18 July 2006;
- (m) Letter from Mr. Jürg Grütter from Grütter consulting sent to the Board on 27 July 2006;
- (n) Letter from the Designated National Authority (DNA) of Spain related to the submission of letters of approval in Spanish sent to the Board on 2 August 2006;
- (o) Letter from Mr. G.J. Eenhorn, WorldWide Recycling, Voorst, The Netherlands, through SGS Climate Change Programme, related to methodologies issues letter and sent to the Board on 15 August 2006;
- (p) Letter from Ms. Belinda Kinkead, EcoSecurities Ltd in Oxford, United Kingdom related to small-scale issues and sent to the Board on 22 August 2006;
- (q) Letter from Mr. Hussein Bagirov, Minister of Ecology and Natural Resources of the Republic of Azerbaijan sent through World Bank related to small-scale issues and sent to the Board on 23 August 2006;
- (r) Letter from Ms. Belinda Kinkead, EcoSecurities, Oxford, United Kingdom, related to validation and verification services from DOEs and sent to the Board on 12 September 2006.
62. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to consider any other business it deems necessary.

5. Conclusion of the meeting

63. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to adopt the report of the twenty-sixth meeting.

Background: The Chair will summarize the meeting and adopt the report, including references to any decisions taken.
