



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

Date: 16 February 2007
Ref: CDM-EB-29

EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE CLEAN DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM

TWENTY-NINTH MEETING

Report

Date of meeting: 14 – 16 February 2007

Location: Bonn, Germany

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

Member	Alternate
Ms. Ulrika Raab ²	Ms. María José Sanz ²
Mr. Hernán Carlino ¹	Mr. Philip M. Gwage ¹
Mr. Akihiro Kuroki ²	Ms. Jeanne-Marie Huddleston ²
Mr. Samuel Adejuwon ²	Mr. Kamel Djemouai ²
Mr. Xuedu Lu ¹	Mr. Richard Muyungi ¹
Ms. Christiana Figueres ²	Mr. José Domingos Miguez ²
Mr. Rawleston Moore ¹	Ms. Desna M. Solofa ¹
Ms. Anastasia Moskalenko ¹	Ms. Natalia Berghi ¹
Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sethi ²	Ms. Liana Bratasida ²
Mr. Hans Jürgen Stehr ¹	Mr. Lex de Jonge ¹

¹ Term: Two years (elected at COP/MOP 1 in 2005)

² Term: Two years (elected at COP/MOP 2 in 2006)

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

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

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

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

1. The Executive Board of the clean development mechanism (CDM) (hereinafter referred to as the Board) elected Mr. Hans Jürgen Stehr and Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sethi as Chair and Vice-Chair, respectively, of the Executive Board until the first meeting of the Board in 2008.
2. On behalf of the Board, the new Chair expressed deep appreciation to the outgoing Chair, Mr. José Domingos Miguez, and Vice-Chair, Mr. Hans Jürgen Stehr, for their excellent leadership during the fifth year of the Board's operations.
3. The Chair welcomed new members and alternates and took note of their oaths of service.
4. No conflict of interest was identified by any member or alternate member present at the meeting.
5. The Board noted that the secretariat was informed that Mr. Kamel Djemouai was unable to attend the meeting and had provided proper justification for his absence.

Agenda item 2. Adoption of the agenda

6. The Board adopted the agenda as proposed and agreed to the programme of work.

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

7. The Executive Board expressed its deep appreciation to the Chair, Mr. Hernán Carlino, and Vice-Chair, Ms. Anastasia Moskalenko, of the CDM Accreditation Panel (CDM-AP), for their outstanding dedication and support to the panel and agreed that they continue to work in the panel.
8. The Board took note of the sixteenth progress report on the work of the CDM accreditation panel (CDM-AP), and an oral report by the Chair, Mr. Hernán Carlino, on the work of the panel. The report summarized information relating to the work of the CDM-AP including the status of applications and developments with respect to desk reviews, on-site assessments, witnessing activities and other accreditation related issues.

General guidance

9. The Board took note of the measures to find out the nature of barriers for the interested entities to apply for accreditation under the CDM, in particular, the survey to be undertaken by the CDM-AP to seek information from regional and national accreditation bodies specifically located in developing countries.
10. The Board considered detailed procedural steps for regular surveillance system under the CDM accreditation process, submitted by the CDM-AP, in response to request of the Board to propose measures to provide incentives to designated operational entities (DOEs) to meet quality standards of the Board other than, and prior to, spot check. The Board adopted these procedures and agreed to include them in the procedure for accrediting operation entities by the Executive Board of the Clean Development Mechanism. The revised accreditation procedure is contained in the [annex 1](#) to this report.
11. The Board considered the new version of the synthesis report of the DOE annual activity reports for 2006 presented by the CDM-AP. The Board, taking into consideration that submission of annual activity reports by the DOEs is obligatory under the CDM modalities and procedures, took note with serious concern that two DOEs have not submitted their reports. The Board agreed to instruct those DOEs to submit their reports with explanations for not submitting within the deadline. The Board also



agreed that if their annual activity reports are not received before the next meeting of the Board, an appropriate action shall be taken against those DOEs.

12. The Board agreed that the experiences gathered recently in validation and verification work by DOEs as well as the accreditation process including spot-checks, re-emphasises the need for the DOEs to work towards the best practices of validation and verification.

13. The Board also requested the CDM-AP to re-visit the accreditation procedures, in particular the procedures for “unscheduled surveillance”, by taking into consideration issues identified through, inter alia, the spot checks in particular how to verify the implementation of the quality management system relating, in particular, the use of technical resources from non-accredited sources. The Board requested the CDM-AP to seek views from the DOE Forum on this work.

14. The Board agreed to open a call for experts starting on **20 February 2007** and ending on **2 April 2007, 17:00 GMT** in order to replace the outgoing members of the CDM-AP with a view to prepare a shortlist of experts for consideration by the Board at its thirty-first meeting. Members currently serving in the CDM-AP may submit their application and be included in the short list. The Board noted that experts appointed to replace CDM-AP members shall, if possible, not come from the same region as the members that remain in office. The Board encourages, however, candidates from all regions to apply.

Case specific

15. The Board took note of the progress of accreditation of the applicant entities, in particular that four DOEs had submitted requests for re-accreditation.

16. The Board agreed, pursuant to decisions 3/CMP.1, to accredit, and provisionally designate, the entity Lloyd’s Register for Quality Assurance (LRQA) (VAL: 13 / VER: none) for the following sectoral scopes:

- (a) 4. Manufacturing industries;
- (b) 5. Chemical industry;
- (c) 6. Construction;
- (d) 7. Transport;
- (e) 10. Fugitive emissions from fuels (solid, oil and gas);
- (f) 11. Fugitive emissions from production and consumption of halocarbons and sulphur hexafluoride;
- (g) 12. Solvents use.

Spot-check cases

17. At its twenty-fourth meeting, the Board decided to undertake a spot check of a DOE and furthermore, at its twenty-eighth meeting to consider an appeal submitted by the same DOE. The Board, taking into consideration the findings of the appeal panel, agreed that the appeal of the DOE was not justified. Furthermore, the Board, taking into consideration the recommendation of CDM-AP on the outcome of the spot-check, noted that the spot check had identified several non-conformities of the DOE regarding both procedural and operational requirements, such as its management and operational structure, contract control, assurance of competencies to perform validation and verification functions and compliance with its own stipulated procedures.



18. The Board decided that the corrective actions related to the non-conformities shall be implemented by the DOE and verified by the CDM assessment team expeditiously. The Board requested the CDM-AP to assess the closure of non-conformities and the implementation of the corrective actions and make a recommendation to the Board. The Board shall consider this at the earliest opportunity in order to reach its final decision.

19. The Board also noted that it will follow this case carefully in order to ensure together with the entity that their performance fully complies with the standards.

20. The Board, in considering a recommendation of the spot-check case of another DOE and after hearing the DOE, decided by the Board at its twenty-sixth meeting, noted that the spot check had identified several non-conformities of the DOE regarding the effective implementation of their system in place, its competencies to perform validation and verification functions, its quality assurance and quality control mechanisms and compliance with the CDM requirements.

21. The Board agreed that the DOE shall undertake corrective actions relating to non-conformities in an expedient manner. The Board decided that implementation of these corrective actions shall be verified by the CDM assessment team expeditiously. The Board requested the CDM-AP to assess the closure of non-conformities and make a recommendation to the Board. The Board shall consider this recommendation in order to reach its final decision.

22. The Board also noted that it will follow this case carefully in order to ensure together with the entity that their performance fully complies with the standards.

23. The Board agreed to consider the case of another DOE, decided by the Board at its twenty-sixth meeting, under spot-check at its thirtieth meeting, to provide the DOE for hearing in person.

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

24. The Board agreed to appoint Mr. Akihiro Kuroki as new Chair and Mr. Xuedu Lu as the Vice-Chair of the Methodologies Panel on baseline and monitoring methodologies (Meth Panel). The Board also appointed Mr. Jose Miguez and Mr. Lex de Jonge to support the Chair and the Vice-Chair.

25. The Executive Board expressed its deep appreciation to the outgoing Chair, Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sethi, and Vice-Chair, Mr. Jean-Jacques Becker, of the Meth Panel, for their outstanding dedication and support to the panel.

26. The Board also appointed Mr. Jean-Jacques Becker to replace the outgoing member Mr. Micheal Lazarus to ensure the continuity of the work of the Meth Panel. The Board expressed its appreciation for the dedication and work done by the outgoing member.

27. The Board took note of the report of the twenty-fifth meeting of the Meth Panel, and an oral report by Chair, Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sethi, on the work of the panel.

Case specific

28. Taking into consideration the inputs by experts (desk reviewers) and the public, the Board agreed to:

(a) **Approve the cases:**

- (i) **AM0046** “Distribution of efficient light bulbs to households” which was proposed as **NM0150-rev**, and (Ghana efficient lighting retrofit project) and link it to scope 3 (Energy demand), as contained in the annex 2 of this report;



- (ii) **NM0178** (Aerobic thermal treatment of municipal solid waste (MSW) without incineration in Parobé - RS), which is integrated into the approved methodology **AM0025**, (see paragraph 19 below);
 - (iii) **AM0047** “Production of waste cooking oil-based biodiesel for use as fuel” which was proposed as **NM0180** (BIOLUX Benji Biodiesel Beijing Project) and link it to scope 1 (Energy industries) and 5 (chemical industries), as contained in the annex 3 of this report; and
- (b) **Possibly reconsider the case: NM0192** subject to:
- (i) Required changes being made by the project participants, taking into account issues raised by the Board, recommendations made by the Meth Panel, and re-submission of a duly revised proposal. The secretariat shall make the revised proposal publicly available upon receipt;
 - (ii) Reconsideration of the revised proposal directly by the Meth Panel, without further review by desk reviewers; and
 - (iii) A recommendation by the Meth Panel being made to the Executive Board.
 - (iv) If project participants wish to have the revised proposals considered at the twenty-sixth meeting of the Meth Panel (26 - 30 March), they shall exceptionally submit them by **26 February 2007** (9:00 GMT).
- (c) **Not to approve** the cases **NM0155-rev**, **NM00157-rev**, **NM0159-rev**, **NM0193**, **NM0196** and **NM0198** which, if revised taking into account comments, can be resubmitted but will require new expert and public input.

Response to requests for clarification of approved methodologies

29. The Board took note of the responses to clarifications provided by the Meth Panel on the following cases:

- (a) **AM_CLA_0035** concerning approved methodology ACM0006 requesting clarification on definition of various terms used in the approved methodology.
- (b) **AM_CLA_0036** concerning approved methodology ACM0006 requesting clarification on definition of various terms used in the approved methodology.
- (c) **AM_CLA_0037** concerning approved methodology ACM0002 requesting clarification on justification that should be provided for not using the dispatch analysis method for estimating operating margin emission factor.

Responses to requests for revisions of approved methodologies

30. The Board agreed to the Meth Panel responses to the request for revisions as follows:

- (a) Not to accept request **AM_REV_0028** concerning approved methodology AM0023 requesting a revision to expand the applicability to include pressure-regulator stations in gas distribution systems and other surface facilities on the gas distribution side besides compressor and gate stations.
- (b) Not to accept request **AM_REV_0030** concerning approved methodology ACM0006 requesting a revision to allow claiming of avoided methane emissions from stockpiling of biomass in the baseline.
- (c) Not to accept request **AM_REV_0031** concerning approved methodology AM0025 requesting the revision to expand the applicability of the approved methodology to project activities that



reduce emissions due to the controlled combustion of fresh waste for energy generation, and the generation of heat which displaces fossil fuel consumption at other (customer's) sites.

(d) Not to accept request **AM_REV_0032** concerning approved methodology ACM0006 requesting a revision to expand the approved consolidated methodology to project activities that represents a new facility for biomass cogeneration plant that utilizes biomass in the baseline and the project scenarios to satisfy in house energy requirements.

(e) Not to accept request **AM_REV_0034** concerning approved methodology ACM0009 requesting the revision to expand the applicability of the approved methodology to project activities that switch fuel from designed/planned use of producer gas fuel in industrial process to natural gas.

Revision of approved methodologies

31. The Board agreed to the revision of the approved methodology **AM0025** to revise the procedure for estimating methane emissions from anaerobic pockets of waste being treated through composting. The revised methodology is contained in annex 4 of this report.

32. The revision referred to in paragraph above will come into effect on 23 February 2007, in accordance with the procedure for the revision of approved methodologies.

General guidance and process

33. The Board agreed to postpone its consideration of the methodological tool avoiding double counting of emission reductions from the production of biofuels to its next meeting.

34. The Board considered the request by the Meth Panel to provide guidance on how to address the issue of shift of pre-project activities in project types that lead to land-use changes with considerable GHG emissions and resultant potential degradation of lands such as deforestation of natural forests. The Board further clarified that project types where shift of pre-project activities can lead to land-use changes, the considerable GHG emissions should be addressed through inclusion of methodological approaches in baseline and monitoring methodologies to estimate the GHG emissions from such land-use changes and requested the Meth Panel to work in collaboration with the A/R WG in developing these approaches.

35. The Board agreed to the revision of the tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality (AT), in response to the request by COP/MOP 1 and COP/MOP 2, as contained in annex 5 of this report. Furthermore in revisiting the issue the Board agreed that the revisions to the AT, and therein explanatory footnotes, now provides sufficient guidance such that the requirement for a brief manual, as agreed by the Board at its twenty-sixth meeting (paragraph 38), is no longer required.

36. The Board encouraged the secretariat to enhance the dialogue with project participants on issues concerning the consideration of methodologies, in accordance with the CDM-MAP, while ensuring equitable and transparent interaction of such, in accordance with request by COP/MOP.2, and report to the Board at its next meeting with a first experience of this new service.

37. Furthermore the Board requested the secretariat to provide the following draft proposals:

(a) Further clarification for project participants to assist them in ascertaining when to request a revision, deviation and/or clarification to an approved methodology, for consideration by the Board at its thirtieth meeting.

(b) An analysis of approved methodologies and proposed new methodology cases that are in the pipeline (non SSC and A/R) to assess the opportunities and potential for consolidation, integration and consistency to ensure that they are in line with the decisions by the Board and the methodological tools, for consideration by the Board at its thirty-first meeting.



38. The Board requests the Meth Panel to provide detailed and clear instruction for revisions of the proposed new methodology to the project participants while preparing recommendation.

39. The Board agreed to open a call for experts starting on **20 February 2007** and ending on **2 April 2007, 17:00 GMT** in order to reconstitute the Meth Panel with a view to prepare a shortlist of experts for consideration by the Board at its thirty-first meeting. Members currently serving in the Meth Panel may re-apply and be included in the short list. The Board noted that experts appointed shall, if possible, not come from the same region as the members that remain in office. The Board encourages, however, candidates from all regions to apply.

Further schedule

40. The Board took note that the twenty-sixth meeting of the Meth Panel is to take place on 26 to 30 March 2007. The Meth Panel meeting will take place over five days with no informal day but instead a mid-meeting working day in order to complete the in meeting tasks.

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

41. The Board agreed to appoint Ms. Marie-Jose Sanz Sanchez, as the new Vice-Chair of the Afforestation and Reforestation Working Group (A/R WG), with Mr. Philip Gwage continuing as the Chair.

42. The Executive Board expressed its deep appreciation to the outgoing Vice-Chair of the A/R WG, Mr. Akihiro Kuroki, for his dedication and support to the working group.

43. The Board took note of the report on the work of the twelfth meeting of the A/R WG and an oral report by its Chair, Mr. Philip M. Gwage, on the work of the group.

Case specific

44. Taking into consideration the inputs by experts and the public and views expressed by the Board, the Board agreed to:

(a) **Approve: AR-AM0006** “Afforestation/Reforestation with Trees Supported by Shrubs on Degraded Land”, which was proposed as ARNM0020-rev (“Afforestation for Combating Desertification in Aohan County, Northern China”) and link it to scope 14 (afforestation and reforestation), as contained in the [annex 6](#) of this report.

(b) **Approve: AR-AM0007** “Afforestation and Reforestation of Land Currently Under Agricultural or Pastoral Use”, which was proposed as ARNM0021-rev (“Chocó-Manabí Corridor Reforestation and Conservation Carbon Project”) and link it to scope 14 (afforestation and reforestation), as contained in the [annex 7](#) of this report.

(c) **Possibly reconsider the case: ARNM0029** subject to:

- (i) Required changes being made by the project participants, taking into account issues raised by the Board, recommendations made by the A/R WG, and re-submission of a duly revised proposal. The secretariat shall make the revised proposal publicly available upon receipt;
- (ii) Reconsideration of the revised proposal directly by the A/RWG, without further review by desk reviewers;
- (iii) A recommendation by the A/R WG being made to the Executive Board;



- (iv) If project participants wish to have the revised proposals considered at the thirteenth meeting of the A/R WG (19 to 21 March, 2007), they shall exceptionally submit them by **26 February 2007, 09:00 GMT**.

(d) **Not to approve case: ARNM0012**-rev that, if revised taking into account comments, can be resubmitted but will require new expert review and public input.

45. The Board noted that the case **ARNM0017** shall be withdrawn in accordance with the procedures for the submission and consideration of a proposed new methodology for afforestation and reforestation project activities under the CDM.

General guidance and process

46. Noting paragraph 4 of the Annex B to the decision 6/CMP.1, which requests the Executive Board to develop simplified baseline methodologies for the small-scale afforestation or reforestation project activities applied on wetlands and settlements, the Board agreed to open a call for public input to seek views on developing the methodologies. The call will start on **20 February 2007** and end on **14 May 2007 @ 09:00 GMT**. The Board also requested the secretariat to prepare a first draft of the proposed methodology, utilizing expertise as required.

47. The Board agreed to open a call for experts starting on **20 February 2007** and ending on **2 April 2007, 17:00 GMT** in order to reconstitute the Afforestation and Reforestation Working Group (A/R WG) with a view to prepare a shortlist of experts for consideration by the Board at its thirty-first meeting. Members currently serving in the A/R WG may re-apply and be included in the short list. The Board noted that experts appointed shall, if possible, not come from the same region as the members that remain in office. The Board encourages, however, candidates from all regions to apply.

Further schedule

48. The Board took note that the thirteenth meeting of the A/R WG is to take place on 19 to 21 March 2007. The A/R WG meeting will take place over two and half days with no informal or in meeting working day.

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

49. The Board agreed to appoint Ms. Ulrika Raab as the new Chair for the Small-Scale Working Group (SSC WG), with Mr. Richard Muyungi continuing as the Vice Chair.

50. The Executive Board expressed its deep appreciation to the outgoing Chair of the SSC WG, Ms. Gertraud Wollansky for her outstanding dedication and to support the working group in the last years.

Case specific

51. The Board agreed to the revised version of AMS III.E as contained in annex 8 if this report. Significant changes include:

- (a) Applicability of the methodology is expanded to include partially degraded waste with three options being provided to calculate methane emissions avoided i.e.
- (i) Based on the weighted average age of the waste; or
 - (ii) Based on the yearly methane generation potential of the disposal site and the relative amount of waste removed from it for combustion; or
 - (iii) Based on the profile of the disposal site and historic waste disposal data.



(b) It is clarified that the methodology is applicable only in cases where it can be demonstrated that organic matter combusted by the project activity would have remained disposed under clearly anaerobic conditions throughout the crediting period in the absence of the project activity.

(c) The revision referred to in paragraphs above will come into effect on 23 February 2007, in accordance with the procedure for the revision of approved methodologies.

52. The Board agreed to open a call for experts starting on **20 February 2007** and ending on **2 April 2007, 17:00 GMT** in order to reconstitute the SSC WG with a view to prepare a shortlist of experts for consideration by the Board at its thirty-first meeting. Members currently serving in the SSC WG may re-apply and be included in the short list. The Board noted that experts appointed shall, if possible, not come from the same region as the members that remain in office. The Board encourages, however, candidates from all regions to apply.

Further schedule

53. The Board noted that the ninth meeting of the SSC WG will take place from 19 to 23 March 2007.

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

54. The Board took note that 506 CDM project activities have been registered by 16 February 2007. The status of requests for registration of project activities can be viewed on the UNFCCC CDM website at <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/>.

Case specific

55. In accordance with the procedures for review as referred to in paragraph 41 of the CDM modalities and procedures, the Board considered a request for review of fifteen (15) requests for registration by DOEs.

56. The Board agreed to register the project activity “India-FaL-G Brick and Blocks Project No.1” (0707) taking note of the initial comments provided by the project participant and the DOE (DNVCert) in response to the request for review.

57. The Board agreed to register, as corrected, the project activity “Yanling Shendu Hydropower Project” (0695) if the revised validation report submitted by the DOE (DNVCert) in response to the request for review is displayed on the UNFCCC CDM website.

58. The Board agreed to register with corrections the project activity/ies:

(a) “Sesa-Waste Heat Recovery Based Power Generation ” (0535) if the DOE (BVQI) and the project participant submit a revised PDD in which the monitoring plan uses the parameters and associated notation as indicated in the approved methodology ACM0004 version 2;

(b) “Methane Recovery and Electricity Generation Project GCM 4” (0610), “Methane Recovery and Electricity Generation Project GCM 20” (0618), “Methane Recovery and Electricity Generation Project GCM 23” (0626), “Methane Recovery and Electricity Generation Project GCM 8” (0644), and “Methane Recovery and Electricity Generation Project GCM 14” (0650), if the DOE (DNVCert) and project participants provide revised PDDs and validation reports which:

- (i) Specify the type of flare to be used by each project activity and how the project participants intend to address the requirement of the approved small-scale methodology AMS-III.D version 9 to monitor the flare efficiency;
- (ii) Provide evidence that these project activities are not debundled components of a large scale project activity by providing GPS coordinates for each digester to be



installed and include a map clearly showing locations of all 29 similar AWMS projects in Mexico submitted for registration by DNVCert;

- (iii) Provide information on digester dimensions, digester biogas output and technical details of electricity generation units to be used by each project activity.

(c) “6 MW Renewable energy generation project by Varam Power Projects in India” (0697) if the DOE (DNVCert) submits a revised validation report of the revised PDD provided by the project participant in response to the request for review;

(d) “Switching fossil fuels in an industrial facility by Indorama Cement Ltd” (0737) if the DOE (SGS) and the project participant further revise the PDD to include calculations of project emissions based on combustion of the waste gas and provide a revised corresponding validation report.

59. After the submission of the specified documentation, the secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the Board, will check the revised documentation before the activity is displayed as registered.

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

(a) “The Godavari Sugar Mills Ltd (TGSML)’s 24 MW Bagasse Based Co-generation Power Project at Sameerwadi” (0577), submitted for registration by the DOE (BVQI), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 9](#) to this report.

(b) “Power generation from the proposed 11.2 MW waste heat recovery boiler at the ISA Smelt furnace of the Copper Smelter, Sterlite Industries India Limited (SIIL), Tuticorin ” (0683), submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV Rheinland), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 10](#) to this report.

(c) “Modification of clinker cooler for energy efficiency improvement in cement manufacturing at Binani Cement Limited” (0685), submitted for registration by the DOE (SGS), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 11](#) to this report.

(d) “Blended Cement Project with Fly Ash – Lafarge India Private Limited” (0715), submitted for registration by the DOE (DNVCert), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 12](#) to this report.

(e) “Uruba Renewable Irrigation Project” (0761), submitted for registration by the DOE (DNVCert), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 13](#) to this report.

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

62. In accordance with the procedures for review as referred to in paragraph 41 of the CDM modalities and procedures, the Board considered the recommendations of the review teams for three (3) of the project activities which were placed “Under review” at the twenty-eighth meeting of the Board.

63. In accordance with the provisions of paragraphs 17 and 18 (a) of the above mentioned procedures, the Board agreed to register the project activity “Bii Nee Stipa III” (0517) taking note of the response provided by the project participant and the DOE (AENOR).

64. In accordance with the provisions of paragraphs 17 and 18 (b) of the above mentioned procedures, the Board agreed to register with corrections the project activity AWMS GHG Mitigation Project MX06-B-32, Aguascalientes, Guanajuato and Michoacán, México” (0463), if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) and project participant submit a revised PDD and validation report, which consider the



continuation of the current situation of discharging into an agricultural channel as the baseline scenario for the sites Palo Blanco II and III.

65. In accordance with the provisions of paragraphs 17 and 18 (c) of the above mentioned procedures, the Board agreed to reject the project activity “Ramirana Emission Reduction Project of Agrícola Super Limitada” (0457), submitted for registration by the DOE (DNVCert), considering that the approved monitoring methodology AM0006 was incorrectly applied to the proposed project activity and the DOE failed to request a deviation from the methodology, therefore the project activity did not meet the requirements stipulated in paragraph 54 of the CDM modalities and procedures.

66. In accordance with the provisions of paragraphs 17 and 18 (b) of the above-mentioned procedures, the Board agreed to register the project activity “Destruction of HFC-23 at refrigerant (HCFC-22) manufacturing facility of Chemplast Sanmar Ltd” (0499), following receipt of the corrected documentation submitted in accordance with the outcome of the Board’s review finalized at its twenty-eighth meeting.

67. The Board considered its rejection of “Cogeneration system based on biomass (rice-husk) replacing oil fired boiler for process steam and generating power for partly replacement of grid power supply to the plant at M/s Indian Acrylics Ltd., District Sangrur, Punjab, India.” (0348) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV Rheinland). The Board noted that the reason for the rejection of the project activity (Paragraph 75 of EB 28 report) was based on an issue on which the DOE and project participant had no opportunity to respond. The Board requested the DOE and the project participant to submit their views on this issue to the secretariat within two weeks. Without prejudging its decision, the Board agreed to consider the response, and take a decision at its next meeting.

Registration procedure

68. The Board agreed to the revised terms of reference prepared by the secretariat for the registration and issuance team (RIT), as contained in [annex 14](#) to this report. These revised terms of reference will take effect from 1 April 2007. The current terms of reference will remain applicable to the operation of the RIT until 31 March 2007.

69. The Board agreed to open an initial call for experts starting on **20 February 2007 and ending on 13 March 2007, 17:00 GMT** with a view to prepare a shortlist of experts for consideration by the Board at its thirtieth meeting in order to appoint the RIT members. Members currently serving in the RIT may re-apply and be included in the short list. The Board noted that experts appointed to replace RIT members shall, if possible, not come from the same region as the members that remain in office. The Board encourages, however, candidates from all regions to apply.

70. Noting that the RIT is comprised of at least 20 members, the Board agreed to open a second call for experts starting on **26 March 2007 and ending on 20 April 2007, 17:00 GMT** with a view to prepare a shortlist of experts for consideration by the Board at its thirty-first meeting in order to appoint additional RIT members.

71. The Board requested Ms. Christiana Figueres and Ms. Jeanne-Marie Huddleston to assess the operation of the registration and issuance team and the evolution of the registration and issuance process to identify for the Board, as appropriate, opportunities to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the system.

72. The Board agreed to adopt version 7 of “Clarifications on the procedures for review referred to in paragraph 41 of the CDM modalities and procedures” as contained in [annex 15](#) of this report.

General guidance



73. The Board considered the issue of withdrawal of project participants from registered project activities and requested the Secretariat to prepare an assessment of the effect of such withdrawals on the rights of Parties involved, in different scenarios.

74. The Board agreed that in cases where project participants are required to calculate a build margin and the specific efficiency data required by an approved methodology is not available they can use the most conservative factor, or the default factors¹, which may be reviewed over time by the Board, whichever is the most conservative. In such cases the project participant must provide, in the PDD, full justification of why the chosen factor is the most conservative. The DOE should confirm the non-availability of the local data and the conservativeness of the factors used in their validation report.

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

75. The Board took note that 31,515,223 CERs have been issued as at 16 February 2007, and that the secretariat, in its capacity as the CDM registry administrator, continues to process requests for opening of holding accounts and for forwarding of CERs. The status of requests for issuance of CERs can be viewed on the UNFCCC CDM website at <<http://cdm.unfccc.int/Issuance>>.

Case specific issues

76. In accordance with the procedures for review as referred to in paragraph 65 of the CDM modalities and procedures, the Board considered a request for review of three (3) requests for issuance.

77. In accordance with paragraph 10 of these procedures the Board agreed to instruct the CDM registry administrator to issue:

(a) 79,049 CERs for “RSCL cogeneration expansion project” (0127), taking note of the initial comments from the DOE (SGS) and project participant in response to the request for review.

(b) 77,294 CERs for “4.5 MW Biomass (low density Crop Residues) based Power Generation unit of Malavalli Power Plant Pvt Ltd.” (0298), taking note of the initial comments from the DOE (DNVCert) and project participant in response to the request for review.

78. In accordance with the clarifications to paragraph 10 of these procedures the Board agreed to instruct the CDM registry administrator to issue CERs for “NorthWind Bangui Bay Project” (0453), following the submission by the DOE (AENOR) and the project participant of a revised monitoring report which incorporates the evidence of calibration of meters as supplied by the project participant in response to the request for review and a corresponding revised verification report.

79. After the submission of the specified documentation, the secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the Board, will check the revised documentation before the CDM registry administrator is instructed to issue any CERs.

80. The Board considered thirty-four (34) requests for deviation related to monitoring reports undergoing verification, agreed to answer thirty-three (33) of them and requested the secretariat to inform the DOEs accordingly. The Board will further consider one deviation at its next meeting.

Issuance procedure

81. The Board agreed to adopt version 4 of “Clarifications on the procedures for review referred to in paragraph 65 of the CDM modalities and procedures” as contained in [annex 16](#) of this report.

¹ As contained in the Board’s response to the request for deviation “Request for guidance: Application of AM0015 (and AMS-I.D)”, available at: <https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/Deviations/index.html>

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

82. In accordance, with decision 1/CMP.2 in relation to the Management plan (CDM-MAP), the Board agreed to continue to keep the CDM MAP under review and make adjustments as necessary to continue ensuring the efficient, cost-effective, transparent and consistent functioning of the clean development mechanism. The Board was informed by the secretariat that the catalogue of decisions will be “road tested” in a first version in March 2007 with the view to become operational by the end of the second quarter 2007.

83. The Board took note of a presentation by the secretariat on the status of income and expenditure, the recent increase in expenditures due to intensive recruitment, a general outlook for the period covering 2006-2007 and the need for the conversion of pledges by Parties for 2006 and 2007 against the background of possibly reaching the level of operating cushion by the end of the second Quarter 2007.

Resources

84. The Board took note of information provided by the secretariat on the status of resources received as reflected in table 1 of [annex 17](#).

85. The Board expressed its appreciation to the Government of Iceland which has generously contributed resources for the work of the CDM and, in light of the recommendation contained in paragraph above, invited Parties which have pledged resources to convert them into contributions in the very near future. The current status of pledges are contained in table 2 of [annex 17](#) to this report.

Agenda item 5. Other matters

86. The Board appreciated the work of the panels and working groups. Noting the expected growth of their workload and with a view to further enhancing their efficiency, the Board encouraged the Chairs of the panels and working groups to carefully guide the process of decision-making and ensure that issues on their agendas continue to reflect the priorities of the Board.

Agenda sub-item 5 (a): Programme of activities

87. The Board noted that the secretariat had called for input from the public in preparing its draft procedures for registration of a programme of activities as a single CDM project activity and issuance of certified emission reductions for a programme of activities, a draft programme of activities design document and a draft CDM programme activity design document. The Board noted that inputs had been received long after the deadline and requested the secretariat to review its draft, as necessary, in light of these inputs and the discussions of the Board and prepare, as appropriate, a revised version of the drafts for consideration of the Board at its next meeting.

Agenda sub-item 5 (b): CDM Joint Coordination Workshop

88. The Board took note of the presentation of the secretariat on the preparations of the CDM Joint Coordination Workshop of the Board (24-25 March 2007) which brings together the Board, Panels, working groups, RIT members, DNA Forum representatives and DOE Forum members, methodology desk reviewers, accreditation team members and provided comments regarding the proposed agenda.

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

89. The Board took note of the oral update by the secretariat on the preparations of the second DNA Forum meeting (26-27 March 2007) which will be held in conjunction with the joint coordination workshop of the Board.

**Agenda sub-item 5 (d): Regional distribution of project activities**

90. The Board was not able due to time constraints to consider this agenda item.

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

91. The Board acknowledged receipt of submissions received from the DOE/AE Forum and informed that, taking into consideration the nature of these issues, the issues shall be forwarded to the Methodology and Accreditation Panel and the A/R WG, accordingly.

92. The Board took note of the oral report by Mr. Werner Betzenbichler, Chair of the DOE/AE coordination forum. The Chair of the forum identified many difficulties which DOEs face in their work. The Chair of the Forum raised, inter alia, the following points for the consideration of the Board:

(a) Requirements for some new procedure on the interactions with the project developers and also noted that the Meth Panel has closer interaction with the project developers during meth meeting when the meeting is in progress and considering the cases of the project developers;

(b) The costs could be more predictable and the resources better managed by only having limited rechecking of the work of DOEs by the secretariat and not spending too many resources by creating extra layers, like RITs;

(c) Additional cost associated with the new requirement of surveillance system under the accreditation will affect the work of DOEs. The cost may be low but will require time and will affect their work. This may adversely affect the incentives to become DOE.

(d) It would reduce the uncertainty in the work of DOEs and the risks, if the validity of use of methodology is linked to the date of submission of the documents of validation/public comments and not when the documents are submitted for registration.

(e) Work to harmonize the quality is taking place in the DOE/AE Forum but there is low incentive for new entrants to participate in any harmonization of quality (DOE/AE Forum, Validation and Verification Manual).

93. The Chair of the Forum also proposed some measures for the consideration of the Board to above issues and difficulties. Some of the proposed measures included, setting of minimum amount of man-days per assessment, introduction of four-eye principle for on-site audits for large scale activities and straight-forward guidance on extent and details required for reporting.

94. The Board took note of the issues raised by Mr. Betzenbichler and provided responses to some of the issues raised by him and considered the interaction useful.

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

95. The Board met with registered observers for an informal interaction on 16 February 2007 and agreed to continue with such meetings in the afternoon of the last day of its future meetings, unless otherwise indicated. These meetings are available on webcast.

96. The Board further agreed to continue to meet with the same type of arrangement at its thirtieth meeting, with space being made available for 70 observers, and to reconsider the issue when necessary. Observers to the thirtieth meeting of the Executive Board shall have registered with the secretariat by **28 February 2007, no later than 17:00 GMT**. In order to ensure proper security and logistical arrangements, the Board emphasized that this deadline will be strictly enforced by the secretariat.



97. The Board acknowledged the (unsolicited) submissions received and recognized that due to time constraints and its current workload was not able to respond to them.

Agenda sub-item 5 (g): Other business

98. As agreed at its twenty-seventh meeting, the Board considered proposals with regard to branding of CDM project activities prepared by the secretariat and noted the complexity of the issue. The Board requested the secretariat to explore options of standardized sign-boards with a view to consider the issue at the thirty-first meeting of the Board.

99. The Board agreed on the provisional agenda for its thirtieth meeting (21 - 23 March 2007) as contained in [annex 18](#) to this report, with an open session on the afternoon of 22 March to 23 March 2007 in order to facilitate observers attendance.

Agenda item 6. Conclusion of the meeting

100. The Chair summarized the main conclusions.

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

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

Agenda sub-item 6 (b): Closure

102. The Chair closed the meeting.



Annexes to the report

Accreditation

Annex 1 - Revised procedures for accreditation

Methodologies

Annex 2 - Approved baseline and monitoring methodology AM0046 (based on the case NM0150-rev)

Annex 3 - Approved baseline and monitoring methodology AM0047 (based on the case NM0180)

Annex 4 - Revision of approved baseline and monitoring methodology AM0025 (integrating the case NM0178)

Annex 5 - Revised tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality (AT)

Issues relating to procedures for afforestation and reforestation project activities

Annex 6 - Approved baseline and monitoring methodology AR-AM0006 (based on ARNM0020-rev)

Annex 7 - Approved baseline and monitoring methodology AR-AM0007 (based on ARNM0021-rev)

Issue relating to procedures for small-scale project activities

Annex 8 - Revision of AMS III.E - Avoidance of methane production from biomass decay through controlled combustion

Matters relating to the registration of CDM project activities

Annex 9 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 577

Annex 10 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 683

Annex 11 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 685

Annex 12 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 715

Annex 13 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 761

Annex 14 - Revised terms of reference and related procedures for a registration and issuance team (RIT)

Annex 15 - Clarifications on the procedures for review referred to in paragraph 41 of the CDM modalities and procedures - version 7

Matters relating to the issuance of CERs and the CDM Registry

Annex 16 - Clarifications on the procedures for review referred to in paragraph 65 of the CDM modalities and procedures - version 4

Resources

Annex 17 - Status of resources and pledges to support 2007 CDM activities

Other business

Annex 18 - Provisional agenda for EB30