



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

Date: 4 May 2007
Ref: CDM-EB-31

EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE CLEAN DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM
THIRTY-FIRST MEETING

Report

Date of meeting: 2 – 4 May 2007

Location: Bonn, Germany

Attendance: The names of members and alternate members present at the thirtieth 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	<i>Ms. María José Sanz Sanchez</i> ²
Mr. Hernán Carlino ¹	<i>Mr. Philip M. Gwage</i> ¹
Mr. Akihiro Kuroki ²	<i>Ms. Jeanne-Marie Huddleston</i> ²
Mr. Samuel Adejuwon ²	<i>Mr. Kamel Djemouai</i> ²
Mr. Xuedu Lu ¹	<i>Mr. Richard Muyungi</i> ¹
Ms. Christiana Figueres ²	<i>Mr. José Domingos Miguez</i> ²
Mr. Rawleston Moore ¹	<i>Ms. Desna M. Solofa</i> ¹
Ms. Anastasia Moskalenko ¹	<i>Ms. Natalia Berghi</i> ¹
Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sethi ²	<i>Ms. Liana Bratasida</i> ²
Mr. Hans Jürgen Stehr ¹	<i>Mr. Lex de Jonge</i> 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) Chair of the Executive Board of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) opened the meeting and asserted that the quorum requirement was met. No conflict of interest was identified by any member or alternate member of the Board present at the meeting.
2. The Board noted that the secretariat was informed that Ms. Natalia Berghi, Ms. Maria José Sanz and Mr. Richard Muyungi were unable to attend the meeting and had provided proper justification for their absence.
3. The Board took note of the resignations of Ms. Anastasia Moskalenko, member from the Eastern European region, and of Ms. Maria José Sanz Sanchez, alternate member from the Western Europe and Other regional group (WEOG). It expressed its deep appreciation for their important contribution to the CDM.
4. The Board requested the secretariat, on behalf of the Chair, to immediately contact a relevant constituency to facilitate and speed up the process of replacement.

Agenda item 2. Adoption of the agenda

5. 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**

6. The Board took note of the eighteenth progress report on the work of the CDM Accreditation Panel (CDM-AP), and an oral report by its Chair, Mr. Hernan Carlino. 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.
7. The Executive Board expressed its deep appreciation to the outgoing Vice Chair of the CDM-AP, Ms. Anastasia Moskalenko, for her outstanding dedication and support to the working group.

General guidance

8. The Board took note of the submission of the annual activity report 2006 by the DOE 'KPMG Sustainability B.V.' submitted on 2 April 2007.
9. The Board considered the proposal submitted by the CDM-AP on appropriate actions for the DOEs not complying with the requirements and/or instructions of the Board. The Board took note that in accordance with the CDM modalities and procedures the DOEs are accountable to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (COP/MOP) through the Executive Board and therefore shall comply with the decisions/ instructions of the Board. Noting that there could be many different areas of authority and related requirements, which DOEs are required to comply with, the Board agreed that appropriate actions for non-compliance should be defined. The Board requested the CDM-AP to undertake a comprehensive review of such requirements and submit a proposal for appropriate actions for all possible requirements to the Board at its next meeting.
10. The Board considered the proposal submitted by the CDM-AP on the possibility for multi-site accreditation system for the DOEs. The Board took into consideration various aspects of the proposal with respect to its usefulness and potential difficulties for the CDM accreditation system. The Board requested the CDM-AP to further explore the proposal by taking into consideration views of the Board



members and looking into alternative measures to address the issues relating to quality management systems of DOEs their accredited premises and use of technical resources from non-accredited premises of the DOEs. The Board requested the CDM-AP to submit its proposal for the consideration of the Board at its twenty-third meeting.

11. The Board considered the clarification submitted by the CDM-AP in response to the request from the AE/DOE Coordination Forum on the possibility for DOEs or other units of the DOE or its parent companies to provide services, such as calibration and/or laboratory services as required by some approved baseline and monitoring methodologies. The Board agreed that the laboratory accreditation, as identified by the request, provides the demonstration of technical competencies of a laboratory but it does not provide assurance of independence of the accredited laboratory's services. The Board further agreed that if a laboratory related to a DOE has provided services for the monitoring, the same DOE can not provide verification/certification services. In the same context, for a given project activity a DOE performing the verification function cannot use services of a laboratory involved in the monitoring activity. The Board, however, agreed that in exceptional cases it may be allowed taking into consideration the specific nature and requirements of a project activity.

12. The Board, during the preliminary discussions on the need to further enhancing the means and channels of communication with the DOEs, noted that the Board had been providing guidance on issues of common interest and decisions and clarifications on specific issues in a timely manner. The Board also examined the existing means of communication and interaction with DOEs and recognised the AE/DOE Forum as one of the effective means of communication and interaction with DOEs. The Board, however, noted the need for broader participation of DOEs and AEs in the Forum activities. The Board requested DOEs and AEs to use the Forum to bring to the attention of the Board issues of common interest (policy and procedural) and to submit specific issues to the Board in their appropriate context following the Board's agreed procedures.

13. The Board held discussions on the request of the COP/MOP to develop guidance for designated operational entities on verification and validation in order to promote quality and consistency in verification and validation reports. The Board requested the secretariat to submit a proposal on a process to meet the request of the COP/MOP for the consideration of the Board at its next meeting. The Board requested the secretariat to consider work already undertaken externally, including the validation and verification manual for CDM and Joint Implementation projects (VVM), as a basis for developing guidelines in order to promote quality and consistency in the validation and verification work.

14. The Board considered a proposal for strengthening the role of the secretariat in undertaking the assessment work for the accreditation of operational entities in order to address difficulties in non-availability of experts, resulting into delays in the assessment process, to increase efficiency and to improve consistency of the assessment work. The Board took note of the procedural and resource implications of the proposal and agreed that to provide in a revision of the CDM MAP for 3 professional and one general service staff (to take part in and support assessment team work), for the Chair of the accreditation panel to define the assessment team composition (using the roster of experts and the secretariat staff as available) and DOEs a change of modalities, as needed, of payment of the assessment fee. The Board requested the secretariat to prepare a revision in the CDM accreditation procedure, in order to implement this proposal, for the consideration of the Board at its next meeting.

15. The Board agreed on the revised indicative level of fee for work by assessment team members. The revised fee structure is contained in the [annex 1](#).

16. The Board considered the applications received in response to a call for experts in order to replace the two outgoing members of the CDM-AP. The Board agreed to appoint Mr. Francisco Antonio España Fernández and Mr. Anil Jauhri as members of the CDM-AP for a term of two years, starting on 1 July 2006. The Board expressed its deep appreciations to the outgoing CDM-AP members, Mr. Satish Rao and Ms. Mercedes Alejanre Irueste.



17. The Board took note of the work of the CDM-AP and progress on various issues under consideration by the CDM-AP.

Spot-checks

18. The Board considered the recommendation of the CDM-AP on the implementation of corrective actions by one DOE under spot-check. The Board took note that the DOE has undertaken a significant work in response to the non-conformities and agreed not to suspend the accreditation status of the DOE. The Board also agreed with the recommendation of the CDM-AP that the DOE shall undertake work on three project activities under the observation of the CDM-AP. The Board also noted that it will follow this case carefully and requested the DOE to ensure that it continues to meet the quality standards and expectations of the Board in carrying out its validation and verification work.

19. After considering the recommendation of the CDM-AP and hearing the DOE under spot-check, the Board agreed not to suspend the accreditation status of the DOE. The Board agreed that the DOE shall undertake corrective actions and their implementation shall be verified by the assessment team.

Further schedule

20. The Board noted that twenty-ninth meeting of the CDM-AP is scheduled to take place from 13 to 15 June 2007 and that hence its recommendation and reports will be submitted after the document deadline for the next meeting.

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

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

Case specific

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

(a) **Approve cases:**

- (i) **AM0048** “New cogeneration facilities supplying electricity and/or steam to multiple customers and displacing grid/off-grid steam and electricity generation with more carbon-intensive fuels” which was proposed as NM0141-rev ((Displacing grid/off-grid steam and electricity generation with less carbon intensive fuels in Aba, Nigeria) and link it to scope 1 (Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources)), as contained in the annex 2 of this report;
- (ii) **AM0049** “Methodology for gas based energy generation in an industrial facility” which was proposed as NM0161-rev (Mondi Gas Turbine Co-generation in Richards Bay, South Africa) and link it to scope 4 (Manufacturing Industries), as contained in the annex 3 of this report;
- (iii) **AM0050** “Feed switch in integrated Ammonia-urea manufacturing industry” which was proposed as NM165-rev (Feed switchover from Naphtha to Natural Gas (NG) at Phulpur plant of IFFCO) and link it to scope 5 (Chemical industries), as contained in the annex 4 of this report;



- (iv) **NM0174-rev** (MSW Incineration Project in Guanzhuang, Tianjin City), which is integrated into the approved methodology AM0025, as contained in annex 5 of this report;
 - (v) **AM0051** “Secondary catalytic N₂O destruction in nitric acid plants” which was proposed as NM0176-rev (Soluciones Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project) and link it to scope 5 (Chemical industries), as contained in the annex 6 of this report;
 - (vi) **NM0179** (Waste Gas and/ or Waste Heat Utilization for ‘Process Steam’ generation or ‘Process Steam and Power’) was consolidated into the Consolidated baseline methodology for GHG emission reductions for waste gas or waste heat or waste pressure based energy system”, which the Board requested the Meth Panel to review and recommend to the Board for consideration at its thirty-second meeting;
 - (vii) **AM0053** “Increased electricity generation from existing hydropower stations through Decision Support System optimization” which was proposed as NM0186 (Increased electricity generation from existing hydropower stations through Decision Support System optimization in Azerbaijan) and link it to scope 1 (Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources)), as contained in the annex 7 of this report;
- (b) **Possibly reconsider the cases:** NM0194, NM0197, NM0200, and NM0202 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;
 - (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-seventh meeting of the Meth Panel (29 May - 01 June 2007), they shall exceptionally submit them by 7 May, 17:00 GMT.
- (c) **Not to approve cases:** NM0142-rev, NM00170-rev, NM0195, and NM0204 which, if revised taking into account comments, can be resubmitted but will require new expert and public input.

23. The Board considered the case NM0171, recommended by the Board for approval, and requested the panel to review the recommendation to use the “combined tool for identification of the baseline scenario and assessment of additionality”.

24. The Board took note that the Meth Panel did not finalize its consideration of the case NM0121-rev (Bambuna Hydro electric project) as the panel will seek expert input on a key issue in this methodology and welcomes the panel’s recommendation for its thirty-second meeting.

Response to requests for clarification of approved methodologies

25. The Board took note of the responses to clarifications provided by the Meth Panel on the cases AM_CLA_0038, AM_CLA_0039, AM_CLA_0040, AM_CLA_0041 and AM_CLA_0042.

***Responses to requests for revisions and resultant revision of approved methodologies***

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

(a) Accept request AM_REV_0027 concerning ACM0002 requesting a revision to expand the applicability to allow exclusion of “immaterial” parts of the multination grid to which the project activity supplies power. The Board requested the panel to revise the approved consolidated methodology. Until the methodology will be revised project participants are invited to submit a request for deviation for their specific case.

(b) Not to accept request AM_REV_0029 concerning ACM0002 requesting a revision to expand the applicability to renewable energy based power plants that export and, hence, result in emissions reductions in another Non-Annex I country. The Board requested that they be submitted as a request for deviation to the Board, as these are very specific cases of a class of projects that export power to another Non-Annex I country. It further observed that these project activities should include in the CDM-PDD, if submitting request for deviation, a proper procedure for: (i) verifying that the electricity is delivered to the grid to which the project activity is exporting; and (ii) to demonstrate that the exported electricity the result in displacement of generation in the grid to which electricity is exported.

(c) Accept request AM_REV_0033 concerning ACM0004 requesting the revision to expand the applicability of the approved methodology to project activities where electricity is generated in a turbine generator supplied by steam from waste heat recovery boilers along with fossil fuel fired boilers. The suggested procedure is incorporated in the draft consolidated methodology for energy generation from waste energy which was proposed by the Meth Panel. The Board will reconsider the draft consolidated methodology at its next meeting.

(d) Not to accept request AM_REV_0035 concerning AM0026 requesting a revision to the approved methodology to allow exclusion of hydro projects from estimating carbon emission factor for grid power displaced by the CDM project activities. The Board while discussing the issue also noted that in the merit order dispatch the timing of the dispatch is very important as to what power is available at the margin. In case of hydropower utilities may like to store water to dispatch as a peaking power and earn more, which is a possibility.

(e) Accept request AM_REV_0036 and AM_REV_0038 concerning AM0014 requesting the revision to expand the applicability of the approved methodology to project activities that use oil or coal to generate energy in the absence of the project activity and use of approved additionality tool to demonstrate additionality. The resultant revised approved methodology is included as annex 8 of this report.

(f) Accept request AM_REV_0037 concerning ACM0007 requesting the revision to expand the applicability of the approved methodology to diesel engines. The resultant revised approved methodology is included as annex 9 of this report.

(g) Not to accept request AM_REV_0039 and AM_REV_0045 concerning ACM0003 requesting the revision to expand the applicability of the approved methodology to: project activities that use biomass as alternative fuel from dedicated plantation; and project activities that increase the share of alternative fuel use used in existing fuel mix.

(h) Not to accept request AM_REV_0040 concerning AM0037 requesting the revision to expand the applicability of the approved methodology to project activities that use previously flared coke over gases to displace use of natural gas in production of methanol.

(i) Not to accept request AM_REV_0041 concerning AM0043 requesting the revision to expand the applicability of the approved methodology to project activities that replace steel pipes with polyethylene pipes.



(j) Accept request AM_REV_0042 concerning AM0023 requesting the revision to expand the applicability of the approved methodology to project activities that reduce leakage in distribution system above ground. The resultant revised approved methodology is included as annex 10.

(k) Not to accept request AM_REV_0043 concerning AM0014 requesting the revision to expand the applicability of the approved methodology to project activities that in the baseline use natural gas and oil use.

(l) Accept request AM_REV_0044 concerning ACM0006 requesting the revision to expand the applicability of the approved methodology by including new scenario for project activities that improve the efficiency of biomass use in generating electricity. The resultant revised approved methodology is included as annex 11.

27. The Board clarified that the approved consolidated methodology ACM0003 is not applicable to project activities where the plants were already using the alternative fuels prior to the implementation of the project activity. The Board also noted that the Meth Panel is undertaking revision of the approved methodology to expand its applicability to such project activities.

28. The Board clarified that either validating or verifying DOE could undertake the task of determination of the permitted operating conditions for project activities using approved methodology AM0034. The determination of the permitted operating conditions, if done at verification, should be as per the approved methodology.

29. The Board considered the draft “Consolidated baseline methodology for GHG emission reductions for waste gas or waste heat or waste pressure based energy system”, as recommended by the panel. The Board agreed that demonstrating additionality of project activities that are implemented in a new industrial facility shall be demonstrated using either of the options, barrier analysis or investment analysis, as proposed in the option 2 by the Meth Panel. The Board further requested the panel to revise the draft to expand it to the project activities that use waste energy to generate heat (hot air, hot oil, etc), as listed in the applicability condition of the draft. The Board also requested the panel to review the need for three-year data to demonstrate the waste energy was not used prior to implementation of the project activity.

30. The revised versions of the methodologies referred to in the paragraphs above will come into effect on 18 May 2007, in accordance with the procedure for the revision of approved methodologies.

General guidance

31. Taking into account the guidance by the COP/MOP to broaden the scope and applicability of methodologies, the Board would like to reiterate that no restrictions should be enforced on the use of the additionality tool e.g. use of investment analysis only. The Board requested the chairs of the panel and working groups to ensure that limiting the use of additionality tool to investment analysis is done in exceptional cases only and for very strong reasons, which need to be substantiated. Further, the Board reiterates that use of the combined tool is not compulsory and may be applied in case no separate procedure is provided for baseline scenario identification.

32. The Board took into account the applications received in response to a call for experts in order to reconstitute the Meth Panel. The Board agreed to appoint the following experts as members of the Meth Panel for a term of one year: Mr. Amr Abdel-Aziz, Mr. Jean-Jacques Becker, Mr. Felix Dayo, Mr. Juerg Fuessler, Mr. Christophe de Gouvello, Mr. Jan-Willem Martens, Mr. Vijay Kumar Mediratta, Mr. Narendra Parachuri, Mr. Daniel Perczyk, Mr. Braulio Pikman, Mr. Roberto Schaeffer, Mr. Lambert Schneider, Mr. Christoph Sutter, Mr. Massamba Thioye, Mr. Ken Yamaguchi. The Board expressed its deep appreciations to the outgoing Meth Panel members, Mr. Ashok Sarkar.



33. The Board considered the clarification provided by the Meth Panel on the shift of a pre-project activity and agreed to further discuss the issue at its next meeting. The Board also requested the panel to provide inputs that may help the Board's discussions of the issue.

34. The Board revised the “clarification to project participants on when to request revision, clarification to an approved methodology or a deviation” incorporating the clarification on when to request revision of approved monitoring plans, as contained in [annex 12](#) to this report.

35. The Board considered the preliminary analysis on approved methodologies and proposed new methodology cases as requested by the Board at its twenty-ninth meeting. It requested the members to provide its comments to the secretariat, which shall prepare a brief note for discussion by the Board at thirty-second meeting

36. The Board considered a proposal for modifications to the methodologies consideration process based on consultations in the Meth Panel, as prepared by the secretariat. The Board agreed to finalize its discussions on the proposed modification and resultant changes in the procedures and forms at its thirty-second meeting.

37. The Board agreed to revise the implications of withdrawal of approved methodology to align it with the implications of revision of an approved methodology. The revised "procedure for the revision of the approved baseline and monitoring methodology by the Executive Board" is attached as [annex 13](#) to this report.

38. The Board discussed the issue of energy efficiency projects under the CDM. It noted that there is a large reduction potential through such measures but that there may also be methodological and additionality challenges faced by potential project participants in implementing such projects under the CDM. The Board discussed various approaches to create a more enabling environment for implementing EE project activities under CDM. In this regard, the Board requested the secretariat to prepare a brief note, for consideration by the Board at its thirty-second meeting, detailing the options currently available under the CDM and suggest possible ways of enhancing these options still further within the modalities and procedures of the CDM.

39. The Board took note of the work of the Meth Panel related to the possibility of developing a consolidated methodology for project activities to ensure a consistent approach in view of the fact that a number of proposed new methodologies submitted in the past two rounds are for project activities that undertake energy efficiency in power/cogeneration plants.

Further schedule

40. The Board took note that the twenty-seventh meeting of the Meth Panel is to take place on 28 May to 1 June 2007 and that the next round of submissions of proposed new methodologies is to be 1 June 2007.

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

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

42. The Executive Board expressed its deep appreciation to the outgoing Vice Chair of the A/R WG, Ms. Maria José Sanz Sanchez, for her outstanding dedication and support to the working group.

General guidance

43. Noting that project participants tend to submit new methodologies, where in some instances the request for a revision to an approved A/R methodology would be more appropriate, the Board



encouraged project participants to consider submitting requests for revisions of approved methodologies if their project activity is broadly similar to the project activities to which the approved methodology is applicable. This should be done in accordance with the latest procedures for the revision of an approved baseline or monitoring methodology by the Executive Board, via the interface on the UNFCCC CDM website at <http://cdm.unfccc.int/goto/ARrev>. The Board clarified that the guidance on when to request a revision, clarification to an approved methodology or deviation, referred in annex 2 of this report, applies *mutatis mutandis* to A/R methodologies.

44. The Board took note of the draft procedure to demonstrate the eligibility of lands for afforestation and reforestation project activities under the clean development mechanism and agreed to launch an additional call for public input, as requested by COP/MOP 2, of comments to the draft procedure as contained in [annex 14](#) of this report, starting 7 May 2007 and ending 18 June 2007 at 17:00 GMT. The Board requested the secretariat to prepare the advanced final draft of the procedure to include the public input for consideration by the Board at its thirty-third meeting.

45. In response to a question raised by the DOE Forum, the Board clarified that in applying the A/R CDM definition of “forest” to stands with several storeys of trees differing in height, then the “forest” may comprise trees from different storeys that in combination meet both the crown cover (or equivalent stocking level) and height thresholds selected by the host Party and reported to the Executive Board through its designated national authority for the CDM.

46. The Board considered and approved the draft methodological tool for the calculation of the number of sample plots for measurements within A/R CDM project activities as contained in [annex 15](#) of this report. The tool facilitates the development of new baseline and monitoring methodologies for A/R CDM project activities by providing two alternative methods by which a minimal number of sample plots for the measurement of biomass can be determined.

47. The Board considered and approved the draft tool for testing the significance of GHG emissions in A/R CDM project activities as contained in [annex 16](#) of this report. The draft tool assists project participants to transparently demonstrate, which GHG emission sources, possible decreases in carbon pools and leakage emissions are insignificant for a particular CDM A/R project activity and therefore can be neglected. Or when required by the applicability conditions of approved methodologies, whether increases in GHG emissions by sources for a particular CDM A/R project activity are significant. The Board also clarified that this tool supersedes the guidance provided by the Board in paragraph 3 (b) of the annex 15 to the report from its twenty-second meeting concerning ignoring leakage emissions from extraction of non-renewable fuel wood.

48. The Board agreed to increase the working group by one member.

49. The Board considered a shortlist containing the remaining members and new applicants to the A/R WG. The Board selected the following new members Mr. Neil Bird, Mr. Willy R. Makundi, and Mr. Raul Ponce-Hernandez for a term of one year and confirmed the membership of Mr. Nagmeldin G. Elhassan, Mr. Igino Emmer, Mr. Marcelo Rocha, Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh, Mr. Craig Trotter and Mr. Xiaoquan Zhang for a further term of one year and Mr. Braulio Pikmann as representative of the Meth Panel to the A/R WG. The Board expressed its deep appreciations to the outgoing A/R WG member, Mr. Sergio Jauregui.

50. The Board took note that the issues that were postponed due to the time constraints at the thirteenth meeting of A/R WG will be considered at the fourteenth meeting of working group.

Further schedule

51. The Board took note that the fourteenth meeting of the A/R WG is to take place from 4 to 6 June 2007 and that the report and recommendations will be submitted to the Board shortly after the document



deadline for its next meeting. The Board recommended the 29 June 2007 as the deadline for the fourteenth round of submissions of proposed new methodologies.

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

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

Case specific

53. The Board approved the new small-scale methodology titled ‘AMS III.L Avoidance of methane production from biomass decay through controlled pyrolysis’ as contained in [annex 17](#) of this report. The Board further clarified that the methodology is applicable to project activities that avoid or reduce methane emission from biogenic organic matter that would otherwise been left to decay under clearly anaerobic conditions until the end of the crediting period in a solid waste disposal site without methane recovery. Due to the project activity, decay is prevented through controlled pyrolysis¹.

54. The Board approved a new small-scale methodology titled ‘AMS III.M Reduction in consumption of electricity by recovering soda from paper manufacturing process’ as contained in [annex 18](#) of this report. The proposed methodology is for project activities that recover caustic soda from waste black liquor produced in paper manufacturing. The Board requested the SSC WG to explore possibilities to broaden the applicability of the methodology to include activities involving the import of caustic soda from Non-Annex I countries in the baseline calculation.

Revisions of approved methodologies

55. The Board agreed to the revised SSC methodologies AMS I.A, AMS I.C and AMS I.D as contained in [annexes 19, 20](#) and [21](#) to this report. The revisions provide options for baseline calculations when cogeneration from fossil fuels is the baseline activity thereby broadening the applicability of AMS I.C. The revised applicability conditions also clarify that all cogeneration project activities should apply AMS I.C. Further, the revision of AMS I.D includes guidance on monitoring of biomass project activities. All small-scale biomass project activities applying AMS I.D. (firing only biomass or firing biomass and fossil fuel) are required to monitor the biomass and any fossil fuel used. The Board requested the SSC WG to analyse if similar further guidance would be required under AMS I.C. and AMS I.A to clarify monitoring biomass in project activities applying these categories and make appropriate recommendations.

56. The Board agreed to the revised SSC methodology AMS III.D as contained in [annex 22](#) to this report, which further clarifies that in the monitoring plan on-site inspections are to be conducted for each individual farm and includes additional guidance on how to determine the efficiency of the flaring process in an enclosed flare and in an open flare.

57. The Board agreed to the revised SSC methodology AMS III.I as contained in [annex 23](#) to this report. The revised methodology clarifies how the number of months with average lagoon temperature above 15°C in AMS III.I is to be determined. In order to determine the months that should be considered for emission reduction calculations, the revision entails monitoring of the ambient temperature instead of the lagoon temperature. Such an approach is consistent with the approach of AM0013.

¹ Pyrolysis is defined as the thermo-chemical decomposition of organic materials into a carbon rich residue, non-condensable combustible gases and condensable vapors, by heating in the absence or lack of oxygen, without any other reagents, except possibly steam.



58. The Board agreed to the revised SSC methodology AMS II.D as contained in [annex 24](#) to this report, in order to broaden the applicability of the methodology to include energy efficiency activities in mining.

59. The Board agreed to the revised SSC methodology AMS III.F as contained in [annex 25](#) to this report. The revised methodology now includes project activities that enhance the capacity utilization of existing compost facilities and provides methods to determine the eligible increased capacity utilization based on the historical records of the annual amount of waste composted at the facility.

60. The revised versions of the methodologies referred to in the paragraphs above will come into effect on 18 May 2007, in accordance with the procedure for the revision of approved methodologies.

Revision of sectoral scopes of methodologies

61. The Board noted that current version of AMS III D is only applicable to methane recovery in agricultural and agro industrial activities and underlying methods and equations of the methodology are based on Volume 4 Agriculture, Forestry and other Land Use of 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National GHG Inventories. Therefore the Board agreed to assign scope 15 to this methodology and exclude this methodology from sectoral scopes 10 and 13, as contained in [annex 21](#) referred above to this report. For similar reasons the Board agreed to exclude AMS III.I (contained in [annex 22](#) above), AMS III.E, AMS III.H, from scope 15, as contained in [annex 26](#) and [27](#) referred above. In this context, the Board agreed that this revision will not affect any witnessing activities of AEs seeking accreditation, already proposed or under process. The Board further agreed that DOE functions (validation, verification etc.) of project activities applying earlier versions of these methodologies i.e. AMS III.D, AMS III.E, AMS III.H and AMS III.I can only be performed by DOEs accredited to all of the sectoral scopes to which the earlier versions of these methodologies respectively belong to.

62. The Board requested the Small-Scale Working Group to review at its next meeting the approach and concepts of monitoring energy efficiency originally proposed in NM0101 and NM0154 and applied in project activities 0859 and 0954 and provide input to the Board as to its suitability for small-scale CDM projects applying AMS-II.D.

General guidance

63. The Board took into account the applications received in response to a call for experts in order to replace the outgoing members of the SSC WG. The Board agreed to appoint the following experts as members of the SSC WG for a term of one year: Mr. Gilberto Bandeira De Melo, Mr. Felix Babatunde Dayo, Mr. Ten Hoopen Michiel, Mr. Binu Parthan and Mr. Daniel Perczyk. The Board expressed its deep appreciations to the outgoing SSC WG member, Mr. Kazuhito Yamada.

64. The Board agreed that submissions requesting the creation of a new small-scale methodology only, should be submitted to the secretariat a minimum eight (8) weeks prior to the meeting date of a SSC WG for it to be considered at that meeting, and requested the secretariat to update the guidelines for completing the SSC PDD accordingly. Submissions requesting revision or clarification of an approved SSC methodology, shall be submitted a minimum four (4) weeks before a meeting of the SSC WG to be considered at that meeting.

65. The Board noted that the SSC WG is continuing its work in the development of the draft category for biofuels in transportation.

Further schedule

66. The Board took note that the tenth meeting of the SSC WG is to take place on 23 May 2007 to 25 May 2007.

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

67. The Board took note that 647 CDM project activities have been registered by 04 May 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

68. 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 sixteen (16) requests for registration by DOEs.

69. The Board agreed to register the project activity:

(a) “Shenzhen Xiaping Landfill Gas Collection and Utilization Project” (0887) submitted for registration by (SGS);

(b) “Ningguo Cement Plant 9100KW Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Anhui Conch Cement Co. Ltd” (0898) submitted for registration by (TÜV-SÜD);

taking note of the initial comments provided by the project participant and the DOE in response to the request for review.

70. The Board agreed to register, as corrected, the project activity “Demand side energy efficiency projects at RIL-PG.” (0956) if the revised validation report and emission reduction estimation spreadsheet submitted by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) in response to the request for review are displayed on the UNFCCC CDM website.

71. The Board agreed to register with corrections the project activity:

(a) “Garganta da Jararaca Small Hydroelectric Power Plant (SHP)” (0809), if the DOE (SGS) and project participant submit a revised PDD which includes only the infrastructural barrier in the barrier analysis and removes all other unsubstantiated barriers, and a corresponding revised validation report;

(b) “Allain Duhangan Hydroelectric Project (ADHP)” (0862) if the DOE (DNV Certification AS) and the project participant submit a revised PDD, correctly referencing the version of the methodology applied, which includes the corrections made during the request for review and a corresponding validation report;

(c) “Yangquan Coal Mine Methane (CMM) Utilization for Power Generation Project, Shanxi Province, China” (0892), if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) and project participant submit a revised PDD which includes the investment analysis of the full proposed plant capacity, and a corresponding revised validation report which also includes and addresses all stakeholder comments received;

(d) “20MW Samal Grid-connected Hydroelectric Project in Orissa, India” (0895) if the DOE (DNV Certification AS) and the project participant submit a revised PDD that includes both additional analysis on the effect of water availability to the investment analysis and clarification on calculation of financial risk as provided in response to the request for review. The DOE should also submit a revised validation report that includes verification that the investment analysis is sufficient in demonstrating the additionality of the project and hence the barrier analysis can be removed from the PDD;

(e) “Methane Capture and use as fuel at Rajaram Maize Products, Chattisgarh” (0945) if the DOE (DNV Certification AS) and the project participant submit a revised PDD that includes the further substantiation provided in the initial response regarding the technological and operational barriers and a corresponding revised validation report that addresses all the stakeholder comments individually.



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.

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

(a) “Use of blast furnace slag in the production of blended cement at Votorantim Cimentos” (0754), 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 28](#) to this report.

(b) “Production of blended cement with blast furnace slag at Cimento Mizu” (0854), 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 29](#) to this report.

(c) “Vikram Cement: Energy efficiency by up-gradation of clinker cooler in cement manufacturing” (0859), 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 30](#) to this report.

(d) “ACEL Blended cement project at Sankrail grinding unit” (0861), submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV Certification AS), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 31](#) to this report.

(e) “Optimum utilisation of clinker for Pozzolana Portland Cement (PPC) production at Birla Plus Cement in Bathinda, Punjab, India.” (0863) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 32](#) to this report.

(f) “4.0 MW Power Plant Using Clinker Cooling Gas Waste Heat” (0872), submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV Certification AS), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 33](#) to this report.

(g) “Energy efficiency and fuel switching measures in the caustic soda and sodium cyanide plant at Vadodara complex of GACL” (0951), submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV Certification AS), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 34](#) to this report.

(h) “GHG emission reduction by energy efficiency improvement of clinker cooler in cement manufacturing at Rajashree cement at District Gulbarga, Karnataka India” (0954), submitted for registration by the DOE (SGS), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 35](#) to this report.

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

74. In accordance with the provisions of paragraphs 17 and 18 (b) of the procedures for review as referred to in paragraph 41 of the CDM modalities and procedures, the Board agreed to register the project activities:

(a) “AWMS GHG Mitigation Project MX06-B-32, Aguascalientes, Guanajuato and Michoacán, México ” (0463),

(b) “The Godavari Sugar Mills Ltd (TGSML)’s 24 MW Bagasse Based Co-generation Power Project at Sameerwadi ” (0577),

following receipt of the corrected documentation submitted in accordance with the outcome of the Board’s reviews finalized at its twenty-ninth and thirtieth meeting respectively.



75. In accordance with the procedures for review as referred to in paragraph 41 of the CDM modalities and procedures, the Board considered the recommendation of the review team for the one (1) project activity which was placed “Under review” at the thirtieth meeting of the Board.

76. 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 “Chilatán Hydroelectric Project” (0785) if the DOE (DNV Certification AS) and the project participant submit a revised PDD which incorporates the clarifications regarding:

(a) The calculation of the build margin, as supplied in response to the request for review, and

(b) The project boundary, timelines for consideration of the project, and barrier analysis as supplied in response to the review,

and a corresponding revised validation report.

77. The Board considered two (2) requests for deviation related to project activities undergoing validation. The Board agreed not to accept one request and requested the secretariat to inform the DOE accordingly. The Board referred the other request to the Methodologies Panel, in order to seek specific technical input.

Registration procedure

78. The Board noted that a call for additional members of the Registration and Issuance Team (RIT) ended on 20 April 2007, and that 45 applications had been received. The Board thanked those experts for their applications and agreed to postpone the selection of additional members until its thirty-second meeting due to time constraints.

General guidance

79. The Board considered the initial assessment prepared by the secretariat regarding issues related to authorization and participation and agreed to request the secretariat to present options to address these issues in a comprehensive manner to ensure consistency between modalities and procedures, glossary of terms and EB guidance and clarifications, for consideration at its thirty-second meeting.

80. The Board agreed that project activities seeking to claim retroactive credits and submitted for registration in accordance with paragraph 78 of EB 28 report which are subsequently rejected by the Board and resubmitted, after 31 March 2007, will not be eligible to claim retroactive credits. Project activities submitted in accordance with paragraph 78 of the report of the twenty-eighth meeting and registered following consideration of a request for review or a review will be allowed to claim retroactive credits.

81. The Board further clarified that in cases where project activities have been withdrawn voluntarily by the project participants prior to registration the registration fee is non-refundable and that in the case of resubmission a new registration fee will have to be paid.

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

82. The Board took note that 45,908,092 CERs have been issued as at 04 May 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*

83. 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 one (1) request for issuance.

84. In accordance with the clarifications to paragraph 10 of these procedures the Board agreed to instruct the CDM registry administrator to issue CERs for “BK Energia Itacoatiara Project ” (0168), following the submission by the DOE (DNV Certification AS) and the project participant of a revised monitoring report which incorporates the clarification on the use of wood logs as fuel for the power plant as provided in response to the request for review and a corresponding revised verification report.

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.

85. The Board considered requests by the DOE (DNV Certification AS) to be permitted to resubmit revised issuance requests for “AWMS GHG Mitigation Project, MX05-B-07, Sonora, México” (0150) (monitoring period: 01 Oct 2005 - 28 Feb 2006) and “AWMS GHG Mitigation Project, MX05-B-09, Nuevo León, México” (0163) (monitoring period: 01 Oct 2005 - 28 Feb 2006). The Board agreed to grant permission to the DOE to submit a revised request for issuance for these monitoring periods, on the basis of the revised documentation already supplied. These revised requests for issuance will be published on the UNFCCC CDM website for a period of 15 days during which Board members or Parties involved may request a review. The Board further agreed to instruct the DOE and project participant that, should they wish to apply an approved deviation to a registered monitoring plan for future monitoring periods, they should submit a request for revision of the monitoring plan.

86. The Board agreed that requests for permission to resubmit requests for issuance for previously rejected requests for issuance should be submitted within 60 days from the date of rejection.

87. The Board considered two (2) request for deviation related to monitoring reports undergoing verification, and agreed to seek further clarifications from the DOE. The Board will reconsider the requests following receipt of these clarifications.

Agenda sub-item 3 (f): Modalities for collaboration with the Subsidiary Bodies

88. The Board requested Mr. José Domingos Miguez, Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sethi and Ms. Anastasia Moskalenko to follow negotiations at Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) related to agenda item “Implications of possible changes to the limit for small-scale afforestation and reforestation clean development mechanism project activities” and report on the outcome to the Board.

89. The Board further requested Mr. Miguez to continue following the agenda item the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) relating to “Implications of the establishment of new hydrochlorofluorocarbon-22 (HCFC-22) facilities seeking to obtain certified emission reductions for the destruction of hydrofluorocarbon-23 (HFC-23)” and report on the outcome to the Board.

90. The Board further requested Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sethi and Ms. Anastasia Moskalenko to continue to follow the agenda item under the Subsidiary Body for Implementation relating to ITL and report on the outcome to the Board.

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

91. In accordance, with decision 1/CMP.2 in relation to the Management plan (CDM-MAP), the Board requested the secretariat to prepare a draft proposal for the revision of the CDM MAP 2007 for its consideration at its next meeting. This draft should reflect the implications of the proposed UNFCCC 2008-09 budget if adopted as well as the additional needs identified requested by the Board, including an analysis of the forecasted income (outstanding pledges, registration fees, SOP, etc) versus expenditures as well as cashflow information for 2006 and 2007.

Resources

92. The Board took note of information provided by the secretariat on the status of contributions received as reflected in table 1 of [annex 36](#). It was noted that since the thirtieth meeting of the Board, the operation reserve has grown of an additional USD 2.22 million as a result of the payment of 68 registration fees (USD 1.12 million) and 31 share of proceeds (USD 1.1 million).

93. The Board expressed its appreciation to the European Commission (USD 108,315) and the Government of Belgium (USD 24,375) which have 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 is contained in table 2 of [annex 36](#) to this report.

Agenda item 5. Other matters**Agenda sub-item 5 (a): Programme of activities**

94. The Board continued its discussion on to the “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 programme of activities design document and a CDM programme activity design document and requested the secretariat to prepare as soon as possible, based on the comments from members, a revised version of the documents for consideration at its thirty-second meeting. A revised version will be made available as an annex to the annotated agenda for that meeting.

95. The Board requested the SSC WG to review the SSC methodologies which have been approved, with a view to revising them to account for leakage under a CPA. The SSC WG shall forward its recommendation in this regard to the EB, as a priority.

96. The Board also requests the AR WG to review the SSC AR methodologies, with a view to revising the leakage provisions, as appropriate, to account for leakage under a CPA. The AR WG shall forward its recommendations to the EB in this regard, as a priority.

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

97. The Board took note of the oral update by the secretariat on the preparations for the third DNA Forum meeting. It noted that it is expected to take place on 3 - 5 October 2007 in a Sub-Saharan country.

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

98. 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 respective panels and working groups.



99. The Board took note of the oral report by Mr. Werner Betzenbichler, Chair of the DOE/AE coordination forum. The Chair of the Forum raised, inter alia, the following points for the consideration of the Board:

- (a) Validity of prompt start crediting for projects under review and rejected (addressed in paragraph 80 above)
- (b) Re-payment of registration fee (addressed in paragraph 81 above)
- (c) Change in review scope and related communication
- (d) Use of procedure for requests for deviation or procedure for revising monitoring plans
- (e) Timeline for requests for deviations
- (f) Evidence that the incentive from the CDM was seriously considered in the decision to proceed with the project activity.

100. The Chair the DOE/AE Forum also provided a feedback on the outcomes of the Fifth DOE/AE Forum Meeting held on 03 May 2007 in Cologne, Germany. The Chair of the Forum in particular highlighted following issues:

- (a) Rationale behind the determination of the frequency of surveillance checks and differences between the scopes of a regular surveillance check and a spot check;
- (b) Consideration of performance parameters in considering the regular surveillance;
- (c) Some delays in undertaking the completeness check for registration and request for issuance and request for guidance on the scope of completeness check and the amount of data to be provided with requests for registration and issuance;
- (d) Request for improving the follow-up mechanisms relating to the inputs forwarded by the DOEs for the consideration of the Board.

101. The Chair of the DOE/AE Forum also provided an update of the work on the revision of the Validation and Verification Manual.

102. The Board members responded to some of the questions raised by the Chair of the DOE/AE Forum. The Board took note of the remaining issues (paragraph 99 (c) to (f)) and agreed to further consider these issues in the near future. The Chair of the CDM AP elaborated the rationale of the institution of regular surveillance in the accreditation system and also explained how the regular surveillance system is different from the unscheduled surveillance (spot-check). The Vice Chair of the Board enquired about the procedure within the Forum for forwarding the questions for the consideration of the Board, to which the Chair of the DOE/AE Forum provided response.

103. The Chair of the Board thanked Mr. Werner Betzenbichler and stressed the need for the Forum to also identify possible answers to the questions raised.

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

104. The Board met with registered observers for an informal interaction on 4 May 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.

105. The Board further agreed to continue to meet with the same type of arrangement at its thirty-second meeting, with space being made available for 70 observers, and to reconsider the issue when



necessary. Observers to the thirty-second meeting of the Executive Board shall have registered with the secretariat by **30 May 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.

106. The Board acknowledged the (unsolicited) submissions received.

Agenda sub-item 5 (e): Other business

107. The Board revised its “Procedures for public communication with the CDM Executive Board” in order to reflect the new practice of the Board with regard of unsolicited submissions as contained in [annex 37](#).

108. The Board agreed on the provisional agenda for its thirty-second meeting (20 - 22 June 2007) as contained in [annex 38](#) to this report, with an open session on the 21 to 22 June 2007.

Agenda item 6. Conclusion of the meeting

109. The Chair summarized the main conclusions. The Board expressed its deep appreciation for the secretariat’s support in preparing and conducting the meeting.

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

110. 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

111. The Chair closed the meeting.



Annexes to the report

Accreditation

Annex 1 - Indicative level of fees for the CDM-AT members

Methodologies

Annex 2 - Approved baseline and monitoring methodology AM0048 (New cogeneration facilities supplying electricity and/or steam to multiple customers and displacing grid/off-grid steam and electricity generation with more carbon-intensive fuels)

Annex 3 - Approved baseline and monitoring methodology AM0049 (Methodology for gas based energy generation in an industrial facility)

Annex 4 - Approved baseline and monitoring methodology AM0050 (Feed switch in integrated Ammonia-urea manufacturing industry)

Annex 5 - Revision to Approved methodology AM0025 to incorporate NM0174-rev

Annex 6 - Approved baseline and monitoring methodology AM0051 (“Secondary catalytic N₂O destruction in nitric acid plants”)

Annex 7 - Approved baseline and monitoring methodology AM0052 (Increased electricity generation from existing hydropower stations through Decision Support System optimization)

Annex 8 - Revision to approved methodology AM0014

Annex 9 - Revision to approved methodology ACM0007

Annex 10 - Revision to approved methodology AM0023

Annex 11 - Revision to approved methodology ACM0006

Annex 12 - Revisions to “clarifications to project participants on when to request revision, clarification to an approved methodology or a deviation”

Annex 13 - Revisions to “procedures for the revision of an approved baseline or monitoring methodology by the Executive Board”

Issues relating to afforestation and reforestation project activities

Annex 14 - Draft procedures to demonstrate the eligibility of lands for afforestation and reforestation project activities

Annex 15 - Methodological Tool: “Calculation of the number of sample plots for measurements within A/R CDM project activities” (Version 01)

Annex 16 - Tool: “Tool for testing significance of GHG emissions in A/R CDM project activities” (Version 01)

Issues relating to small-scale CDM project activities

Annex 17 - AMS III.L Avoidance of methane production from biomass decay through controlled pyrolysis

Annex 18 - AMS III.M Reduction in consumption of electricity by recovering soda from paper manufacturing process

Annex 19 - Revision of AMS I.A

Annex 20 - Revision of AMS I.C

Annex 21 - Revision of AMS I.D

Annex 22 - Revision of AMS III.D

Annex 23 - Revision of AMS III.I

Annex 24 - Revision of AMS II.D

Annex 25 - Revision of AMS III.F

Annex 26 - Revision of AMS III E

Annex 27 - Revision of AMS III.H



Matters relating to the registration of CDM project activities

- Annex 28 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 0754
- Annex 29 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 0854
- Annex 30 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 0859
- Annex 31 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 0861
- Annex 32 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 0863
- Annex 33 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 0872
- Annex 34 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 0951
- Annex 35 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 0954

Resources

- Annex 36 - Status of resources and pledges to support 2007 CDM activities

Other business

- Annex 37 - Revised procedures for public communication with the CDM Executive Board
- Annex 38 - Provisional agenda for EB32