CLEAN DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM EXECUTIVE BOARD

ANNOTATIONS TO THE PROPOSED AGENDA

ADDENDUM

Thirty-second meeting

UNFCCC Headquarters
Bonn, Germany
20 - 22 June 2007

CONTENTS

I. ADDENDUM TO THE ANNOTATED AGENDA

3. Work plan

(b) Methodologies for baselines and monitoring

1. ►***Action***: The Board may wish to take note of the report of the twenty-seventh 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.

Background: The Meth Panel held its twenty-seventh meeting in Bonn, Germany on 27 May - 1 June 2007 and undertook its work in two parallel groups. The Meth Panel dealt with general issues relating to case-specific issues process, methodological clarifications, guidance and other issues, as specified below.

Case specific

2. ►***Action***: Taking into consideration the inputs by experts (desk reviewers) and the public, the Board may wish, based on recommendations of the Meth Panel (see MP27 report), to:

(a) Approve cases NM210 contained in the annex 3 of the Meth Panel report (MP27 report);

(b) Forward cases NM0203 for revision to the project participants and for resubmission without the need for further experts and public input. If project participants wish to have the revised proposals considered at the twenty-ninth meeting of the Meth Panel (24-28 September 2007), they shall exceptionally submit them by 13 August 2007 10 AM GMT;

(c) Not approve cases NM0121-rev, NM0160-rev, NM0172-rev, NM0205, NM0206, NM0207, NM0214, NM0218, NM0219, NM0221 and NM0223 that, if revised taking into account comments, can be resubmitted but will require new expert and public input.

Background: Information on methodologies currently under consideration by the Board and the Meth Panel are available on the UNFCCC CDM website[1]. The Meth Panel agreed on preliminary recommendations to project participants for proposals NNM0194-rev, NM0197-rev, NM0208, NM0209, NM0211, NM0216, and NM0220. The Meth Panel did not conclude its discussion on the cases NM0212 and NM0222. The Panel will seek expert input before concluding its discussion (see paragraph 10 of MP27 meeting report).

3. ►***Action***: The Board may wish to approve:

(a) Case NM0171 recommended for approval as "Energy efficiency improvement of a boiler by introducing oil/water emulsion technology", as contained in annex 1 of Meth Panel's report (see MP27 report); with

(b) One of the following options for identification of baseline scenario and demonstrating additionality of project activity:

(i) Combined tool; or

(ii) Use of baseline scenario identification procedure, as proposed by the project participants, and additionality tool to demonstrate additionality.

[1] See <http://cdm.unfccc.int/goto/MPappmeth>

Background: The Board considered the case NM0171, recommended by the panel 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". The Meth Panel reconsidered the case "**NM0171**: Use of Hydro Heavy Fuel Oil Technology (HHFOT) to improve energy efficiency at a power plant in Pakistan," as per the Board's request. The Meth Panel noted that as the proposal to identify baseline scenario in the submission was based on the procedure of the combined tool and, hence, in view of maintaining consistency in the application of procedures it had suggested the use of the combined tool.

4. ►***Action***: The Board may wish to approve:

(a) Cases NM0200-rev and NM0213 consolidated into "consolidated baseline methodology for fuel switching from coal and/or petroleum fuels to natural gas in power plants for electricity generation" as contained in annex 2 of Meth Panel's report (see MP27 report); with

(b) One of the following options to demonstrating additionality of project activity:

(i) Investment analysis alone.

(ii) The additionality tool.

Background: The panel consolidated the cases NM0200-rev and NM0213 as both the cases are for project activities that implement fuel switch from coal and/or petroleum fuel to natural gas in an existing power plant. NM0200-rev is for case where the power plant is connected to the grid, whereas, in NM0213 the power plant supplies to captive customers. The panel could not conclude whether for such fuel switch activities investment analysis alone should be used for demonstrating additionality. Therefore, it requested the Board to take the final decision.

5. ►***Action***: The Board may wish to approve:

(a) Cases NM0215 and NM0217 consolidated into "consolidated baseline and monitoring methodology for new grid connected fossil fuel fired power plants using a less GHG intensive technology" as contained in annex 4 of Meth Panel's report (see MP27 report); with

(b) One of the following options to demonstrating additionality of project activity:

(i) Investment analysis alone,

(ii) The additionality tool.

(c) One of the following options for identifying the sample power plants to estimate the efficiency of the identified baseline power plant:

(i) Include power plants that use the same technology as the project power plant,

(ii) Not to include power plants that use the same technology as the project power plant.

Background: The panel consolidated the cases NM0215 and NM0217 as both the cases are for project activities that establish a new power plant using a less GHG intensive technology than the one that would have been used in the absence of the project activity. The panel could not conclude whether for such new facilities investment analysis alone should be used for demonstrating additionality. Further, the panel also could not conclude whether or not power plants/units that use the same technology as the project plant should be excluded from the sample used to estimate the efficiency of the identified baseline power plant. Therefore, it requested the Board to take the final decision.

Responses to clarifications

6. ►***Action***: The Board may wish to take note of the response to a clarification provided by the Meth Panel, as referred in the Meth Panel report (MP27)

(a) Clarified the request AM_CLA_000043 concerning approved methodology AM0025.

(b) Clarified the request AM_CLA_000044 concerning approved methodology ACM0010.

(c) Clarified the request AM_CLA_000044 concerning approved methodology AM0025.

(d) Clarified the request AM_CLA_0046 concerning approved methodological tool "to determine methane emissions avoided from dumping waste at disposal site".

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

Responses to requests for revisions and resultant revision of approved methodologies

7. ►***Action***: The Board may wish to agree to the responses to revisions and the resultant revision of approved methodologies as referred to in the Meth Panel report (MP27):

(a) Not to accept request AM_REV_0046 concerning ACM0001 requesting a revision to expand the applicability of the approved consolidated methodology to project activities that capture biogas from anaerobic organic waste water treatment systems using an open pond or lagoon system. To revise the consolidated methodology ACM0001 to include procedures for estimating emissions reductions from use of captured landfill gas for energy generation. Further, to expand the applicability of the approved consolidated methodology to project activities where the captured landfill gas is used to supply consumers through a natural gas distribution network, if the Board approves case NM0210. The revised version of the methodology is contained in annex 6 of Meth Panel's report (see MP27 report).

(b) Accept request AM_REV_0047 concerning ACM0006 requesting a revision to the approved consolidated methodology to expand its applicability to project activities that use biomass to generate power and heat which is supplied to the user and not to the grid.

(c) Not to accept request AM_REV_0047 concerning ACM0006 requesting a revision to expand the applicability of the approved consolidated methodology to allow project activities that co-fire biomass and fossil fuel in existing biomass residue power generating unit(s) while applying scenario 16 of the approved consolidated methodology.

Background: Information on the revisions to methodologies is available on the UNFCCC CDM website (<http://cdm.unfccc.int/goto/MPrev>). The Meth Panel recommended to revise the approved consolidated methodology ACM0006 in response to the request for revision AM_REV_0047. The revision to the approved methodology shall be considered by the panel at its twenty-eighth meeting, before recommending to the Board.

8. ►***Action***: The Board may wish to approve the revision of approved methodology AM0025 clarifying that approved methodology is applicable to project activities:

(a) Where output of composting activity is disposed of in landfill; and

(b) Where refuse derived fuel is used for either generation of heat or co-generating energy.

Background: The panel revised approved methodology AM0025 to incorporate the clarifications that it provided to the applicability of the approved methodology as requested by clarifications AM_CLA_0044 and AM_CLA_0046.

9. ►***Action***: The Board may wish to provide guidance that validating DOE shall confirm that estimates provided in the survey used for defining the terms of the underlying oil production project are used to present the estimated flare reduction in the CDM-PDD for project activities using approved methodology AM0009. At verification the DOE could check the production data for oil and associate gas and compare it with initial production target. If the oil production differs significantly from initial production target, then it should be checked upon verification that this is not intentional, and that such a scenario is properly addressed by the contract between the contracted party(ies).

Background: The Board, at its thirtieth meeting, requested the Meth Panel to review the approved methodology AM0009 to consider whether a method for forecasting the baseline oil production levels and volumes of gas recovered from the oil field during the crediting period should be stipulated to provide greater accuracy to the ex-ante emission reductions estimations. The panel noted that in oil extraction projects the estimate of associate gases is determined based on an area, which the contracted party (ies) are authorized to develop, and a production target is established by development survey. The estimated production of associated gas depends on, among other factors, the likely (but not definite) number of wells drilled to ensure the production target. Therefore, the uncertainty in such estimates can be significant. The panel was of the view that estimates provided in the survey used for defining the terms of the underlying oil production project should be used to present the estimated flare reduction, which could be confirmed by validating DOE.

10. ►***Action***: The Board may wish to approve the "Consolidated baseline methodology for GHG emission reductions for waste gas or waste heat or waste pressure based energy system", as contained in annex 7 of Meth Panel's report (see MP27 report).

Background: 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 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. The panel revised the methodology as requested by the Board. The panel explained that the three year data requirement was proposed by the proposed new methodology submissions based on which the draft consolidated methodology is prepared, which the panel found appropriate taking account of the possible variability of waste energy generation due to various factors. It also highlighted the fact that the proposed draft consolidated methodology provides options to establish baseline parameters if historic data is not available.

11. ►***Action***: The Board may wish to withdraw approved methodology AM0032 (Methodology for waste gas or waste heat based cogeneration system) and ACM0004 (Consolidated methodology for waste gas and/or heat for power generation), which are incorporated into the draft consolidated methodology for cogeneration using waste gas, referred to in annotated agenda item 19 above.

Background: The approved methodology AM0032 is for project activities that use waste gas to cogenerate energy for on-site use or export. The approved consolidated methodology ACM0004 is for project

activities using waste gas, generated at existing or new industrial facility, to generate electricity for own use or export to the grid. Whereas, the new recommended draft consolidated cogeneration methodology is applicable to all project activities that could apply either AM0032 or ACM0004, which include: new and existing facilities; generation of electricity or heat or cogenerate electricity and heat; own consumption of generated energy and its export to grid and/or other identified customers.

General guidance

12. ►***Action:*** The Board may wish to agree that submissions of proposed new methodologies for hydroelectric power project activities with a power density less than 4 W/m^2 shall only be considered after the expert community working on methods for the measurement of greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) from reservoirs, associated with hydroelectric projects, have concluded their work, except for reservoirs where it can be demonstrated that these GHG emissions are negligible.

Background: The Meth Panel considered reports from experts on the scientific agreement on methods for the measurement of greenhouse gas emissions from reservoirs, as requested by the Meth Panel at its twenty-sixth meeting for the case NM0121-rev. The Meth Panel noted that the experts were of the view that the extrapolation of point measurements to estimate reservoir-wide emissions may not be very reliable. The experts also noted that further work is underway to improve measurement procedures and these efforts are not likely to conclude in the immediate future. The Meth Panel agreed to recommend that submissions of proposed new methodologies for hydroelectric power projects activities with a power density less than 4 W/m2 should only be considered after the expert community working on methods for the measurement of greenhouse gas emissions from reservoirs have concluded their work, except for reservoirs where it can be demonstrated that the emissions are negligible.

13. ►***Action:*** The Board may wish to clarify to the project participants that project activities that improve the combustion efficiency of fuels used in energy generation, should clearly distinguish between the saving in fuels from such project activities that are due to the improvement in combustion efficiency and those that are due to improvements in energy efficiency. The Board may wish to further clarify that though improvements in combustion efficiency may result in fuel savings, they may not result in equivalent reduction in GHG emissions, as the fuels saving are due to better oxidation of the fuel, which in absence of the project activity would have remained unburned, thus not resulting in GHG emissions.

Background: The panel noted that some of the new proposed methodologies submitted are for project activities that undertake measures for improving the combustion efficiency of fuels in energy generation equipments. The panel would like to clarify that the improvement of combustion efficiency in some cases may lead to energy efficiency, nonetheless, the project proponents should clearly distinguish the saving in fuel from such projet activies that are due to combustion efficiency and those that are due to energy efficiency, as the reduction in GHG emissions occur only due to improvement in energy efficiency alone. Though improvement in combustion efficiency saves fuel but these fuel savings are because of better oxidation of unburnt carbon in absence of the project activity and thus do not result in decrease in GHG emissions.

14. ►***Action***: The Board may wish to approve tool for estimation of project or leakage emissions from fossil fuel combustion.

Background: The panel recommends for approval tool for estimation of project or leakage emissions from fossil fuel combustion, as contained in annex 8 of the Meth Panel's report (see MP27 report).

15. ►***Action***: The Board may wish to approve tool for estimation of project emissions from electricity consumption.

Background: The panel recommends for approval tool for estimation of project emissions from electricity consumption, as contained in annex 9 of the Meth Panel's report (see MP27 report).

16. ►***Action***: The Board may wish to launch a call for public input on the draft tool for estimation of emissions from cultivation of biomass. The Board may also wish to take note of the concept, discussed by the Meth Panel, namely a list of crops used as feedstock for the production of biofuels, that if grown on degraded lands, are likely to result in negligible GHG emission from the cultivation of these crops and, therefore in such cases these emissions could be neglected.

Background: The Meth Panel discussed a draft tool for estimating emissions from cultivation of biomass on degraded land. The panel recommended to the Board to launch a call for public comments on the draft tool, as contained in annex 10 of Meth Panel's report (see MP27 report). The Meth Panel considered a further concept namely a list of crops used as feedstock for the production of biofuels, that if grown on degraded lands, are likely to result in negligible GHG emission from the cultivation of these crops and, therefore in such cases these emissions could be neglected.

17. ►***Action***: The Board may wish to consider the brief note prepared by the secretariat on approved methodologies and proposed new methodology cases.

Background: The Board, at thirty-first meeting, considered the preliminary analysis on approved methodologies and proposed new methodology cases. 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

18. ►***Action:*** The Board may wish to agree to the proposed modifications to the methodologies consideration process and resultant changes in the procedures and forms. In doing so the Board may want to consider a further oral account by the secretariat on its first experiences of enhanced dialogue with project participants on issues concerning the consideration of methodologies.

Background: The Board at its thirty-first meeting 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. In accordance with the request by CMP.2, the Board at its thirtieth meeting considered the oral report by the secretariat on its first experiences of the new service of enhanced dialogue with project participants on issues concerning the consideration of methodologies and requested the secretariat report orally at the thirty-second meeting of the Board.

19. ►***Action:*** The Board may wish to consider a note prepared by the secretariat on the issue of energy efficiency projects under the CDM including options currently available under the CDM and possible ways of enhancing these options still further within the CDM modalities and procedures.

Background: The Board at its thirty-first meeting considered 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 energy efficiency 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.

For notification by the Board

20. ***Note:*** The Board may wish to take note that the Meth Panel is developing guidance on calculating upstream emissions for different ways in which a bioenergy carrier can be produced. The Board also took note that the Meth Panel is undertaking a synthesis of the information available on the GHG emissions associated with biofuel production in Non Annex I countries to recommend a methodological approach to

estimate such emissions and to explore the possibility of providing conservative default values on a regional basis, which could be easily used by project proponents.

Background: The Board, at its thirty-first meeting, 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. The Meth Panel discussed the issue and considered it as calculation of upstream GHG emission for biomass energy project activities based on cultivated biomass. These GHG emissions may include the GHG emissions associated with deforestation of land effected directly or indirectly by the project activity. The production of a bioenergy carrier (e.g. biofuel) could typically be based on either of the following possibilities: (i) Biofuel purchased from the market, i.e., the producer of biofuel is not identifiable; (ii) Biofuel produced from vegetable oil purchased from the market, i.e., the producer of vegetable oil is not identifiable; (iii) Biofuel produced from vegetable oil that is produced from agricultural raw material, e.g. soybean, purchased from the market, i.e., the producer of agricultural raw material is not identifiable; (iv) Biofuel produced from vegetable oil that is produced from agricultural raw material, e.g., soybean, cultivated within the project boundaries. The Meth Panel agreed to develop guidance on calculating upstream emissions for these situations. As a first step the Meth Panel agreed to undertake a synthesis of the information available on the GHG emissions associated with biofuel production in Non Annex I countries. The synthesis will consider the different ways to produce biofuels as well as the dependence of GHG emissions to the localisation of the production of different steps in the production chain.

21. ***Note:*** The Board may wish to take note that the Meth Panel will undertake revision of the approved methodology AM0037 to include a procedure for baseline scenario for production facility.

Background: The Meth Panel discussed the issue of applicability condition regarding "displacement of production in Annex I country by project activity production" of the approved methodology AM0037 "Flare reduction and gas utilization at oil and gas processing facilities", as requested by the Board at its twenty-sixth meeting. The Meth Panel noted that the approved methodology does not provide a procedure for identification of baseline scenario for the production of the product using flared gas. The Panel agreed to consider proposals for revision of the methodology to include a procedure for baseline scenario for production facility. The Meth Panel will consider the draft revision of the approved methodology at its twenty-eighth meeting.

22. ***Note:*** The Board may wish to take note that the Meth Panel will prepare a report on approaches to address uncertainty emissions reductions at its twenty-eighth meeting.

Background: The Meth Panel discussed the draft report prepared for the Board on addressing uncertainty in estimating emissions reductions. The panel agreed to finalize the report on uncertainties in emissions reduction estimation and its recommendation, to the Board, at its twenty-eighth meeting.

23. ***Note:*** The Board may wish to take note that the twenty-eight meeting of the Meth Panel will be held from 9-13 July 2007 and that the deadline for the twentieth round of submissions of proposed new methodologies is to be 3 September 2007.

Background: The Board at its twenty-sixth meeting agreed to the calendar of meetings, including meetings of panels and working groups, for 2007 and deadlines for submission of proposed new methodologies.

(c) Issues relating to afforestation and reforestation project activities

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

Background: The A/R WG held its fourteenth meeting in Bonn, Germany on 4 - 6 June 2007. The A/R WG dealt with general issues and case-specific issues.

Case specific

25. ►***Action***: Taking into consideration the inputs by experts (desk reviewers) and the public, the Board may wish, based on recommendations of the A/R WG (see A/R WG 14 report), to:

(a) Not approve case ARNM0026-rev that, if revised taking into account comments, can be resubmitted but will require new expert and public input.

Background: Information on methodologies currently under consideration by the Board and the A/R WG are available on the UNFCCC CDM website[2]. The A/R WG agreed on preliminary recommendations to project participants for proposals ARNM0034 and ARNM0033.

General guidance

26. ►***Action****:* The Board may wish to clarify that the provisions of paragraph 11 of Annex to 6/CMP.1 shall apply to bundles of small scale A/R project activities, created for the purpose of validation only, hence the limit for net anthropogenic greenhouse gas removals by sinks as provided in paragraph 1 (a) of Annex to 6/CMP.1 shall not apply to the paragraph 11. Therefore, the "General principles for bundling" (EB 21, annex 21) may not be applicable mutatis mutandis in the context of validation of bundles of A/R-SSC CDM project activities only.

Background: In response to a query by the DOE forum, the Board at its thirtieth meeting requested the A/R WG to consider draft guidance on the application of the guidance contained in paragraphs 1(a) and 11 of the annex to the decision 6/CMP.1 to the validation of the bundles of several small-scale A/R CDM project activities, which may exceed the limit for net anthropogenic greenhouse gas removals by sinks for small-scale A/R CDM project activities.

27. ***Note:*** The Board, at its last meeting, requested the A/R 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 A/R WG shall forward its recommendations to the EB in this regard, as a priority. The A/R WG recommendations are referred to under the agenda item 'Other matters - Programme of activities'.

28. ►***Action****:* The Board may wish to further clarify that when the A/R CDM definition of forest is applied to stands with several storeys, those trees selected from any storey to satisfy the crown cover threshold (or equivalent stocking level) must also be trees that have the potential to reach the height threshold at maturity *in situ*, where the crown cover and height thresholds referred to, are those selected by the host party and reported to the Executive Board through its designated national authority for the CDM.

Background: The Board at its twenty-ninth meeting requested the A/R WG to consider draft guidance on the application of the A/R CDM definition of forest in stands with several storeys of trees. In response to a query by the DOE Forum, requesting clarification whether the existing criteria for forest definition could be fulfilled as a result of all storeys or by the highest storey only, the A/R WG developed further draft clarifying guidance.

[2] See <http://cdm.unfccc.int/goto/MPappmeth>

29. ►***Action:*** The Board may wish to revise the form: Proposed New Baseline and Monitoring Methodologies for A/R (CDM-AR-NM) version 2, and the Guidelines for Completing the Project Design Document and the Proposed New Methodology for A/R as included in the "Technical guidelines for the development of new afforestation/reforestation baseline and monitoring methodologies" version 1, as contained in annexes of the A/R WG's report (see A/R WG 14 report).

Background: The A/R WG revised the CDM-AR-NM form and guidelines to avoid duplication with the CDM-AR-PDD, in particular with regard to the sections on stratification and uncertainties. Furthermore, the form now includes areas for recommendation and comments by the WG members for use during the methodology consideration process.

30. ►***Action:*** The Board may wish to select a member of the Board to act as Vice-Chair of the A/R WG.

Background: At its last meeting, the Board took note of the resignation of Ms. María Sanz Sanchez, Vice-Chair of the A/R WG and expressed its deep appreciation to her for her outstanding dedication and support to the working group.

For notification by the Board

31. ***Note:*** The Board may wish to take note that A/R WG agreed not to continue work on guidance on leakage and leakage management areas, however the methodological work to date will be applied to develop a set of tools for the estimation of leakage.

Background: At its fourteenth meeting, the A/R WG agreed not to continue work in guidance on leakage and leakage management areas. The work done to date, will be used to develop a set of tools for estimation of leakage.

32. ***Note***: The Board may wish to take note that A/R WG agreed not to continue work on guidance for treatment of uncertainties in A/R CDM project activities. The work undertaken to date has been considered in the approved tools: "Calculation of the number of sample plots for measurements within A/R CDM project activities" and "Tool for testing significance of GHG emissions in A/R CDM project activities".

Background: At its fourteenth meeting, the A/R WG considered draft proposal for "Guidelines for treatment of uncertainties in A/R CDM project activities" and agreed not to continue its work on the issue. The work done was already used in the approved tools: "Calculation of the number of sample plots for measurements within A/R CDM project activities" and "Tool for testing significance of GHG emissions in A/R CDM project activities".

33. ***Note***: The Board may wish to express its deep appreciations to the outgoing A/R WG member, Mr. Frank Werner.

Background: At its last meeting, the Board selected the new members of the A/R WG and expressed its deep appreciations to the all but one of the outgoing A/R WG members.

34. ***Note:*** The Board may wish to take note that the fifteenth meeting of the afforestation and reforestation working group will be held from 4 to 6 July 2007.

4. Other matters

(a) Programme of Activities

35. ►***Action***: The Board may wish to agree to the recommendation by the ARWG, that no specific revision of the leakage provisions is needed for the purpose of application of the approved SSC A/R methodology (AR AMS0001 - Version 03) to CDM project activity under a programme of activities (PoA).

Background: At its last meeting, the Board requested the A/R WG to review the SSC A/R methodologies, with a view to revising the leakage provisions, as appropriate, to account for leakage under a CPA. The ARWG considered the issue and agreed to recommend that no changes are required to the approved methodology for its use under a programme of activities (PoA).

- - - -