



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

Date: 14 September 2007  
Ref: CDM-EB-34

EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE CLEAN DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM

THIRTY-FOURTH MEETING

Report

**Date of meeting:** 12 - 14 September 2007

**Location:** Bonn, Germany

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

<b>Member</b>	<i>Alternate</i>
<b>Ms. Ulrika Raab</b> <sup>2</sup>	<b>Mr. Martin Hession</b>
<b>Mr. Hernán Carlino</b> <sup>1</sup>	<b>Mr. Philip M. Gwage</b> <sup>1</sup>
<b>Mr. Akihiro Kuroki</b> <sup>2</sup>	<b>Ms. Jeanne-Marie Huddleston</b> <sup>2</sup>
<b>Mr. Samuel Adejuwon</b> <sup>2</sup>	<b>Mr. Kamel Djemouai</b> <sup>2</sup>
<b>Mr. Xuedu Lu</b> <sup>1</sup>	<b>Mr. Richard Muyungi</b> <sup>1</sup>
Ms. Christiana Figueres <sup>2</sup>	<b>Mr. José Domingos Miguez</b> <sup>2</sup>
<b>Mr. Rawleston Moore</b> <sup>1</sup>	<i>N.N</i>
<b>Mr. Evgeny Solokov</b> <sup>1</sup>	<b>Ms. Natalia Berghi</b> <sup>1</sup>
<b>Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sethi</b> <sup>2</sup>	<b>Ms. Liana Bratasida</b> <sup>2</sup>
<b>Mr. Hans Jürgen Stehr</b> <sup>1</sup>	<b>Mr. Lex de Jonge</b> <sup>1</sup>

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 Chair of the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism (CDM) (hereinafter referred to as the Board) 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. Christiana Figueres and Ms. Natalia Berghi were unable to attend the meeting and had provided proper justification for their absence.
3. The Board took note of the resignation of Mr. Rawleston Moore, member from the from the small island developing States (AOSIS), which will be effective after this meeting. It expressed its deep appreciation for his important contribution to the CDM.

**Agenda item 2. Adoption of the agenda**

4. The Board adopted the revised agenda and agreed to the programme of work.

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

5. The Board took note of the twenty-first 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.

***Case specific***

6. The Board considered a recommendation of the CDM-AP on review of work of three project activities for an entity under spot-check. The Board, taking note that the DOE had made serious efforts to improve its performance and instituted a number of measures to meet the expected quality objectives of the Board, agreed to close the spot-check process for the DOE.
7. The Board considered the report of the appeal panel established to assess the appeal submitted by a DOE against the recommendation of the CDM-AP. The Board taking into consideration the recommendation of the appeal panel agreed to reject the appeal by the DOE.
8. The Board, taking into consideration an institutional issue related to a DOE, agreed to undertake a spot-check of the DOE. The Board also agreed on the scope of the spot-check and requested the CDM-AP to undertake this spot-check in an expeditious manner.

***General guidance***

9. The Board took note of the progress of the work on several items, as reported by the Chair of the panel, including elaboration of CDM accreditation standards, development of a policy framework to address non-compliance issues by DOEs and dissemination of information on DOEs and their accredited sectoral scopes.
10. The Board agreed to the revised accreditation procedure, as contained in [annex 1](#) of this report. The revision relates to the appeals section of the CDM accreditation procedure.



11. The Board took note of the CDM guidance document on specific CDM assessors and AE/DOE auditor competencies, submitted by the CDM-AP. The Board requested the CDM-AP to submit a proposal with further elaborations.
12. The Board took note of the progress on the consideration of the request of the DOE/AE Forum on phased verification approach for CDM project activities and requested the panel to submit its recommendation for the consideration of the Board at its thirty-sixth meeting.
13. The Board agreed to inform the DOEs that in validating CDM project activities that apply approved methodology ACM0006 the consideration of baseline alternatives should not be restricted to only the alternatives mentioned in the approved methodology, but also consider any other realistic and credible alternatives relevant to the concerned project activity.
14. The Board agreed to select an additional methodological expert for the CDM-AP at its next meeting.

#### ***Further schedule***

15. The Board noted that the thirty-second meeting of the CDM-AP is scheduled to take place from 7 - 9 November 2007.

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

#### ***Case specific***

16. The Board approved the consolidated methodology ACM0013 “Consolidated methodology for new grid connected fossil fuel fired power plants using a less GHG intensive technology”, linked to the sectoral scope 1, as contained in [annex 2](#) of this report. The Board noted that the approved consolidated methodology provides incentives for continual improvement in fossil fuel use efficiency for power generation in countries that are predominantly fossil fuel dependent and shall continue be so into the future. The approved methodology ensures that renewable resources projects are neither impacted nor jeopardised and the potential for the application of this methodology in a particular geographic area decreases, as more of these projects are registered under the CDM.

#### ***General guidance***

17. With reference to a proposed methodology, the Board considered the analysis of implication of different options proposed by the Meth Panel with regard to accounting emissions of GHGs and also implications on gases covered under the Montreal Protocol. The Board agreed that:
  - (a) The project boundary shall encompass all anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases, as defined in paragraph 1 of the Convention but not included in Annex A of the Kyoto Protocol, under the control of the project participants that are significant and reasonably attributable to the CDM project activity.
  - (b) The leakage emissions from greenhouse gases, as defined in paragraph 1 of the Convention but not included in Annex A of the Kyoto Protocol, should be accounted, if the CDM project activity results in an increase of such emissions.
  - (c) The global warming potentials used to calculate the carbon dioxide equivalence of anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases not listed in Annex A, shall be those accepted by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change in its third assessment report.
18. The Board appointed Ms Ciska Terblanche as additional methodological expert for the Meth Panel. The Board, in view of the possibility of the resignation of a panel member in addition appointed



Mr. Luis Alberto de La Torre as a replacement member. The replacement of members appointment shall be effective from the meeting immediately after last meeting attended by the departing member. The terms of these new members shall be synonymous with the terms of the existing members appointed to the panel by the Board at its thirty-first meeting.

19. The Board considered the note prepared by the secretariat on the feasibility and benefits of conducting the meetings of the Meth Panel and the SSC Working Group and possibly also the A/R Working Group simultaneously in one meeting location and agreed further consider the issue at its next meeting.

20. The Board clarified that all project participants shall republish the PDD for comments at the validation stage in cases where, due to the expiry of the version of approved methodology applied, project participants change the applied version to the most recent one. The Board decided at its thirty-third meeting to extend the period during which project participants may request registration of a project activity applying the older version of a revised methodology. Hence, the Board clarified that provisions pertaining to the identification in a revised methodology of those project activities, which are to publish a PDD within 30 days do not apply anymore<sup>1</sup>.

21. The Board considered the progress report of the secretariat on the work related to energy efficiency. The Board noted that work has been initiated on assessing the key issues for not approving new methodologies submitted to Board for energy efficiency projects as well as potential solutions to these issues in the approved methodologies. Work is also underway in reviewing energy efficiency efforts undertaken in various parts of world to identify possible solutions that could be used to develop methodological tools for facilitating energy efficiency project activities under the CDM.

22. The Board revised the procedure for the submission and consideration of queries regarding the application of approved methodologies by DOEs to the Meth Panel, to enable faster responses to queries that as per the procedures need not be considered by entire panel. The revised procedures, which come into effect on 1 November 2007, are included in [annex 3](#).

#### ***Further schedule***

23. The Board took note that twenty-third round of submissions of proposed new methodologies is to be 19 November 2007 in order to allow the submissions to be considered by the Meth Panel at its thirty-first meeting. Further, the Board noted that the cut-off date for consideration of request for revision and clarification to be considered at the thirtieth meeting is 1 October 2007.

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

#### ***Case specific***

24. In accordance with the request by the CMP the Board agreed to submit to CMP in response to its request (paragraph 30 of decision 1/CMP2) the following two simplified methodologies “for calculating emission reductions for small-scale project activities that propose the switch from non-renewable to renewable biomass” to the CMP at its third session:

- (a) SSC I.E. Switch from Non-Renewable Biomass for Thermal Applications by the User, as contained in [annex 4](#) of this report;
- (b) SSC II.G. Energy Efficiency Measures in Thermal Applications of Non-Renewable Biomass, as contained in [annex 5](#) of this report.

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph 29, report of the twenty-seventh meeting of the Board and paragraph 93 of report of the twenty-fifth meeting of the Board.



25. The Board agreed to request the SSCWG to consider, as a matter of priority at the next meeting, the approved SSC methodology AMS II.E (Energy efficiency and fuel switching measures for buildings) with a view to providing additional guidance on the monitoring for both retrofit and new facility measures and that these changes are aligned with the applicability conditions of the methodology.

#### *General guidance*

26. In order to further improve the small scale methodology consideration process the Board revised the procedures for submissions of small-scale methodologies by revising and the procedures, guidelines and forms and approving the additional forms below, which come into effect on 1 November 2007. Amongst others, the revised procedures prescribe that all new proposed small-scale methodologies submissions undergo a desk review prior to consideration by the Board and the Guidelines for completing the form for submission of bundled small-scale CDM project activities have been made into a standalone guidance document.

- (a) New procedures for clarifications of SSC methodologies, as contained in annex 6 of this report;
- (b) New procedures revisions of SSC methodologies, as contained in annex 7 of this report;
- (c) New procedures for submissions of proposed SSC methodologies, as contained in annex 8 of this report;
- (d) Revised guidelines for completing the simplified project design document, as contained in annex 9 of this report;
- (e) New guidelines for completing the form for submission of bundled small-scale CDM project activities, as contained in annex 10 of this report;
- (f) Revised form for submissions on Small Scale Methodologies and Procedures (F-CDM-SSC-Subm), as contained in annex 10 of this report;
- (g) New form for Proposed New Small Scale Methodologies (F-CDM-SSC-NM), as contained in annex 12 of this report;
- (h) New proposed New Small Scale Methodology - public comment form (F-CDM-SSC-NMpu), as contained in annex 13 of this report;
- (i) New proposed New Small Scale Methodology expert form (F-CDM-SSC-NMex), as contained in annex 14 of this report;

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

27. The Board took note that 785 CDM project activities have been registered by 14 September 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*

28. 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 forty-six (46) requests for registration by DOEs.



29. The Board agreed to register the project activity “Jiangsu Qidong 91.5 MW Wind Power Project” (0905) taking note of the initial comments provided by the project participant and the DOE (DNV Certification AS) in response to the request for review.
30. The Board agreed to register, as corrected, the project activity:
- (a) “Partial substitution of fossil fuels with biomass in cement manufacture” (0876) if the revised PDD and spreadsheet supplied by the project participant/DOE (DNV Certification AS) in response to the request for review is displayed on the UNFCCC CDM website.
  - (b) "GEEA-SBS Biomass Treatment Project in Alegrete, Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil" (1092) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV Certification AS) if the revised PDD submitted in response to the request for review is published on the UNFCCC CDM website.
  - (c) "Manasi River Stage I Hydropower Project of Hongshanzui Hydropower Plant, Xinjiang Tianfu Thermolectric Co., Ltd." (1103) submitted for registration by the DOE (TUV-SÜD) if the revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report submitted in response to the request for review are displayed on the UNFCCC CDM website.
  - (d) "SSML – Simbhaoli Biomass Power Project" (1112) submitted for registration by the DOE (BVC Holdings S.A.) if the revised investment analysis spreadsheet and revised validation report provided by the PP/DOE in response to the request for review are displayed on the UNFCCC CDM website.
  - (e) "10MW Waste Heat Recovery based Captive Power Project at Vikash Metal and Power Limited" (1149) submitted for registration by the DOE (SGS) if the revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report submitted in response to the request for review is published on the UNFCCC CDM website.
31. The Board agreed to register with corrections the project activity:
- (a) "Hangyeong second phase SS-wind power Project" (1000) if the DOE (KEMCO) submits a revised validation report, corresponding to the revised PDD submitted in response to the request for review, which provides further evidence and confirmation that the policy implementing the subsidies omitted from the NPV calculation was implemented after 11 November 2001.
  - (b) "Inversiones Hondurenas Cogeneration Project" (1034) if the DOE (DNV Certification AS) and the project participant submit a revised PDD that includes reference to the response to the request for review that clarifies that the biomass residues are not left to decay and a revised corresponding validation report.
  - (c) "Yunnan Yingjiang Nandihe Hydro Power Project" (1074) if the DOE (DNV Certification AS) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report, which:
    - (i) Describes the consideration of the CDM in section B5; and
    - (ii) Accurately presents the calculation of the project IRR.



- (d) "Guangzhou Xingfeng Landfill Gas Recovery and Electricity Generation CDM Project" (1075) if the DOE (JCI) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and a revised validation report that include additional information and corrections provided in response to the request for review.
- (e) "GEEA Biomass 5 MW Power Plant Project" (1089) if the DOE (DNV Certification AS) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and a revised validation report which include:
  - (i) Additional information provided in response to the request for review;
  - (ii) An assessment to demonstrate annually that the rice husks used by the project activity would have been disposed in a solid waste disposal site without methane recovery in the absence of the project activity, in accordance with the monitoring requirement of the AMS III-E ver 10;
  - (iii) Validation of the benchmark rate and input data used in the investment analysis; and
  - (iv) A correction to the start date of the crediting period.
- (f) "Bandar Baru Seriting Biomass Project" (1091) if the DOE (DNV Certification AS) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report that includes:
  - (i) The comments submitted by the PP in response to the request for review;
  - (ii) The quantity of biomass used by the project on an annual basis so that this can be directly compared to the quantity available in Annex 5 (i.e. %);
  - (iii) Amendment to section E.1.2.2 in the PDD to "the quantity of EFB available in the region is at least 25% higher than the biomass used by the project activity".
- (g) "Project for the catalytic reduction of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia oxidation reactors of the NAN1 and NAN2 nitric acid plants at Abonos Colombianos SA ("Abocol"), Colombia" (1119) if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and a revised validation report which:
  - (i) Include the sources and assumptions used to determine baseline parameters of NAN2;
  - (ii) Indicate the re-assessment of baseline emission factor for NAN2 during verification;
  - (iii) Assess the project emission reductions from each of the plants independently using the baseline emission factor of each of the plant.
- (h) "Rice husk based cogeneration plant (5 MW) at Shibzada Ajit Singh Nagar District, Punjab by M/s Nahar Industrial Enterprises limited" (1130) if the DOE (DNV Certification AS) submits a revised validation report corresponding to the PDD provided by the PP in response to the request for review.
- (i) "Jiangxi Fengcheng Mining Administration CMM Utilization Project" (1135) if the DOE (DNV Certification AS) submits a revised validation report which confirms how the



DOE has validated the benchmark rate to be appropriate in the context of this project activity and which external data has been assessed during this validation.

- (j) "7.25 MW wind energy project of Aruppukottai Sri Jayavilas Ltd, Tamilnadu, India" (1137) if the DOE (SGS) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report that include:
- (i) The explanation of the calculation of net electricity generated by the renewable technology and diagram provided in response to the request for review; and
  - (ii) The cross checking of the electricity measured at the interconnection point with the individual readings from each wind turbine meter.
32. 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.
33. The Board agreed to undertake a review of the project activity:
- (a) "Power generation from waste heat at NSIL" (0997), 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 15 to this report;<sup>2</sup>
  - (b) "Ramgarh Chini Mills RE project" (1003), 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 16 to this report;
  - (c) "Compañía Azucarera Hondureña S.A. cogeneration project" (1035), 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 17 to this report;
  - (d) "Chumbagua Cogeneration Project" (1043), 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 18 to this report;<sup>3</sup>
  - (e) "Ingenio Magdalena S.A. cogeneration project" (1044), 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 19 to this report;<sup>4</sup>
  - (f) "La Grecia Cogeneration Project" (1056), 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 20 to this report;<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PDD and monitoring plan should be revised to incorporate the PP/DOE comments in response to the request for review regarding the exclusion of monitoring of fossil fuels.

<sup>3</sup> If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE should submit a revised PDD that includes the equity IRR, a benchmark based on the annual average active interest rate for Honduras in 2004, comments regarding the local stakeholder consultation process provided by the PP/DOE in response to the request for review, and a corresponding revised validation report.

<sup>4</sup> If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE should submit a revised PDD that includes the ex-post data vintage for the calculation and monitoring of the operating and build margin baseline emission factors and a corresponding revised validation report.

<sup>5</sup> If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE should submit a revised PDD that includes a benchmark based on the annual average active interest rate for Honduras in 2002 and a corresponding revised validation report.



- (g) "Cargill Uberlândia Biomass Residues Fuel Switch Project" (1065), 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 21](#) to this report;
- (h) "SRBSL – Waste Heat Recovery based Captive Power Project" (1076), 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 22](#) to this report;
- (i) "Montecristo Hydroelectric Project" (1077), submitted for registration by the DOE (AENOR), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 23](#) to this report;
- (j) "Optimal utilization of clinker by increasing the additives in cement production at Holcim Lanka Ltd (HLL), Sri Lanka" (1084), 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 24](#) to this report;<sup>6</sup>
- (k) "Emission reduction through partial substitution of fossil fuel with alternative fuels like agricultural byproducts & Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) in the manufacturing of portland cement at Vikram Cement (VC), Neemuch (MP), India" (1085), submitted for registration by the DOE (RWTÜV), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 25](#) to this report;<sup>7</sup>
- (l) "BHL Bilai Project" (1086), 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 26](#) to this report;
- (m) "Ancon – EcoMethane Landfill Gas Project" (1104), 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 27](#) to this report;
- (n) "M/S. Kothari Sugars and Chemicals Ltd (KSCL)'s Bagasse Based Co-generation Project, at Perambalur district, Tamil Nadu, India" (1109), 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 28](#) to this report;<sup>8</sup>
- (o) "4MW Waste Heat Recovery based power project by GRSPL, India" (1114), 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 29](#) to this report;

---

<sup>6</sup> If the Board ultimately decide to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD which adequately describes the prior consideration of the CDM and a monitoring plan as revised in response to the request for review.

<sup>7</sup> If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PDD should be revised to ensure that reference is made to the selection of only one baseline and that the baseline GHG emissions from the fossil fuels displaced by the alternative fuels will be calculated in accordance with step 4 of approved baseline methodology ACM0003 version 4.

<sup>8</sup> If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD which includes:

- (i) In section B5, the information regarding the consideration of the CDM; and
- (ii) the revised monitoring plan as submitted in response to the request for review; and a corresponding revised validation report.



- (p) "75MW wind power project in Maharashtra by Essel Mining Industries Limited" (1115), 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 30](#) to this report;
- (q) "Jiaozishan Landfill Gas Recovery and Utilisation Project" (1120), 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 31](#) to this report;
- (r) "Ciudad Juarez Landfill Gas to Energy Project" (1123), 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;
- (s) "MSPPL WHR based power project at Chattisgarh, India" (1140), 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;<sup>9</sup>
- (t) "Priyata Intercontinental Wind Power Project, India" (1142), 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 34](#) to this report;
- (u) "AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-19, Goias, Brazil" (1154), 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 35](#) to this report;
- (v) "AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-20, Minas Gerais, Brazil" (1157), 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 36](#) to this report;
- (w) "AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-21, Goias, Brazil" (1158), 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 37](#) to this report;
- (x) "AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-24, Mato Grosso and Mato Grosso do Sul, Brazil" (1159), 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 38](#) to this report;
- (y) "AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-25, Minas Gerais, Brazil" (1160), 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 39](#) to this report;
- (z) "AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-26, Minas Gerais, Brazil" (1161), 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 40](#) to this report;

---

<sup>9</sup> If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD which includes, in section B5, the additional information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the consideration of the incentives of the CDM in the decision to proceed with the project activity.



- (aa) "AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-27, Goias, Brazil" (1162), 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 41](#) to this report;
- (bb) "AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-28, Santa Catarina, Brazil" (1163), 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 42](#) to this report;
- (cc) "AWMS Methane Recovery Project BR06-S-29, Sao Paulo, Brazil" (1164), 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 43](#) to this report;
- (dd) "Renewable biomass residue based steam generation at Arvind Mills, Santej" (1217), 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 44](#) to this report.

34. 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.

35. In accordance with the procedures for review as referred to in paragraph 41 of the CDM modalities and procedures, the Board considered the recommendations of the review teams for fourteen (14) project activities which were placed "Under review" at the thirty-third meeting of the Board.

36. In accordance with the provisions of paragraphs 17 and 18 (b) of the procedures mentioned in paragraph 35 above, the Board agreed to register the project activity:

- (a) "Fuel switch at BSM sugar mills" (1022) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV Certification AS) submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report which clearly demonstrate that the applicability requirements of AM0036 have been met by the project activity, "if power is generated with heat from the boilers, it is not increased as a result of the project activity, i.e: (a) site, the power generation capacity installed remains unchanged due to the implementation of the project activity and this power generation capacity is maintained at the pre-project level throughout the crediting period; and (b) the annual power generation during the crediting period is not more than 10% larger than the highest annual power generation in the most recent three years prior to the implementation of the project activity";
- (b) "Phu Khieo Bio-Energy Cogeneration project (PKBC)" (1024) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV Certification AS) submit a revised PDD containing an investment comparison analysis which indicates that the project activity is less financially attractive than at least one alternative, and a corresponding revised validation report;
- (c) "Central Izalco Cogeneration Project" (1033) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV Certification AS) submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report, which includes all corrections provided in response to the request for review, and:
  - (i) The reference of electricity tariff used in the calculation of IRR;
  - (ii) A sensitivity analysis which accurately reflect how the variation in electricity tariff would affect the project's IRR; and
  - (iii) Additional information on the active El Salvador interest rate applied as benchmark in accordance with the requirements of the Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality.



(d) “19.27 MW Grid connected wind electricity generation project by KPR Mills in Tamil Nadu” (1042) if the project participant and the DOE (BVC Holding S.A.) submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report, which includes:

- (i) A clear description of the evolution of TUFS and its availability to the project activity;
- (ii) Separate investment analysis for each of the two investment decisions (phase 1 and 2 respectively phase 3 and 4) made in the implementation of the project activity, including the assumption of TUFS being available for phase 3 and 4 and confirmation of the appropriate benchmark for each decision; and
- (iii) Sensitivity analysis corresponding to each investment decision. If applicable, a recalculation of the expected amount of CERs.

37. In accordance with the provisions of paragraphs 17 and 18 (c) of the procedures mentioned in paragraph 35 above, the Board could not register the following project activities for the reasons stated:

- (a) "Pão de Açúcar – Demand side electricity management - PDD 7" (0988), submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV Certification AS), because the project participant and the DOE failed to sufficiently substantiate that the monitoring requirements of AMS-II.E, in particular with respect to ensuring that CERs can be claimed only for energy savings due to the measures installed, would be correctly applied in the project activity.
- (b) "Kunak Bio Energy Project" (1014) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV Certification AS), because the project participant and the DOE failed to sufficiently substantiate how a required rate of return in the palm oil industry could be considered a valid benchmark for an investment in the electricity supply industry, by demonstrating that “project activities under similar conditions developed by the same company used the same benchmark”, in accordance with the "Tool for demonstration and assessment of additionality".
- (c) "Pão de Açúcar – Demand side electricity management - PDD 3" (1023), submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV Certification AS), because the project participant and the DOE failed to sufficiently substantiate that the monitoring requirements of AMS-II.E, in particular with respect to ensuring that CERs can be claimed only for energy savings due to the measures installed, would be correctly applied in the project activity.
- (d) "Pão de Açúcar – Demand side electricity management - PDD 2" (1030), submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV Certification AS), because the project participant and the DOE failed to sufficiently substantiate that the monitoring requirements of AMS-II.E, in particular with respect to ensuring that CERs can be claimed only for energy savings due to the measures installed, would be correctly applied in the project activity.
- (e) "Eliane Natural Gas fuel switch project" (1041), submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV Certification AS), because the project participant and the DOE failed to sufficiently substantiate that the monitoring requirements of ACM0009 version 3, in particular with respect to the monitoring of energy efficiency for the project activity, would be correctly applied in the project activity.
- (f) "Pão de Açúcar – Demand side electricity management - PDD 4" (1050) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV Certification AS), because the project participant and the DOE failed to sufficiently substantiate that the monitoring requirements of AMS-II.E, in particular with respect to ensuring that CERs can be claimed only for energy savings due to the measures installed, would be correctly applied in the project activity.



- (g) "Pão de Açúcar – Demand side electricity management - PDD 1" (1055) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV Certification AS), because the project participant and the DOE failed to sufficiently substantiate that the monitoring requirements of AMS-II.E, in particular with respect to ensuring that CERs can be claimed only for energy savings due to the measures installed, would be correctly applied in the project activity.
- (h) "Pão de Açúcar – Demand side electricity management - PDD 6" (1057) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV Certification AS), because the project participant and the DOE failed to sufficiently substantiate that the monitoring requirements of AMS-II.E, in particular with respect to ensuring that CERs can be claimed only for energy savings due to the measures installed, would be correctly applied in the project activity.
- (i) "Pão de Açúcar – Demand side electricity management - PDD 8" (1058) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV Certification AS), because the project participant and the DOE failed to sufficiently substantiate that the monitoring requirements of AMS-II.E, in particular with respect to ensuring that CERs can be claimed only for energy savings due to the measures installed, would be correctly applied in the project activity.
- (j) "Pão de Açúcar – Demand side electricity management - PDD 5" (1060) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV Certification AS), because the project participant and the DOE failed to sufficiently substantiate that the monitoring requirements of AMS-II.E, in particular with respect to ensuring that CERs can be claimed only for energy savings due to the measures installed, would be correctly applied in the project activity.

38. In accordance with the clarifications to paragraph 18 (b) of the procedures mentioned in paragraph 35 above, the Board agreed to register the project activity "Chilatán Hydroelectric Project" (0785) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV Certification AS) considering that the corrections requested by the Board at its thirty-first meeting had been made.

#### ***General guidance***

39. Due to the heavy workload for this meeting the Board agreed to consider a draft revision of the current "Procedures for requests for deviation" to be prepared by the secretariat for consideration by the Board at its thirty-fifth meeting.

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

40. The Board took note that 80,216,183 CERs have been issued as at 14 September 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***

41. 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 nineteen (19) requests for issuance.

42. In accordance with paragraph 10 of these procedures the Board agreed to instruct the CDM registry administrator to issue 427,144 CERs for "Catalytic N<sub>2</sub>O destruction project in the tail gas of the Nitric Acid Plant of Abu Qir Fertilizer Co." (0490), taking note of the initial comments from the DOE (DNV Certification AS) and project participant in response to the request for review



43. In accordance with the clarifications to paragraph 10 of these procedures the Board agreed to instruct the CDM registry administrator to issue CERs for:
- (a) “Methane capture and combustion from swine manure treatment for Corneche and Los Guindos” (0031), if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised monitoring report and a revised verification report which include:
    - (i) Clarifications provided in response to the request for review; and
    - (ii) Confirmation that the changes in the treatment system have not happened in this monitoring period in accordance with paragraph 75 of the report from EB33.
  - (b) “Methane capture and combustion from swine manure treatment for Peralillo” (0032), if the revised monitoring report and the revised verification report submitted in response to the request for review by the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) are displayed in the UNFCCC CDM website.
  - (c) “Vaturu and Wainikasou Hydro Projects” (0089), if the verification report submitted in response to the request for review by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) is displayed in the UNFCCC CDM website.
  - (d) “N2O Emission Reduction in Onsan, Republic of Korea” (0099), if the verification report submitted in response to the request for review by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) is displayed in the UNFCCC CDM website.
  - (e) “Methane Extraction and Fuel Conservation Project at Tamil Nadu Newsprint and Paper Limited (TNPL), Kagathipuram, Karur District, Tamil Nadu” (0124), if the DOE (SGS) submits a revised verification report which includes the information provided in response to the request for review.
  - (f) “Jalles Machado Bagasse Cogeneration Project (JMBCP)” (0187), if the project participant and the DOE (BVC Holdings S.A.) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which include:
    - (i) Recalculation of CO<sub>2</sub> emission factor of the grid stated in the PDD;
    - (ii) Information on the FAR 1 and FAR 2 submitted in response to the request for review; and
    - (iii) Clarification on the monitoring of fossil consumption submitted in response to the request for review.
  - (g) “Lages Methane Avoidance Project” (0268), if the DOE (DNV Certification AS) submits a revised verification report which includes the assessment on the project boundary changes due to the additional wood suppliers and the verification that the new biomass residues would be left to decay in the absence of project activity in accordance with the methodology.
  - (h) “LDEO Biomass Steam and Power Plant in Malaysia” (0395), if the project participant and the DOE (DNV Certification AS) submits a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which includes the recalculation of the emission reduction provided in response to the request for review.



(i) “SEO Biomass Steam and Power Plant in Malaysia” (0402), if the project participant and the DOE (DNV Certification AS) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which include:

(i) Information on the oil-fired boilers submitted in response to the request for review; and

(ii) Recalculation of the emission reduction excluding the stream generation from PKE.

(j) “VGL - Waste Heat based 4 MW Captive Power Project at Raipur” (0432), if the DOE (SGS) submits a revised verification report which includes the confirmation that no fossil fuel have been consumed in the project boundary in accordance with the methodology.

(k) “Água Doce Wind Power Generation Project” (0575), if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which include:

(i) The information on the monitoring of power supplied to the grid; and

(ii) The information on the transmission loss and the power consumption.

44. 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.

45. In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 10 of these procedures, the Board agreed to undertake a review of the request for issuance of CERs for the project activity:

(a) “Methane capture and combustion from swine manure treatment for Pocillas and La Estrella ” (0033), submitted by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 45](#) to this report;<sup>10</sup>

(b) “Cuyamapa Hydroelectric Project ” (0045), submitted by the DOE (DNV Certification AS), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 46](#) to this report;<sup>11</sup>

(c) “Nagda Hills Wind Energy Project (India)” (0112), submitted by the DOE (RWTÜV), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 47](#) to this report;

(d) “Sahabat Empty Fruit Bunch Biomass Project ” (0288), submitted by the DOE (SGS), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 48](#) to this report;<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> If the Board ultimately decides to issue CERs for the project activity, the DOE should submit a revised verification report which clearly indicates the status of the FARs raised by the DOE during the verification and how the DOE has addressed these issues.

<sup>11</sup> If the Board ultimately decides to issue CERs for the project activity, the PP/DOE should submit a revised monitoring report which includes the information on electricity generation beyond the maximum installed capacity in response to the request for review, and a corresponding revised verification report.

<sup>12</sup> If the Board ultimately decides to issue CERs for the project activity, the DOE should submit a revised verification report which clearly indicates the diesel consumption in the project boundary.



- (e) “Advanced swine manure treatment in Maitenlahue and La Manga” (0458), submitted by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in annex 49 to this report;<sup>13</sup>
- (f) “Grasim Cement: Energy efficiency by up-gradation of clinker cooler in cement manufacturing” (0858), submitted by the DOE (SGS), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in annex 50 to this report;<sup>14</sup>
- (g) “Aços Villares Natural gas fuel switch project” (1037), submitted by the DOE (DNV Certification AS), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in annex 51 to this report.

46. 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.

47. In accordance with the procedures for review as referred to in paragraph 65 of the CDM modalities and procedures, the Board considered the recommendations of the review teams for one (1) project activity which was placed “Under review” at the thirty-third meeting of the Board.

48. In accordance with the clarifications to paragraph 18(b) of the above mentioned procedures, the Board agreed to instruct the CDM registry administrator to issue CERs for “Central Energética do Rio Pardo Cogeneration Project (CERPA)” (0209) for the monitoring period 1 January 2006 - 31 December 2006 if the PP and DOE (RWTÜV) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which include:

- (i) The information to confirm that the bagasse for cogeneration was supplied from the project boundary in response to the request for clarification; and
- (ii) Additional information on the processing capacity of sugar cane before and after the project activity which confirms the third applicability of the methodology.

49. The Board considered four (4) requests for deviation related to monitoring reports undergoing verification, agreed to answer them and requested the secretariat to inform the DOEs accordingly.

#### ***Update on the status of the CDM Registry***

50. The secretariat presented to the Board an update on the status of the work of the CDM Registry. The Board took note that 12,528,749 CERs were issued in August 2007, so that at the end of that month the total accumulated number of CERs issued reached 76,068,517. From this figure, 69% have been forwarded to temporary holding accounts (52,686,445 CERs), 28% (21,279,366 CERs) still remain in the pending account and 1% (581,341 CERs) have been forwarded to permanent holding accounts of Non-Annex I project participants.

51. In relation to the number of holding accounts in the CDM Registry, the secretariat reported that 98 holding accounts have been opened as of the end of August, from which 20 correspond to permanent account holders and 78 to temporary account holders.

---

<sup>13</sup> If the Board ultimately decides to issue CERs for the project activity, the PP/DOE should submit a revised monitoring report with the revised emission reduction, the monitoring of the flow rate after aerobic treatment and the temperature, and a corresponding revised verification report.

<sup>14</sup> If the Board ultimately decides to issue CERs for the project activity, the PP/DOE should submit a revised monitoring report that explains the use of different calorific values of fossil fuels, and a corresponding revised verification report.



52. The secretariat also briefed the Board on the main current developments related to the operation of the CDM Registry in particular on: the initialisation process of the CDM registry with the ITL, which is scheduled to be fully completed by the third week of September; the first round of the User Acceptance Test has been completed at the beginning of September without any problem on the part of the CDM Registry; and, finally, the full implementation and go-live of the new version of the CDM Registry is scheduled to take place by mid October. It is expected at that time that account holders will have online access to make forwarding requests and obtain account statements.

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

##### ***CDM-MAP***

53. In accordance with decision 1/CMP.2 relating to the Management plan (CDM-MAP), the Board agreed to continue to keep the CDM MAP under review and make adjustments as necessary to continue ensuring the efficient, cost-effective, transparent and consistent functioning of the clean development mechanism. The secretariat announced that a version of the MAP to cover CDM activities in 2008 which will provide projections on the workload in 2009 will be presented for comments at the thirty-fifth meeting of the Board.

##### ***Resources***

54. The Board took note of information provided by the Secretariat on the status of resources received as reflected in table 2 of [annex 52](#). It was noted that since the thirty-third meeting of the Board, the operation reserve has grown by an additional USD 4, 719,541 million as a result of the payment of USD 2,353,595 in registration fees, USD 2,352,253 in share of proceeds and USD 13,693 methodologies fees.

55. The Board was informed by the secretariat that the balance of resources made available from Parties' contributions and fees now amounts to USD 0.7 million. The secretariat will therefore need to start using resources generated by registration fees and share of proceeds earlier than planned in the coming weeks becoming, de facto, self-financing. The current status of pledges, indicating those Parties that have so far not transferred pledges made, is contained in table 1 of [annex 52](#) to this report.

#### **Agenda item 5. Other matters**

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

56. The Board took note of the paper prepared by the secretariat, containing an analysis of how the barriers identified by the Board in its recommendations to CMP.2 could be addressed and an analysis of type of projects and methodologies that could be more suitable for regions with limited participation in the CDM, particularly in Africa, SIDS and LDCs and on that basis the Board had a fruitful discussion on possible elements to be included in its recommendations to be forwarded to CMP3.

57. The Board agreed that a group of members will be working to further develop these elements including the possibility of linking some activities to the area of micro finance, in order to finalize its recommendations at its thirty-fifth meeting.

58. The Board also welcomed the launch of the CDM Bazaar ([www.cdmbazaar.net](http://www.cdmbazaar.net)) developed by the secretariat and UNEP RISOE Centre and indicated it as a concrete step towards enhancing the access to and sharing of information for all stakeholders involved in the CDM process.

##### **Agenda sub-item 5 (a): Relations with Designated National Authorities**

59. The Board took note of the oral update by the secretariat on the preparations for the third DNA Forum meeting and noted with appreciation that the preparations are on schedule.

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

60. 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.
61. 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) Change of a project activity title during the validation process under circumstances where the issued 'letter of approval (LOA)' from DNAs is sometimes different to the title of the project activity; and if the project participants themselves wish to change the project title. Thus depending on circumstances there appears to be a potential for causing time delays and/or confusion.
  - (b) Clear guidance was sought on the scope of the completeness check conducted by the secretariat especially related to the step when making the monitoring report available to the public.
  - (c) A concern was posed on the postponing of starting date of the crediting period for project activities that were placed "under review" and were eventually registered without any "request for corrections".
  - (d) Support was sought from the Board on matters related to some DNAs issuing restrictive LOA resulting from either late issuance of the LOA not allowing the DOE to submit for 'request for registration' due to a change in methodology or PDD format version and/or in cases where there is a late registration for project activities that enters a review process.

62. The Board members responded to the questions raised by the Chair of the DOE/AE Forum. The Board took also note of the remaining issues and agreed to further consider these issues.

63. 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)**

64. The Board met with registered observers for an informal interaction on 14 September 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.

65. The Board further agreed to continue to meet with the same type of arrangement at its thirty-fourth 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 **26 September 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.

**Agenda sub-item 5 (e): Other business**

66. The Board agreed to the calendar of meetings for 2008, which is contained in [annex 53](#) to this report. The Board noted that candidates that are being considered for nomination as Board members or alternate members may wish to note that the caseload and number of meetings for 2008 remain high.



67. The Board agreed on the provisional agenda for its thirty-fifth meeting (15 - 19 October 2007) as contained in [annex 54](#) to this report, with an open session on the 18 to 19 October 2007.

#### **Agenda item 6. Conclusion of the meeting**

68. The Chair summarized the main conclusions. The Board has expressed its appreciation to the secretariat for its excellent preparation and support throughout the meeting particularly in light of the heavy workload.

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

69. 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**

70. The Chair closed the meeting.

-----



## **Annexes to the report**

### **Accreditation**

Annex 1 - Accreditation procedure (version 08)

### **Methodologies**

Annex 2 - ACM0013 “Consolidated methodology for new grid connected fossil fuel fired power plants using a less GHG intensive technology”

Annex 3 - Revised the procedure for the submission and consideration of queries regarding the application of approved methodologies by DOEs

### **Issues relating to small-scale CDM project activities**

Annex 4 - Recommendation to the CMP: SSC I.E. Switch from Non-Renewable Biomass for Thermal Applications by the User

Annex 5 - Recommendation to the CMP: SSC II.G. Energy Efficiency Measures in Thermal Applications of Non-Renewable Biomass

Annex 6 - Procedures for clarifications of SSC methodologies

Annex 7 - Procedures revisions of SSC methodologies

Annex 8 - Procedures for submissions of proposed SSC methodologies

Annex 9 - Guidelines for completing the SSC-PDD

Annex 10 - Guidelines for completing the form for submission of bundled small-scale CDM project activities

Annex 11 - Form for submissions on Small Scale Methodologies and Procedures (F-CDM-SSC-Subm)

Annex 12 - Form for Proposed New Small Scale Methodologies (F-CDM-SSC-NM)

Annex 13 - Proposed New Small Scale Methodology - public comment form (F-CDM-SSC-NMpu)

Annex 14 - Proposed New Small Scale Methodology expert form (F-CDM-SSC-NMEx)

### **Matters relating to the registration of CDM project activities**

Annex 15 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 0997

Annex 16 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1003

Annex 17 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1035

Annex 18 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1043

Annex 19 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1044

Annex 20 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1056



- Annex 21 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1065  
Annex 22 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1076  
Annex 23 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1077  
Annex 24 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1084  
Annex 25 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1085  
Annex 26 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1086  
Annex 27 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1104  
Annex 28 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1109  
Annex 29 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1114  
Annex 30 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1115  
Annex 31 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1120  
Annex 32 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1123  
Annex 33 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1140  
Annex 34 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1142  
Annex 35 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1154  
Annex 36 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1157  
Annex 37 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1158  
Annex 38 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1159  
Annex 39 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1160  
Annex 40 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1161  
Annex 41 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1162  
Annex 42 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1163  
Annex 43 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1164  
Annex 44 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1217

**Matters relating to the issuance of CERs and the CDM registry**

- Annex 45 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0033  
Annex 46 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0045  
Annex 47 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0112



Annex 48 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0288

Annex 49 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0458

Annex 50 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0858

Annex 51 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 1037

**Resources**

Annex 52 - Status of resources and pledges to support 2007 CDM activities

**Other business**

Annex 53 - Tentative schedule for CDM meetings in 2008

Annex 54 - Provisional agenda for EB35