



**CLEAN DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM EXECUTIVE BOARD**

**PROPOSED AGENDA AND ANNOTATIONS**

Thirty-eighth meeting

UNFCCC  
Bonn, Germany  
12 - 14 March 2008

CONTENTS

I. PROPOSED AGENDA

II. ANNOTATIONS TO THE PROPOSED AGENDA

Annex 1 – Draft revision of the form for proposed new methodologies (CDM-NM)

Annex 2 – Status of income and expenditure



## I. PROPOSED AGENDA

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

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

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



## II. ANNOTATIONS TO THE PROPOSED AGENDA

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

1. ► **Action:** The Chair shall ascertain whether (a) the members present constitute a quorum, and (b) the absence of any member or alternate member is “without proper justification”<sup>1</sup>.

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

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

### 2. Adoption of the agenda

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

*Background:* The Board agreed, at its thirty-seventh meeting, on items to be included in the provisional agenda for its thirty-eighth meeting. In accordance with rule 21 of the rules of procedure of the Board, subsequent additions or changes to the provisional agenda by members and/or alternate members were to be incorporated in the proposed agenda. The proposed agenda was transmitted to the Board on 20 February 2008 and thereafter posted on the UNFCCC CDM website.

### 3. Work plan

#### (a) Accreditation of operational entities

##### *General guidance*

4. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to consider the update by the secretariat on the progress with regard to the work on the guidance for DOEs on validation and verification activities prepared by the secretariat. An update on the progress and an overview of comments from the Board members will be presented.

*Background:* The Board, at its last meeting, agreed to provide written comments on the draft document and also agreed that members of panels and working groups are to be invited to comment on the next version of the document individually rather than having the document considered at panel deliberations. The Board requested the secretariat to design a workplan so that the Board could consider the VVM at its thirty-ninth meeting. The secretariat circulated the draft document along with a preliminary work plan to the members of the Board with a deadline of 25 February 2008 for written comments.

5. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to consider and accept the new nomination of a representative from the International Accreditation Forum (IAF), to serve in an advisory capacity to the CDM Accreditation Panel (CDM-AP).

*Background:* The revised terms of reference of the CDM-AP, agreed by the Board at its twenty-third meeting, specifies that the panel may draw on the advice, as required, of one expert identified by the IAF. The secretariat has received a notification from the secretary of the IAF on the nomination and replacement of an expert to serve in the advisory capacity to the panel.

---

<sup>1</sup> Please refer to rules 28 and 7 of the rules of procedures of the Executive Board.



6. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to launch a call for experts in order to replace the outgoing members of the CDM-AP with a view to prepare a shortlist of experts for consideration by the Board at its thirty-ninth meeting.

*Background:* The Board at its twenty-fourth meeting selected members of the CDM-AP for a term of two years. The term of office of two members of the CDM-AP will therefore expire on 30 June 2008.

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

7. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to take note of the report of the thirty-first 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 thirty-first meeting in Bonn, Germany on 4 - 8 February 2008 and undertook its work in two parallel groups. The Meth Panel dealt with case-specific issues, methodological clarifications, guidance and other issues, as specified below.

***Case specific***

8. ► **Action:** Taking into consideration the inputs from experts (desk reviewers) and the public, the Board may wish, based on recommendations of the Meth Panel (see MP31 report), to:

(a) Approve cases NM0231 and NM0243 as approved methodologies, contained in annexes 1 and annex 2 of the Meth Panel report (see MP31 report);

(b) Not to approve cases NM0238, NM0242, NM0245 and NM0249 that, if revised taking into account comments, can be resubmitted but will require new expert and public input.

*Background:* The Meth Panel agreed on preliminary recommendations to project participants for the proposals NM0244, NM0247, NM0248, NM0250, NM0251, NM0252 and NM0253. The panel could not conclude its discussions on cases NM0208, NM0235 and NM0246. A recommendation by the panel on NM0208 and NM0246 will be prepared as soon as the expert input, in the context of NM0208, is available (see paragraph 8 of the MP31 report). Information on methodologies currently under consideration by the Board and the Meth Panel are available on the UNFCCC CDM website<sup>2</sup>.

The Meth Panel had recommended the case NM0231 for approval at its thirtieth meeting with two options (option 1: applicable to existing facilities; option 2: applicable to both greenfield and existing facilities) which the Board considered at its thirty-sixth meeting. The Board requested the panel to reassess the options and it recommended for approval, on the basis of additional expert input, the draft methodology, which is applicable to both existing and greenfield facilities (option 2). If the project activity is implemented in a greenfield facility, the application of Step 3 of the combined tool (investment analysis) is compulsory.

***Responses to clarifications***

9. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to agree to the responses to the requests for clarifications AM\_CLA\_0063 to AM\_CLA\_0066, as provided by the panel and referred to in the Meth Panel report (see Table on request for clarifications of MP31 report).

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



*Background:* Information on the clarification to methodologies is available on the UNFCCC CDM website (<<http://cdm.unfccc.int/goto/MPclar>>). The panel will prepare a draft revision of the approved consolidated methodology ACM0006 based on response to AM\_CLA\_0064 at its thirty-second meeting.

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

10. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to agree to the following responses to the requests for revisions and the resultant revision of the approved methodologies, as referred to in the Meth Panel report (see Table on request for revision of MP31 report):

(a) Not to accept request AM\_REV\_0072 concerning ACM0006 requesting a revision to include a new scenario for project activities that use biomass residue in an existing cogeneration system where in absence of the project activity fossil fuels and biomass residues (i.e. co-firing) would be used.

(b) Accept request AM\_REV\_0073 concerning ACM0012 requesting a revision to expand the applicability of the methodology to project activities that displaces the use of mechanical energy in the baseline with electricity generated from waste gas. The panel will prepare a draft revision of the approved consolidated methodology ACM0012 based on response to AM\_REV\_0073, and also response to AM\_REV\_0075, at its thirty-second meeting.

(c) Accept request AM\_REV\_0074, with a number of changes, concerning ACM0006 requesting a revision to add a new scenario for project activities that install a higher capacity and better efficiency new single fuel or co-fired (multiple fuel) cogeneration plant at an existing facility replacing the baseline plant which is also single fuel or co-fired (multiple fuel) cogeneration. The panel will prepare a draft revision of the approved consolidated methodology ACM0006 based on response to AM\_REV\_0074 at its thirty-second meeting.

(d) Accept request AM\_REV\_0075 concerning ACM0012 requesting a revision to expand the applicability of approved methodologies to project activities that increase the share of waste heat/gas captured and utilized compared to the baseline use of waste heat/gas. The panel will prepare a draft revision of the approved consolidated methodology ACM0012 based on response to AM\_REV\_0075, and also response to AM\_REV\_0073, at its thirty-second meeting.

(e) Not to accept request AM\_REV\_0076 concerning AM0019 requesting a revision to expand the applicability of the methodology to project activities that generate electricity from renewable energy and replace: (i) planned fossil fuel plant; and (ii) hypothetical plants that would have been built in the absence of the project activity.

(f) Not to accept request AM\_REV\_0077 concerning AM0036 requesting a revision to expand the applicability of the methodology to project activity where the fuel switch from fossil fuel to biomass residue is effected in a large number of small boilers distributed in a geographical region.

(g) Not to accept request AM\_REV\_0078 concerning ACM0014 requesting a revision to expand the applicability of the methodology to project activities that are implemented in greenfield facilities.

(h) Not to accept request AM\_REV\_0079 concerning AM0014 requesting a revision to expand the applicability to project activities that (i) install cogeneration at new commercial or institutional establishments; (ii) use steam to meet the heat requirements that in the baseline would have been met by an electrical system.

*Background:* Discussions on the request for revision AM\_REV\_0071 could not be concluded as the proposed revision is already addressed in the revision of AM0047 proposed by the Meth Panel at its thirtieth



meeting to the Board. The Board further sought clarification on revision of AM0047 proposed by the panel, discussion on which could not be concluded by the panel, and the panel expects to conclude its discussions and respond to the Board at its thirty-second meeting. The panel recommended not to accept AM\_REV\_0078 (expand applicability of ACM0014 to project activity implemented in greenfield facility), but a revision of ACM00014 was carried out to expand its applicability to greenfield facilities. The panel agreed that the proposal made by AM\_REV\_0078 did not provide a sufficiently robust procedure to establish the design parameters of the anaerobic lagoon that would have been built in the absence of the project activity and therefore the approach proposed was not incorporated in the draft revised consolidated methodology. Information on the revisions to methodologies is available on the UNFCCC CDM website (<<http://cdm.unfccc.int/goto/MPrev>>).

### ***Revision/consolidation of approved methodologies***

11. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to approve the revision of the following approved methodologies and methodological tools:

(a) **AM0034:** the revision of the approved methodology in response to the request for clarification AM\_CLA\_0063. The draft revision clarifies that, except production of Nitric Acid, which is monitored on a daily basis, all other variables are to be monitored at shorter intervals (i.e. 2 seconds). The procedure requires estimating the N<sub>2</sub>O flow for the total number of operating hours of the plant based on the average N<sub>2</sub>O flow observed for the period when the plant is operating within the permitted range, as the baseline N<sub>2</sub>O emission factor is estimated as ratio of N<sub>2</sub>O produced during one full campaign and actual total production of nitric acid produced during that campaign. This means that the total N<sub>2</sub>O is estimated as if the plant was operating for recorded operating hours of a full campaign within the permitted operating parameters. The draft revised methodology is contained in annex 3 of the Meth Panel report (see MP31 report).

(b) **AM0037:** the revision of the approved methodology. The revision removes the third applicability condition and introduces procedures in the methodology to discount emissions reductions by the amount that would have occurred in an Annex I country. The panel requested the Board to note that the recommended revision restricts the applicability of the methodology to cases where the associated gas substitutes feedstocks in the project activity. The Board at its twenty-sixth meeting requested the panel to review the third applicability condition taking into account the emission reduction between the project case, which replaces new plants in an Annex I country, and which does not replace any plant in an Annex I country. The panel agreed that if a project activity replaces a plant (partly or entirely) in an Annex I country, then depending on the product, the emission reductions will occur in the Annex I country. In such a situation, that part of the emission reductions should not be credited to the project activity as they occur in countries that have emission caps. Crediting of these reductions will therefore result in double crediting of emission reductions. The draft revised approved methodology is contained in annex 4 of the Meth Panel report (see MP31 report).

(c) **ACM0014:** the revision to the approved consolidated methodology ACM0014 expanding its applicability to project activities that are implemented in greenfield facilities. The revision was undertaken by the panel based on the analysis it undertook following agreement at its thirtieth meeting and the Board's mandate to expand the applicability of methodologies where possible. The draft revision is contained in annex 6 of the Meth Panel report (see MP31 report).

*Background:* The requests submitted and the recommendations provided by the Meth Panel are made publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website at <http://cdm.unfccc.int/goto/MPclar> and <http://cdm.unfccc.int/goto/MPrev>, respectively.

*General guidance*

12. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to clarify the following regarding the approved methodology ACM0006:

(a) The term ‘reference plant’ used in the approved methodology is defined as a “commonly installed new biomass residue fired cogeneration power plants in the respective industry sector in the country or region”. The comparison should exclude plants implemented as CDM project activities. In cases where no such plant exists within the country, the reference plant (and its electrical efficiency) should be identified through economic analysis to identify the most probable situation in the baseline for generating the same amount of electricity (which could be partially produced by a reference plant and partially by power plants connected to the grid) and heat, as anticipated to be produced in the project activity. The analysis should take into account the availability of technology, common practice in similar industries, and other relevant factors as applicable;

(b) The efficiency of heat generation of the project plant could be the same or different than the heat generation of the reference plant in context of scenarios 4, 13, 14 and 18.

*Background:* The panel provided the above guidance in context of the requests for clarification AM\_CLA\_0065 and AM-CLA\_0064. The panel will prepare a draft revision of the approved consolidated methodology ACM0006 incorporating above clarifications at its thirty-second meeting.

13. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to approve guidance to the project participants that submissions of methodologies relating to the substitution, recycling, and recovery and destruction of SF<sub>6</sub> used in various processes, should provide the following in their submissions: (i) robust procedures to address the possibility of intentional increase of baseline SF<sub>6</sub> consumption; and (ii) direct monitoring of all the key parameters that are related to estimation of baseline and project emissions including detailed explanations of key operating conditions and procedures, and an explanation addressing uncertainty.

*Background:* The Meth Panel, in its consideration of cases NM0238, NM0251 and NM0252, which are related to substitution, recycling, and recovery and destruction of SF<sub>6</sub> used in various processes, noted that there is a possibility of intentionally increasing the use of baseline SF<sub>6</sub> consumption. This is because the revenue from CER attributed to the destruction of SF<sub>6</sub> can be an order of magnitude higher than the market price of SF<sub>6</sub>.

14. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to approve guidance on apportioning project emissions between co-product and by-product(s). The proposed draft guidance to apportionment of project emissions between the co-product and by-product(s) is attached in annex 7 (see MP31 report).

*Background:* The panel discussed a proposal on procedures to apportion project emissions between co-products and by-products. The panel noted that along with output, some project activities also produce by-products e.g. in the production of biofuels by-products such as glycerol is produced. While in other project activities co-products or by-products are consumed. The panel agreed that in such cases all the project emissions should not be attributed to the main product only, but should be apportioned between the main product, co-product(s) and the by-product(s).

15. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to consider the draft revision to the “Tool for assessment and demonstration of additionality”, as attached in annex 1 to the annotations to the thirty-seventh meeting<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> <<http://cdm.unfccc.int/EB/037/eb37annagan1.pdf>>



*Background:* Due to time constraints at its last meeting, the Board could not consider the “Tool for assessment and demonstration of additionality” and deferred its consideration to the thirty-eighth meeting. At its thirty-sixth meeting, the Board considered the draft revision to the tool for assessment and demonstration of additionality as proposed by the Meth Panel. The Board agreed to further consider the suggested changes. The Board further agreed to the revision of the footnote 7, as reflected in annex 1 to that annotations, clarifying that in undertaking the benchmark analysis option, either of the financial indicators, project IRR or equity IRR can be used, provided appropriate benchmark indicator for the financial indicator is chosen.

16. ► **Action** the Board may wish to launch a call for public comment on the draft revisions to “Guidelines for completing the project design document (CDM-PDD), and the proposed new baseline and monitoring methodologies (CDM-NM)”. The draft revision to the guidelines is attached as annex 8 of the Meth Panel report. The Board may also wish to request the secretariat to revise the CDM-NM guidance section of the guidelines, before publishing for comments, should it approve the revised CDM-NM form (see paragraph 17 below).

*Background:* The panel considered the draft revised “Guidelines for completing the project design document (CDM-PDD), and the proposed new baseline and monitoring methodologies (CDM-NM)”. Part III of the guidelines has been updated to reflect guidance provided by the CDM Executive Board relevant to methodological procedures or information regarding project design since version 5 of the guidelines was approved by the Board. Furthermore, part II.B of the guidelines has been revised in order to provide further guidance on how to describe the project activity and the baseline scenario in the CDM-PDD. The draft revision to the guidelines is attached as annex 8 of the Meth Panel report (see MP31 report).

17. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to approve the revision of the form for proposed new methodologies (CDM-NM), as prepared by the secretariat taking into account advice of the panel. The revised form is contained in annex 1 to these annotations.

*Background:* The secretariat undertook the review of the CDM-NM form in order to provide clarity between the different sections viz., Meth Panel recommendation, methodological procedures, and explanation/justification. The form contents have not been changed but the sections have been re-ordered. The first section contains the recommendations by the panel, followed by a section on the proposed new methodology, and finally a section to enable project participants explain/justify the different components of proposed new methodology. The section on methodological procedure also provides the template, which the panel uses to make recommendations of draft methodology. This will enable standardization of the approved methodology format.

18. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to launch a call for experts in order to reconstitute the Meth Panel with a view to prepare a shortlist of experts for consideration by the Board at its thirty-ninth meeting. Members currently serving in the Meth Panel may submit their application for inclusion in the short list.

*Background:* The Board at its thirty-first meeting selected members of the Meth Panel for a term of one year. The term of office of existing members of the Meth Panel will therefore expire in 27 June 2008. The new members shall attend the thirty-third meeting of the Meth Panel to enable a smooth transition.

19. ► **Note:** The Board may wish to take note of the oral progress report of the secretariat on the work related to energy efficiency.

*Background:* The Board at its thirty-seventh meeting took note of the oral progress report of the secretariat on the work related to energy efficiency. The secretariat informed that experts had provided a report on identifying the key methodological reasons for non-approval of proposed methodologies for energy efficiency





project activities as well as monitoring and assessment of energy savings in efforts taken in various countries to promote energy efficiency. The Board requested the secretariat to identify the possible tools and guidance for demand side efficiency CDM projects based on these reports. Further, the Board requested the secretariat to present the analysis to the Meth Panel for its commenting. The secretariat is also requested to make a recommendation to the Board at its forty-first meeting.

20. **Note:** The Board may wish to take note that the panel discussed the issues the Board raised regarding the revision of the approved methodology AM0047. The panel agreed to undertake additional work on the following aspects: (i) estimation of emissions from processing and production of biofuels from cultivated inputs; and, (ii) estimation of emissions for extraction and processing of crude oil to produce fossil fuels. The Board may also want to take note that the panel considered a first draft of expert inputs on emissions for the cultivation of specific crops, used for biofuels production, in different parts of the world.

*Background:* The panel at its thirtieth meeting recommended for approval to the Board revision of AM0047, expanding its applicability to project activities that use cultivated seeds to produce biofuels. The Board after considering the recommendation of the panel, requested the panel to review the estimation of project emissions from cultivation of raw material with a view to identify the relevance of the various emissions source in terms of their significance vis à vis inclusion of similar emissions sources in the production of petrodiesel. The Board also requested the panel to provide inputs on the extent to which upstream emissions should be considered and also the criterion that could be used to eliminate minor emission sources, both in the baseline and the project situation.

21. **Note:** The Board may wish to take note that the panel discussed the case where project participants implement voluntary agreements through the use of CDM.

*Background:* This was discussed in the context of the case NM0238 and the panel agreed to highlight to the Board that such voluntary agreements can have implications on determining, in particular the baseline scenario, baseline emissions and additionality. A note explaining the issue is attached as annex 6 to the Meth Panel report (see MP31 report).

22. **Note:** The Board may wish to take note that the panel discussed the concept note for the use of barrier analysis to demonstrate additionality for project activities where the implementation of the project activities may result in significant financial benefits without CDM revenues. The panel agreed to further work on the recommendation taking into account advice.

*Background:* The panel, as requested by the Board at its thirty-fifth meeting, discussed the concept note for the use of barrier analysis to demonstrate additionality for project activities where the implementation of the project activities may result in significant financial benefits without CDM revenues. It agreed with that in situations where the proposed CDM project activity may result in significant financial benefits (excluding CDM revenues) relative to the baseline, the use of barrier analysis should be substantiated in light of the higher financial benefit. The panel also agreed that such specific substantiation initially should be restricted to greenfield facilities where the proposed CDM project activities are being implemented. The panel discussed the various options that project participants could use to support the argument that the project activity, despite having a higher IRR without CDM revenues compared to what would have been implemented in absence of the project activity, would still have not overcome the barriers it faces.

23. **Note:** The Board may wish to take note that the panel discussed the draft revised AM0018 as per the request of the Board. The panel agreed to further discuss the revisions as it identified a number of other issues that need to be explained and clarified in the approved methodology. The panel agreed to finalize its recommendation to the Board at its next meeting.



*Background:* The Board, at its thirty-fifth meeting, requested the Meth Panel to revise the approved methodology AM0018 to provide procedures for estimating the baseline specific steam consumption ratio (SSCR) in situations where the production capacity during the project activity increases compared to the nominal capacity at which the baseline SSCR was estimated at the start of the project activity.

24. *Note:* The Board may wish to take note that the panel discussed a draft tool, which could be used for project activities where equipment efficiency improvements are undertaken. The panel agreed to finalize its recommendation to the Board at its next meeting.

*Background:* The panel under the mandate of the COP/MOP identified that procedures for estimating the load v/s efficiency curve for of the baseline equipment replaced by project activity could be provided as a tool to ensure consistency across methodologies.

25. *Note:* The Board may wish to take note that the panel discussed the possibility of developing a tool for estimating the baseline emissions from fossil fuel consumption and electricity consumption. The panel agreed to finalize its recommendation to the Board at its next meeting.

*Background:* The panel under the mandate of the CMP identified that procedures for estimating the baseline emissions from fossil fuel consumption and electricity consumption could be provided as a tool to ensure consistency across methodologies.

26. *Note:* The panel requested the Board to take note that the panel could not consider the Board's request regarding pros and cons for project activities that: (i) reduce the consumption of a raw material, which is produced outside the project boundary; and (ii) where one cannot ensure that the raw material use, which is avoided by the project activity, will not be produced (outside the project boundary). The panel will consider the issue at its thirty-second meeting, with the aim to provide a recommendation to the Board.

*Background:* The panel at its thirtieth meeting recommended to the Board to provide guidance on project activities that: (i) reduce the consumption of a raw material, which is produced outside the project boundary; and (ii) where one cannot ensure that the raw material use, which is avoided by the project activity, will not be produced (outside the project boundary). The Board had requested the panel to provide pros and cons of such a guidance, to enable the Board to take a decision

27. *Note:* The Board may wish to take note that panel agreed to finalize its recommendation, on the Board's request to analyze the issue of storage of HFC-23 during the downtime of a HFC-23 destruction facility in context of the approved methodology AM0001, at its thirty second meeting.

*Background:* The Board, at its thirty-sixth meeting, requested the Meth Panel to provide clarification on approved methodology AM0001 on how to address situations where HCF-23, generated in production of HCFC-22, is stored, when the HCF-23 incineration plant is temporarily not functioning, and subsequently destroyed. Furthermore, the Board requested the panel to provide guidance on whether to take into account the HCFC-22 produced during the down times of HFC-23 incineration plants including implications on the calculation of CERs.

28. *Note:* The Board may wish to take note that the panel agreed to undertake a revision of the approved methodology AM0001 to provide more clarity to the procedures.

*Background:* The panel, in analyzing the issue of storage of HFC-23 produced during the downtime of a HFC-23 facility, in the context of the approved methodology AM0001, noted that the methodology needs further clarification on the procedures.



29. **Note:** The Board may wish to take note that the panel's thirty-second meeting will be held from 7 to 11 April 2008, as per annex 25 of the thirty seventh meeting of the Board.

30. **Note:** The Board may wish to take note the Meth Panel reminded project participants that the deadline for the twenty-third round of submissions of proposed new methodologies is 16 April 2008. The Meth Panel also reminded project participants that baseline and monitoring methodologies can be submitted at any time prior to this deadline, which is highly encouraged, as it facilitates speedy consideration.

31. **Note:** The Board may wish to take note the Meth Panel also reminded the project participants that the deadline for consideration of request for revision and request for clarification at the thirty-third meeting to be held from 23 to 27 June 2008 shall be 11 May 2008, 24:00 GMT.

**(c) Issues relating to CDM afforestation and reforestation project activities**

32. **Action:** The Board may wish to take note of the report on the work of the eighteenth meeting of the Afforestation and Reforestation Working Group (A/R WG) and an oral report by its Chair, Mr. José Domingos Miguez, on the work of the group.

*Background:* The A/R WG held its eighteenth meeting in Bonn, Germany on 11 – 13 February 2008. The A/R WG dealt with case-specific issues and general issues.

***Case specific***

33. **Action:** Taking into consideration the inputs by experts (desk reviewers) and the public, the Board may wish, based on recommendation of the A/R WG (see A/R WG 18 report) to:

(a) Approve the case ARNM0032-rev and the draft consolidated methodology, which is based on the above mentioned case and approved methodology AR-AM0003, as contained in annex 1 of the A/R WG 18 report.

(b) Withdraw the approved methodology AR-AM0003.

*Background:* The A/R WG 18 recommended the draft consolidated afforestation and reforestation baseline and monitoring methodology: "Afforestation and reforestation of degraded land". The draft methodology is applicable to afforestation and reforestation CDM project activities that are implemented on degraded lands, which are expected to remain degraded or continue to degrade in the absence of the project. The working group also recommended that the approved methodology AR-AM0003 be withdrawn. The A/R WG agreed to continue its work on the case ARNM0035. Information on methodologies currently under consideration by the Board and the A/R WG are available on the UNFCCC CDM website<sup>4</sup>.

***Responses to requests for clarifications***

34. **Action:** The Board may wish to take note and agree to the response to request for clarifications provided by the A/R WG, as referred in the A/R WG report (see paragraph 9 of the A/R WG 18 report):

(a) The Board may wish to clarify that it is sufficient to demonstrate the eligibility of land as per the most recent version of "Procedures to demonstrate the eligibility of land for afforestation and reforestation CDM project activities" and that it is not essential to differentiate between afforestation and reforestation A/R CDM project activities in order to demonstrate the eligibility of land. This is valid for all A/R CDM methodologies, for both large- and small-scale A/R CDM project activities.

<sup>4</sup> See <<http://cdm.unfccc.int/goto/ARappmet>>

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

### **General guidance**

35. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to clarify that if project proponents expect that they may need more flexibility in the application of the definition of the project boundary, possibly beyond the guidance provided by the Board during its thirty-sixth meeting (paragraph 37 of the EB36 report), then they should consider registering a Programme of Activities (PoA) as a single A/R CDM project activity.

*Background:* The Executive Board at its thirty-sixth meeting approved guidance on the application of the definition of the project boundary of A/R CDM project activities (paragraph 37 of the EB36 report). The Board also requested the A/R WG to provide further input on the application of the definition of the project boundary to A/R project activities to allow for more flexibility, in particular for those features of the project boundary that differ from those of non-A/R CDM project activities, for consideration by the Board at its thirty-eighth meeting (paragraph 38 of the EB36 report).

36. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to request the A/R WG to develop new simplified baseline and monitoring methodologies for small-scale afforestation and reforestation project activities under the CDM for the (i) conversion of cropland or grassland to forest including agroforestry and (ii) sand-dune fixation by conversion to forest, under the croplands and grasslands types, respectively.

*Background:* The CMP.1 requested the Board to draft simplified baseline and monitoring methodologies for the four types of small-scale afforestation or reforestation project activities as contained in appendix B to 6/CMP.1. The A/R WG considered the need for development of more SSC A/R methodologies within the four types (croplands, grasslands, wetlands and settlements) as contained in appendix B to 6/CMP.1. In considering the potential for SSC A/R CDM project activities, the group agreed to request the Board for a mandate to develop additional small-scale methodologies, under the types “croplands” and “grasslands”, namely the (i) conversion of cropland or grassland to forest including agroforestry and (ii) sand-dune fixation by conversion to forest, under the croplands and grasslands types, respectively.

37. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to clarify that the “Procedure for the submission and consideration of request for clarification on the application of approved small-scale methodologies” apply *mutatis mutandis* to requests for clarification on the application of approved A/R small-scale methodologies. The Board may wish to request the secretariat to prepare and make available the forms for this purpose.

*Background:* The Executive Board at its thirty-fourth meeting approved the “Procedure for the submission and consideration of request for clarification on the application of approved small scale methodologies” (see Annex 6 of the EB34 report) and the related forms referred to in the above-mentioned approved procedures.

38. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to launch a call for experts in order to reconstitute the A/R WG with a view to prepare a shortlist of experts for consideration by the Board at its thirty-ninth meeting. Members currently serving in the A/R WG may submit their application for inclusion in the short list.

*Background:* The Board at its thirty-first meeting selected members of the A/R WG for a term of one year. The term of office of existing members of the A/R WG will therefore expire on 20 June 2008. The new members shall attend the twentieth meeting of the A/R WG to enable a smooth transition.

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

39. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to take note of the report of the fourteenth meeting of the Small Scale Working Group (SSC WG) and an oral report by the Chair of the working group, Ms. Ulrika Raab on the work of the group.

*Background:* The SSC WG held its fourteenth meeting in Bonn, Germany on 11 – 13 February 2008. The SSC WG dealt with case-specific issues, process and methodological clarifications and other issues, as specified below.

***Case specific***

40. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to approve to the methodology ‘AMS II.H Energy efficiency measures through centralization of utility provisions of an industrial facility’ as contained in annex 1 of the report of the fourteenth meeting of the SSC WG (see SSC WG 14 report).

*Background:* In response to the submission SSC\_148, the SSC WG recommended a new methodology titled ‘SSC II.H Energy efficiency measures through centralization of utility provisions of an industrial facility’. The proposed methodology is for project activities that implement more efficient technologies to produce electrical energy, thermal energy and cooling in addition to switching fossil fuels in an integrated manner. Emission reductions are achieved through the introduction of a combined heat and power unit or a combined cooling, heat and power unit that uses a less carbon intensive fuel.

***Revisions of approved methodologies:***

41. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to approve the revision of ‘AMS I.C Thermal energy for the user with or without electricity’, thereby expanding its applicability to include additional baseline scenarios (e.g., steam/heat produced from renewable biomass and electricity imported from the grid and/or generated in a captive plant in the baseline, while in the project heat and electricity are produced by a renewable biomass based cogeneration unit), as contained in annex 2 of the report of the fourteenth meeting of the SSC WG (see SSC WG 14 report).

*Background:* The requests submitted and the recommendations provided by the SSC WG (see SSC\_143, 144 and 161) are made publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website at <http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/SSCmethodologies/Clarifications/index.html>.

42. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to approve the revision of ‘AMS III.H Methane recovery in wastewater treatment’, expanding its applicability to include the possibility for pipeline transport of the recovered and upgraded biogas from the wastewater treatment facility to end users, as contained in annex 3 of the report of the fourteenth meeting of the SSC WG (see SSC WG 14 report). The revisions also clarified that for project activities involving sequential treatment of wastewater in anaerobic lagoons, the COD removed by each of the lagoon shall be considered for baseline estimations.

*Background:* As requested by the Board at its thirty-seventh meeting, the SSC WG recommended a revision to AMS III.H to include the option to upgrade the recovered biogas (purified to ensure higher methane content) and then inject into a natural gas distribution grid or transport in a dedicated pipe network to the end user sites. In proposing this revision the SSC WG took into account the guidance of approved large-scale methodology AM0053.

43. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to approve the revision of ‘AMS III.D Methane recovery in animal manure management systems’, clarifying the use of the tier 2 approach of 2006 IPCC guidelines for emission

reduction calculations for manure management systems, as contained in annex 4 of the report of the fourteenth meeting of the SSC WG (see SSC WG 14 report). Further the applicability of the methodology is expanded to include the possibility of pipeline transport of the recovered and upgraded biogas from the landfill recovery facility to end-users, similar to the revision recommended to AMS III.H.

*Background:* As requested by the Board at its thirty-fifth meeting, the SSC WG agreed to recommend a revision to AMS III.D, which includes additional guidance on the use of the tier 2 approach of 2006 IPCC guidelines for emission reduction calculations for manure management systems, e.g. the application of IPCC default values is further explained, monitoring requirements are clarified and a definition of “average number of animals” is provided. In proposing this revision the SSC WG took into account the guidance of the approved large-scale methodology ACM0010. The revisions also include the possibility of pipeline transport of the recovered and upgraded biogas from biogas recovery systems to end users, similar to the revisions to AMS III.H.

44. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to approve the revision of ‘AMS III.G Landfill Methane Recovery’ as contained in annex 5 of the report of the fourteenth meeting of the SSC WG (see SSC WG 14 report). The revision excludes the consideration of landfill gas collection efficiency in the ex-ante calculation of emission reductions. Further the applicability of the methodology is expanded to include the possibility of pipeline transport of the recovered and upgraded biogas from the landfill recovery facility to end-users, similar to the revision recommended to AMS III.H.

*Background:* In response to a request, the SSC WG recommended a revision of AMS III.G to exclude 50% landfill gas collection efficiency specified by AMS III.G for ex-ante calculations. Ex-post emission reductions calculations are based on actual measurement of landfill gas collected. Furthermore, literature shows that the maximum achievable collection efficiencies, in the case of engineered landfills, are as high as 90%. The requests submitted and the recommendations provided by the SSC WG (see SSC\_160) are made publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website at <http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/SSCmethodologies/Clarifications/index.html>.

### **General guidance**

45. ► **Note:** The Board may wish to take note of the analyses carried out by the SSC WG regarding the issue of consideration of leakage due to transfer of used equipment, as contained in paragraph 33 of the report of the fourteenth meeting of the SSC WG (see SSC WG 14 report).

*Background:* The Board requested the SSC WG to assess the appropriateness of paragraph 12 of AMS I.D, which refers to leakage due to equipment transfer, and similar provisions in other relevant small-scale methodologies in order to assess under which conditions and methods this provision should be implemented by proposed CDM project activities. Following a consistency check with the corresponding large-scale methodologies, the SSC WG noted that leakage due to equipment transfer was also addressed under in AM0046 and AM0060, where specific guidance to ensure that the replaced equipment is destroyed has been included. The SSC WG agreed to recommend that the continued use of the replaced baseline equipment (e.g. end use equipment with low residual value) outside the project boundary should remain in the approved methodology. It noted on the other hand that in other cases the emission impact of continued use of displaced equipment outside the project boundary is subject to uncertainty and is difficult to quantify. The SSC WG agreed to carry out further work for estimating the emission impact of equipment displaced outside the project boundary by the project activity. Furthermore, it agreed to recommend that the revenue from the sale of replaced equipment by the project proponent should be incorporated in the barrier analysis, where relevant.



46. ► **Note:** The Board may wish to take note of the analyses carried out by the SSC WG regarding the revision of type II methodologies, as contained in paragraph 11 of the report of the fourteenth meeting of the SSC WG (see SSC WG 14 report).

*Background:* At its thirty-third meeting the Board requested the SSC WG to analyse the application of type II methodologies for energy efficiency project activities in the CDM pipeline with a view to identify any further guidance or revisions that may be necessary to clarify the application of these methodologies, and to do this in conjunction with the work being undertaken by the secretariat. Following a preliminary analysis of the expert work on energy efficiency, as commissioned by the secretariat, the SSC WG recognised a need to prioritise its work on the revision of AMS II.C, applicable to efficient electrical equipment (e.g. lighting) projects. In particular it noted that the monitoring in AMS II.C should be strengthened and agreed to continue to consider the issue and make a final recommendation to the Board at its next meeting.

47. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to launch a call for experts in order to reconstitute the SSC WG with a view to prepare a shortlist of experts for consideration by the Board at its thirty-ninth meeting. Members currently serving in the SSC WG may submit their application for inclusion in the short list.

*Background:* The Board at its thirty-first meeting selected members of the SSC WG for a term of one year. The term of office of existing members of the SSC WG will therefore expire in 20 June 2008. The new members shall attend the sixteenth meeting of the SSC WG to enable a smooth transition.

48. ► **Note:** The Board may wish to take note that the case SSC-NM0004 was not deemed suitable for recommendation to the Board<sup>5</sup> as made publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website at <http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/SSCmethodologies/Clarifications/index.html>.

49. ► **Note:** The Board may wish to take note that the fifteenth meeting of the SSC WG will be held from 14 - 16 April 2008.

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

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

*Background:* The information available in the section on “Project Activities” on the UNFCCC CDM website (<<http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects>>), indicates the status of project activities submitted for registration. The main information, as of 27 February 2008, can be summarized as follows:

- (a) Registered CDM project activities: 948 (nine hundred and forty-eight);
- (b) Request for registration: 52 (fifty-two);
- (c) Request for review: 17 (seventeen);
- (d) Corrections requested: 55 (fifty-five);
- (e) Under review: 11 (eleven);
- (f) Rejected CDM project activities: 59 (fifty-nine);
- (g) Withdrawn: 9 (nine);

---

<sup>5</sup> In accordance with paragraph 13 of the procedures for the submission and consideration of a proposed new small scale methodology.

*Case specific*

51. ► **Action:** The Board shall consider the requests for review of the 17 requests for registration listed in table 1 below.

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

<i>Ref No.</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>
1232	UHE Mascarenhas power upgrading project	?	?	?
1292	Power generation from waste heat of new DRI kilns at JSPL	?	?	?
1345	24.75 MW Ranganathaswamy Mini Hydel Project, Karnataka, India	?	?	?
1354	Flare gas recovery project at Hazira Gas Processing Complex (HGPC), Hazira plant, Oil and Natural Gas Corporation (ONGC) Limited	?	?	?
1366	Biomass generation project, in Sheyang county, Jiangsu province, P.R. China	?	?	?
1375	Shandong Gaotang 30MW Biomass Power Generation Project	?	?	?
1380	Power Generation by Waste Heat Recovery Project in Henglai Building Materials Co. Ltd., Yixing City, Jiangsu Province, P. R. China	?	?	?
1383	Koppal Green Power Limited Biomass Power Project	?	?	?
1388	Yunnan Dali Yang'er 49.8MW Hydropower Project	?	?	?
1398	Biomass Based Power Project of Balaji Agro Oils Ltd.	?	?	?
1400	Jinggangshan 36 MW Hydropower Project	?	?	?
1403	Steam Optimization in Cooking Process in Paper Plant	?	?	?
1405	CEMEX Costa Rica: Use of biomass residues in Colorado cement plant	?	?	?
1413	Jaroensompong Corporation Rachathewa Landfill Gas to Energy Project	?	?	?
1424	Carhuaquero IV Hydroelectric Power Plant	?	?	?
1430	Pushihe Erji 10 MW Small Hydropower Project in Yunnan Province	?	?	?
1439	Aluhe 12.6 MW Small Hydropower Project in Yunnan Province	?	?	?

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

52. ► **Action:** The Board shall consider the recommendation of the review team for the eleven (11) project activities listed in table 2, which the Board placed under review at its thirty-seventh meeting.

*Table 2: Projects which were placed “Under review” at EB37*

<i>Ref No.</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>
1273	Someshwara small hydropower project (24.75 MW) in Karnataka, India			
1279	Fundão-Santa Clara Energetic Complex Project (FSCECP)	?	?	?
1285	Tradewinds Methane Extraction and Power Generation Project	?	?	?
1289	Fuel switchover from higher carbon intensive fuels to Natural	?	?	?





Ref No.	Title	A	B	C
	Gas (NG) at Indian Farmers Fertiliser Cooperative Ltd (IFFCO) in Phulpur Village, Allahabad, Uttar Pradesh by M/s Indian Farmers Fertiliser Cooperative Ltd (IFFCO)			
1296	"Waste Heat Recovery project" at Saraikela, Kharsavan, Jharkhand by M/s Kohinoor Steel Private Limited	?	?	?
1324	Power generation from waste heat of submerged arc furnaces	?	?	?
1331	Fuel Free Electricity to Grid	?	?	?
1333	Zhongzhou 16.5 MW Hydropower Project			
1356	Reducing the Average Clinker Content in Cement at CEMEX Mexico Operations	?	?	?
1363	5 MW renewable energy project for a grid system" at Rohru Tehsil, Shimla District in Himachal, India	?	?	?
1377	Bundled Wind Power Project of JeJu Special Self-Governing Province in Korea	?	?	?

*Background:* At its thirty-seventh meeting the Board decided to place the project activities identified in table 2 above under review. A review has been conducted by the review teams and a recommendation has been circulated to the Board. In accordance with the "Procedures for review referred to in paragraph 41 of the modalities and procedures for a clean development mechanism", the Board shall decide whether to register the project activities (case A in table 2), to request the DOE and project participants to make corrections (case B in table 2), or to reject the project activities (case C in table 2).

53. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to consider corrections made to the proposed CDM project activity listed in table 3.

*Table 3: Projects to be registered with corrections following consideration of a review*

Ref No.	Title	A	B
1131	4.5 MW Wind Power Project in Kadavakallu, Andhra Pradesh	?	?

*Background:* At previous meetings, following consideration by the Board of the reviews of requests for registration of the project activities listed in table 3 above, the Board agreed that the project activities could be registered following corrections. The DOEs have submitted revised documentation which the Board may wish to consider in accordance with the clarifications to paragraph 18(b) of the "Procedures for review referred to in paragraph 41 of the modalities and procedures for a clean development mechanism". If the Board considers the corrections as satisfactory, the projects shall be registered (case A in table 3), otherwise the requests are rejected (case B in table 3).

### **General guidance**

54. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to consider revising the existing terms of reference of the registration and issuance team (RIT).

*Background:* As the current terms of reference of the RIT will expire on 31 March 2008, there is a need to consider the current terms of reference with a view to revise them, as appropriate. The current terms of reference will remain applicable to the operation of the RIT until 31 March 2008.

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

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

*Background:* The information available in the section on “Issuance of CERs” on the UNFCCC CDM website (<http://cdm.unfccc.int/Issuance>), indicates the status of request for issuance. The main information, as of 27 February 2008, can be summarized as follows:

- (a) CERs issued: 502 issuances, aggregate 121,145,109 CERs
- (b) Requests for Issuance: 19 requests, 2,334,349 aggregate CERs
- (c) Requests for review: 14 requests, 3,243,980 aggregate CERs
- (d) Under review: 2 (two)

***Case specific***

56. ► **Action:** The Board shall consider requests for review of the 14 requests for issuance listed in table 4.

*Table 4: Requests for issuance for which a review has been requested by three or more Board members or one Party involved.*

<i>Ref. No.</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>No. of CERs</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>
0127	RSCL cogeneration expansion project	89701	?	?	?
0151	Quimobásicos HFC Recovery and Decomposition Project	241156	?	?	?
0193	HFC23 Decomposition Project of Zhejiang Juhua Co., Ltd, P. R. China	1577196	?	?	?
0204	AWMS GHG Mitigation Project, MX05-B-12, Sonora, México	13067	?	?	?
0257	AWMS GHG Mitigation Project, MX05-B-14, Jalisco, México	22491	?	?	?
0258	Nueva Aldea Biomass Power Plant Phase 1	132227	?	?	?
0259	Trupan Biomass Power Plant in Chile	120835	?	?	?
0395	LDEO Biomass Steam and Power Plant in Malaysia	31049	?	?	?
0445	Demand side energy conservation & reduction measures at IPCL – Gandhar Complex	12182	?	?	?
0508	Onyx Alexandria Landfill Gas Capture and Flaring Project	17824	?	?	?
0599	Jilin Taonan Wind Power Project	93539	?	?	?
0767	HFC23 Decomposition Project at Zhonghao Chenguang Research Institute of Chemical Industry, Zigong, SiChuan Province, China	606982	?	?	?
0819	Zhongjieneng Suqian 2*12MW Biomass Direct Burning Power Plant Project	24161	?	?	?
0968	Incomex Hydroelectric Project	261570	?	?	?



*Background:* Three (3) or more members of the Executive Board or a Party involved requested a review of the requests for issuance listed in table 4 above. In accordance with the “Procedures for review referred to in paragraph 65 of the modalities and procedures for a clean development mechanism”, for each case the Board shall decide whether to instruct the CDM registry administrator to issue the requested CERs (case A in table 4), to issue CERs following corrections (case B in table 4) or to undertake a review of the request for issuance (case C in table 4). If the Board agrees to undertake a review of these requests for issuance it shall also decide on the scope of the review and the composition of the review team for each case.

57. **Action:** The Board shall consider the recommendation of the review team for the two (2) project activities listed in table 5, which the Board placed under review at its thirty-seventh meeting.

Table 5: Projects which were placed “Under review” at EB37

Ref No.	Title	No. of CERs	A	B	C
0231	CAMIL Itaqui Biomass Electricity Generation Project	56917	?	?	?
0593	15.4 MW wind farm at Satara District, Maharashtra	99414	?	?	?

*Background:* At its thirty-seventh meeting the Board decided to place the project activities identified in table 5 above under review. A review has been conducted by the review teams and a recommendation has been circulated to the Board. In accordance with the “Procedures for review referred to in paragraph 65 of the modalities and procedures for a clean development mechanism”, for each case the Board shall decide whether to approve the proposed issuance of CERs (case A in table 5), to request the DOE to make corrections based on the findings from the review before approving the issuance of CERs (case B in Table 5), or to decline to approve the proposed issuance of CERs (case C in Table 5).

58. **Action:** The Board may wish to consider corrections made to the proposed CDM project activity listed in table 6.

Table 6: CERs to be issued with corrections following consideration of a review

Ref No.	Title	No. of CERs	A	B
0288	Sahabat Empty Fruit Bunch Biomass Project	13552	?	?

*Background:* At previous meetings, following consideration by the Board of the reviews of requests for issuance of the project activities listed in table 6 above, the Board agreed that CERs could be issued following corrections. The DOEs have submitted revised documentation which the Board may wish to consider in accordance with the clarifications to paragraph 18(b) of the “Procedures for review referred to in paragraph 65 of the modalities and procedures for a clean development mechanism”. If the Board considers the corrections as satisfactory, the CERs shall be issued (case A in table 6), otherwise the request shall be rejected (case B in table 6).

59. **Action:** The Board may wish to provide guidance in relation to requests for deviation submitted by DOEs prior to issuance.

*Background:* Five (5) requests for deviation have been submitted by a DOE to the Board since its thirty-seventh meeting for consideration by the Board at its thirty-eighth meeting. In addition, one (1) request for deviation requiring further clarification from the DOE was deferred from last meeting to the thirty-eighth meeting of the Board.



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

60. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to: (a) take note of the report by the secretariat on the status of resources; (b) agree to ways to operationalize the implementation of CMP request; and (c) take further action, as necessary.

*Background:* At its last meeting the Board, in response to the encouragement by the CMP in relation to enhancing the executive and supervisory role of Board members and in relation with the adopted CDM MAP 2008 (version 01), requested the secretariat to explore options to operationalize the implementation including the cost estimates for consideration by the Board at its next meeting with the view to discuss and consider a revision of the CDM MAP 2008 to address these needs.

The status of income and expenditure is presented in annex 2 of these annotations.

#### 5. Other matters

##### (a) Regional distribution

61. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to take note of the current status of distribution of CDM project activities and an update from the secretariat on the various activities in this area.

*Background:* The CMP, at its second session, adopted decision 1/CMP.2, which contains several elements relating to regional distribution and capacity building, including an encouragement to the Executive Board to continue to facilitate the regional distribution of project activities.

##### (b) Relations with Designated National Authorities

62. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to note the briefing of the secretariat on the outcomes of the fourth meeting of the CDM DNA Forum held on 29 - 30 November 2007 in Bali, Indonesia.

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

##### (c) Relations with Designated Operational and Applicant Entities

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

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

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

64. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to (a) agree to avail itself for informal briefings with registered observers in the afternoon of 14 March 2008; and (b) invite members and alternates to share information on events in which they participated.



*Background:* On the occasion of its last meeting, the Chair and other members of the Board met with registered observers for an informal briefing and agreed to continue with such meetings in the afternoon of the last day of its future meetings, unless otherwise indicated.

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

(e) **Other business**

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

*Background:* At its thirty-first meeting, the Board revised its procedures for public communication, as contained in annex 37 to its report. These procedures shall be followed with respect to all unsolicited submissions.

The following communications have been sent to the Board prior to its thirty-eighth meeting:

- (a) Letter from Mr. Chaim Nissim, Noe21, regarding a request for revision of AM0001 received on 10 December 2007;
- (b) Letter from Mr. In Park, Team Leader, Environmental and Safety Team, LG Chem and Mr. Junji Hatano Mitsubishi UFJ Securities, Chairman, Clean Energy Finance Committee, Mitsubishi UFJ Securities Co., Ltd. received on 7 January 2008 regarding LG Chem Naju plant fuel switching project (1185);
- (c) Letter from Mr. Ricardo Esparta, Technical Director, Ecoinvest regarding a request to reconsider the decision made by the CDM Executive Board during its meeting at EB34 which agreed to reject the project activities Pão de Açúcar - Demand side electricity management and received on 15 January 2007;
- (d) Letter from Ms. Anne Arquit Niederberger, Policy Solutions received on 18 January 2008 and related to an appeal to against the Executive Board's decision to reject the bagasse CHP project reference 1109;
- (e) Letter from Mr. B H Kothari, Chairman KSCL received on 21 January 2008 related to an appeal regarding the rejection of 1109 M/S. Kothari Sugars and Chemicals Ltd (KSCL)'s Bagasse Based Co-generation Project, at Perambalur district, Tamil Nadu, India;
- (f) Letter from Ms. Barbara Haya, Consultant, International Rivers received on 22 January 2008 related to a review of proposed CDM project-Jorethang Loop;
- (g) Letter from Mr. Giorgi Tabuashvili, Finance Director, Georgian Oil and Gas Corporation received on 24 January 2008 related to Meth Panel prescriptions on methodology "NM0242: Methane Leak Reduction from Natural Gas Pipelines";
- (h) Letter from Mr. Paul Kirai, Executive Director, Environmental Cost Management (ECM) Centre Ltd. received on 24 January 2008 related to the proposed new methodology category SSC\_140;
- (i) Letter from Mr. Himanshu Thakkar, of South Asia Network on Dams, Rivers & People, Delhi, India received on 24 January 2008 related to Comments on review of proposed Jorethang Loop for CDM;
- (j) Letter from Mr. Mehrnaz Raft, CDM Manager Agrenco Group and Mr. Urs Brodmann of Factor Consulting received on 19 February 2008 related to NM228 and the production of bio-diesel from oil-seeds;



(k) Letter from Ms. Tatiana Boldyreva of Tricorona AB (Publ.) received on 19 February 2008 related to revision of AM0009;

(l) Letter from Mr. Jesus Casas Marin, Deputy Vice-President, Strategy, Regulation, The Environment and Sustainable Development, Endesa, S.A., received on 20 February 2008 related to the project construction of the Central American Regional Transmission Grid main line – SIEPAC;

(m) Letter from Mr. Ferdinand Heilig, CEO Carbon Climate Protection GmbH received on 27 February 2008 related to a statement on the Methodology Panel recommendation (AM\_REV\_0067) on the request for revision of the approved methodology AM0028, submitted by CARBON in September 2007.

66. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to consider any other business it deems necessary.

#### 6. Conclusion of the meeting

67. ► **Action:** The Board may wish to agree the report of the thirty-eighth meeting.

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

- - - - -