



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

Date: 13 February 2009
Ref: CDM-EB-45

EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE CLEAN DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM

FORTY-FIFTH MEETING

Report

Date of meeting: 11 - 13 February 2009

Location: Bonn, Germany

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

Members	Alternates
Mr. Lex de Jonge ²	Mr. Pedro Martins Barata ²
Mr. Kamel Djemouai ¹	Mr. Samuel Adeoye Adejuwon ¹
Mr. Philip M. Gwage ²	Mr. Xuedu Lu ²
Mr. Martin Hession ¹	Mr. Thomas Bernheim ¹
Mr. Shafqat Kakakhel ¹	Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sethi ¹
Mr. Clifford Mahlun ²	Mr. Noah Idechong ²
Mr. Paulo Manso ²	Mr. Hussein Badarin ²
Mr. Victor Nicolae ²	Ms. Diana Harutyunyan ²
Mr. Hugh Sealy ¹	Mr. José Domingos Miguez ¹
Mr. Peer Stiansen ¹	Mr. Akihiro Kuroki ¹

¹ Term: Two years (term of service ends immediately before the first meeting in 2011)

² Term: Two years (term of service ends immediately before the first meeting in 2010)

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

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

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

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

1. The Executive Board of the clean development mechanism (CDM) (hereinafter referred to as the Board) elected Mr. Lex de Jonge and Mr. Clifford Mahlung as Chair and Vice-Chair, respectively, of the Executive Board until the first meeting of the Board in 2010.
2. The Board expressed deep appreciation to the outgoing Chair, Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sethi, and Vice-Chair, Mr. Lex de Jonge, for their excellent leadership during the seventh year of the Board's operations.
3. The Chair of the Board opened the meeting and asserted that the quorum requirement was met. Members and alternate members made declarations as to whether they had a conflict of interest as to any items on the meeting agenda. Specifically, Mr. Pedro Martins Barata, Mr. Thomas Bernheim, Mr. Martin Hession and Mr. Hugh Sealy also requested that their signed statements regarding conflict of interest be attached to this report, as contained in annex 1 to this report

Selection of Chairs and Vice-Chairs of panels/working groups

4. The Board requested Mr. Martin Hession and Mr. Samuel Adeoye Adejuwon to continue to act as the Chair and Vice-Chair of the CDM Accreditation Panel (CDM-AP) respectively.
5. The Board appointed Mr. Philip Gwage and Mr. Pedro Martins Barata, as Chair and Vice-Chair of the Methodologies Panel (Meth Panel) respectively. Furthermore, the Board elected Mr. Xuedu Lu and Mr. Thomas Bernheim to support the Chair and Vice-Chair in the Meth Panel. On behalf of the Board, the Chair of the Board expressed deep appreciation to Mr. Akihiro Kuroki as the outgoing Chair of the Meth Panel for his dedication and excellent support.
6. The Board further requested Mr. José Domingos Miguez and Ms. Diana Harutyunyan to continue as Chair and Vice-Chair, respectively, of the Afforestation and Reforestation Working Group (A/R WG).
7. The Board appointed Mr. Hugh Sealy and Mr. Peer Stiansen, as the Chair and the Vice-Chair of the Small Scale Working Group (SSC WG). On behalf of the Board, the Chair of the Board expressed deep appreciation to Ms. Ulrika Raab and Mr. Kamel Djemouai as the outgoing Chair and Vice-Chair of the SSC WG for their dedication and excellent support to the working group.

Agenda item 2. Adoption of the agenda

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

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

9. The Board took note of the twenty-ninth progress report on the work of the CDM Accreditation Panel (CDM-AP), and an oral report by its Chair, Mr. Martin Hession. 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*

10. The Board considered the recommendation of the CDM-AP, and agreed to accredit and provisionally designate the entity "TUV NORD Cert GmbH" for the verification functions in the following sectoral scopes:

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

11. The Board considered the recommendation of the CDM-AP relating to the designated operational entity under spot-check "Det Norske Veritas Certification AS (DNV)". The Board decided to monitor the activities of the DOE through:

- (a) A surveillance visit to be carried out within three (3) months to check the full implementation of all identified corrective actions and their effectiveness, in particular, review of all CDM project activities in response to the first non-conformity and evidences of internal audits at some sites; and
- (b) A monitoring five (5) project activities randomly selected by the CDM-AP from projects submitted by the DOE for requests for registration/issuance to assess the DOE's continuing competence for undertaking validation/verification activities.

The Board further decided to terminate the suspension of the DOE with immediate effect.

12. The Board considered the recommendation from the CDM-AP relating to the designated operational entity under spot-check "Japan Consulting Institute (JCI)". The Board decided to confirm the accreditation status of the entity and agreed to close the spot-check process.

General guidance

13. The Board considered the draft document 'elaboration of CDM accreditation requirements'. The Board expressed its views on, in particular, sections relating to the use of external resources by the AEs/DOEs, subcontracting and possibility for multi-site accreditation, and requested the CDM-AP to revise relevant sections of the document taking into account views expressed. The Board requested the CDM-AP to submit the revised document for adoption by the Board at its forty-sixth meeting.

14. The Board considered the draft revised procedure for accrediting operational entities by the Board, submitted by the CDM-AP. The Board requested the CDM-AP to revise the document taking into consideration the views expressed by the Board and to submit the revised document for adoption by the Board at its forty-sixth meeting.

15. The Board, recognising additional work needed on both documents referred to in paragraphs 13 and 14 decided to defer to its forty-sixth meeting the effective date of the implementation of new accreditation system, as referred to in the paragraph 11 & 12 of the report of its forty-third meeting.



16. The Board, in reference to its decisions taken at its forty-second and forty-third meetings relating to streamlining the accreditation process, considered the recommendation of the CDM-AP on the implications of the decisions on current accreditation status of entities. The Board agreed on the recommendation and further agreed that the decision shall become effective on adoption of the revised accreditation procedure as referred in paragraph 15 .

17. The Board took note of the statistical analysis undertaken by the secretariat on the performance assessment of DOEs and requested the secretariat to provide an update of these and at its next meeting.

18. The Board agreed to undertake, inter alia, the following activities in the implementation of the Validation and Verification Manual (CDM-VVM):

(a) Hold three workshops to raise awareness and providing opportunities for sharing of experiences among AEs/DOEs. The Board, after taking into consideration location of applicant and designated operational entities, requested the secretariat to hold these workshops in Asia and Pacific, Western Europe and Latin America and Caribbean region. The Board also requested the secretariat to hold these workshops in close collaboration with AE/DOE Coordination Forum and encouraged the AEs/DOE for their participation in the workshops;

(b) Request the secretariat to establish a web-based communication facility for AEs/DOEs to provide their views, feedback and experiences with regard to application of requirements of the CDM-VVM in their validation and verification functions.

The Board also requested the secretariat, subject to cost implications, to explore other possibilities for wider dissemination of the CDM-VVM.

19. The Board agreed to launch a call for experts starting on 18 February 2009 and ending on 31 March 2009 in order to replace two outgoing members of the CDM-AP with a view to prepare a shortlist of candidates for consideration by the Board at its forty-seventh meeting. Outgoing CDM-AP members are encouraged to submit their application, for automatic inclusion in the short list, should they wish to continue.

Further schedule

20. The Board noted that the fortieth meeting of the CDM-AP will be held from 25 - 27 February 2009, as per annex 16 of the forty-third meeting of the Board.

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

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

Case specific

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

**23. Approve cases:**

(a) **AM0075** - "Methodology for collection, processing and supply of biogas to end-users for production of heat", which was proposed as NM0248 (Project for useful use of landfill gas actually being flared substituting natural gas) and link it to scopes 01 (Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources)) and 05 (Chemical industries), as contained in the [annex 2](#) of this report. The Board agreed to expand the applicability of the proposed new methodology to allow for contractual arrangements whereby the project participants share CERs generated by the project activities with the end-users of biogas involved in the project activity;

(b) **AM0076** - "Methodology for implementation of fossil fuel trigeneration systems in existing industrial facilities", which was proposed as NM0264 (Caracol Knits Trigeneration Project) and link it to scope 01 (Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources)), as contained in the [annex 3](#) of this report;

(c) **AM0077** - "Recovery of gas from oil wells that would otherwise be vented or flared and its delivery to specific end-users", which was proposed as NM0268 (Titis Sampurna Semanggi Compressed Natural Gas Project) and link it to scopes 01 (Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources)) and 10 (Fugitive emissions from fuels (solid, oil and gas)), as contained in the [annex 4](#) of this report. The Board agreed to expand the applicability of the proposed new methodology to allow for contractual arrangements whereby the project participants share CERs generated by the project activity with end-users of processed gas involved in the project activity;

(d) **AM0078** - "Point of use abatement device to reduce SF₆ emissions in LCD manufacturing operations", which was proposed as NM0271 (Point of Use Abatement Device to Reduce SF₆ emissions in LCD Manufacturing Operations in the Republic of Korea (South Korea)) and link it to scopes 04 (Manufacturing industries) and 11 (Fugitive emissions from production and consumption of halocarbons and sulphur hexafluoride), as contained in the [annex 5](#) of this report.

24. Not to approve cases: NM0277, NM0287, NM0289, and NM0291 which, if revised taking into account comments, can be resubmitted but will require new expert and public input.

Responses to request for clarification

25. The Board took note of the responses to requests for clarification provided by the Meth Panel on the cases AM_CLA_0128 to AM_CLA_0138.

Responses to requests for revision of approved methodologies

26. The Board agreed to the responses prepared by the Meth Panel to requests for revision to approved methodologies:

(a) Accept request AM_REV_00100 concerning revision of the approved methodology AM0049 to expand its applicability to project activities where electricity produced from cogeneration is exported to the grid on an ad hoc basis without claiming emission reductions, and to include the editorial change of replacing the term "syngas" by "methane rich gas" throughout the text of the methodology. See also paragraph 27 below. Not to accept the third point of the request AM_REV_0100 to modify the requirements under leakage emissions when methane rich gas is used as the project fuel, as the impact of these modifications on the upstream and associated emissions calculation is not adequately addressed in the revision proposal;

(b) Not to accept request AM_REV_0124 concerning revision of the approved methodology ACM0010 to broaden the applicability criteria to allow dedicated cattle colonies to be treated as a large farm with a treatment facility in the project boundary, close to the point of production of the



waste;

(c) Accept request AM_REV_0128 concerning revision of the approved methodology ACM0002 to include project emissions from fossil fuel used for solar power generation. See also paragraph 27 below;

(d) Not to accept request AM_REV_0129 concerning revision of the approved methodology ACM0002 to modify the applicability conditions to allow the expansion of hydro power plants in the case when 5 years historical data is not available and to modify the calculation of the average of historical quantity of electricity delivered by the existing facility to the grid;

(e) Not to accept request AM_REV_0130 concerning revision of the approved methodology ACM0006 to include a new scenario to expand the applicability to project activities that install a new biomass residues fired cogeneration plant at a site where, prior to the implementation of the project activity, an existing cogeneration plant has been operated using a mix of fossil fuels and biomass residues;

(f) Not to accept request AM_REV_0131 concerning revision of the approved methodology AM0036 to broaden the applicability criteria to cases in which power generation increases beyond the 10% threshold;

(g) Not to accept request AM_REV_0132 concerning revision of the approved methodology AM0058 to expand the applicability of the methodology to project activities where the power generation unit is installed at the same time as the start of the new primary district heating system or has been operating for less than three years;

(h) Not to accept request AM_REV_0134 concerning revision of the approved methodology AM0048 to expand its applicability to new demand of heat and electricity (new customers) rather than only to the existing demand prior to the start of the project activity.

Revision to approved methodologies

27. The Board revised the following approved methodologies:

(a) **AM0021:** The revision is made to address the issues arising out of a request for deviation from the application of this methodology. The revision includes provisions to calculate the adipic acid production based on production of final product (derivative) using the stoichiometric balance approach for cases where adipic acid is an intermediate product of the plant and cannot be directly measured. It is also clarified that if there is outside supply of adipic acid for the production of such a final product/ derivative, this approach cannot be used for the calculation of the quantity of adipic acid. The revised approved methodology is contained in annex 6 to this report;

(b) **AM0023:** The editorial revision is made in response to the request for clarification AM_CLA_0132. The revision is to adjust the text in the Project Boundary section, to be consistent with the Applicability Conditions section as modified from version 1 to version 2 of this methodology. The revised approved methodology is contained in annex 7 to this report;

(c) **AM0049:** The revision is made in response to the request for revision AM_REV_0100. The revision includes provisions to expand the applicability of this methodology to project activities where electricity produced from cogeneration is exported to the grid on an ad hoc basis without claiming emission reductions, and include the editorial change of replacing the term “syngas” by “methane rich gas” in the text of the methodology. The revised approved methodology is contained in annex 8 to this report;



- (d) **ACM0001:** The revision is made in response to the request for clarification AM_CLA_0133. The revision includes guidance to estimate air heater efficiency and provision that emission reductions can only be claimed for thermal energy use, if the landfill gas is used in a boiler or in an air heater. The revised approved methodology is contained in [annex 9](#) to this report;
- (e) **ACM0002:** The revision is made in response to the request for revision AM_REV_0128. The revision includes the provision to estimate project emissions due to combustion of fossil fuel for operation of a solar power plant and also includes a procedure to estimate project emissions due to fossil fuel combustion in renewable energy generation plants for the operation of backup power equipment. The revised approved methodology is contained in [annex 10](#) to this report;
- (f) **ACM0006:** The revision is made in response to the request for revision AM_REV_0074. The revision includes a new scenario that involves the installation of a new single or co-fired cogeneration plant (using a mix of biomass residues and fossil fuels) that provides electricity and heat to captive users at the project site. In the absence of the project activity, a reference plant with the same rated power capacity and generating the same amount of heat and power as the project plant but using a different fuel mix would be installed at the same site. The revised approved methodology is contained in [annex 11](#) to this report;
- (g) **ACM0014:** The revision is made in response to the request for clarification AM_CLA_0131. The revision includes the deletion of the parameter $EF_{CH_4,digest,y}$ from the monitoring table, and provision of a default leak factor for $FL_{biogas,digest,y}$ of 0.05 m^3 biogas leaked / m^3 biogas produced. The revised approved methodology is contained in [annex 12](#) to this report.
28. The revised versions of the methodologies referred to in the paragraphs above will come into effect on 27 February 2009, 24:00 GMT, in accordance with the procedure for the revision of approved methodologies.
29. Based on the issues arising out of requests for deviations and reviews, the Board requested the following to the Meth Panel:
- (a) In its consideration of requests for deviation on issuance for a number of project activities applying ACM0006, the Board noted different approaches proposed by project proponents to deviate from the methodological requirement of continuous monitoring of biomass consumed by the project activity. These approaches vary in degree of accuracy and conservativeness. The Board requested the Meth Panel, at its soonest convenience, to analyze the proposed approaches with a view to incorporating related procedures in a revised version of the methodology or alternatively developing guidance to address the issue;
- (b) In its consideration of a number of requests for review of issuance for project activities applying early versions of ACM0001, the Board noted that the project proponents/ DOE applied provisions from the Meth Panel clarification AM_CLA_0095 regarding periodical measurement of methane content in the LFG with minimum of four quarterly measurements in a year, which is now incorporated in the latest version of the methodology. It was also observed that the emission reductions resulted from applying lower bound of confidence interval on daily basis may lead to a different result if monthly or yearly basis is applied. The Board therefore requested the Meth Panel, at its soonest convenience, to:
- (i) Further clarify the provision, which allows periodical measurement of methane content in the LFG with minimum of four quarterly measurements in a year, while also acknowledging that methane content of LFG can vary by more than 20% in a single day;



- (ii) Consider if additional guidance is required to select an appropriate number of samples, which can provide results with a 95% confidence level and a reasonable margin of error.
- (c) In its consideration of a deviation from the approved methodology AM0034, the Board noted that the methodology allows for the use of an automated extractive gas analyzer system that uses Non Dispersive Infrared Absorption (NDIR) for continuous measurement of concentration of N₂O in the stack gas of the nitric acid plant. The Board requested the Meth Panel, at its soonest convenience, to look into the possibility of allowing the use of an in-situ analyser meeting all requirements of the automated measurement system as specified in the approved methodology;
- (d) In its consideration of request for review of projects applying AM0033 the Board noted that this methodology may require project participants to have access to confidential information of competitors, in particular for the determination of the Loss of Ignition in baseline. The Board therefore requested the Meth Panel to consider the providing guidance on how such values should be validated or whether default values could be applied.

General guidance

30. Due to the time constraints the Board did not consider the draft guidance on the barrier “first-of-its-kind” and the draft guidance on the application of common practice analysis, and agreed to discuss these documents in its forty-sixth meeting.
31. Due to the time constraints the Board did not consider (a) the input received as a response to the call for inputs on the proposal for the enhanced barrier test, along with (b) an assessment of approved methodologies and registered project activities with a view to assessing the extent of project activity types covered by the applicability of the proposed guidance and agreed to discuss these documents in its forty-sixth meeting.
32. Due to the time constraints the Board did not consider the draft guidance on expansion of industrial gases recovery methodologies to new facilities, and agreed to discuss this document in its forty-sixth meeting.
33. Due to the time constraints the Board did not consider the draft guidance on an accurate plant load factor for wind power project activities applying ACM0002 taking into account the variability of the wind parameters and gaps of data, and agreed to discuss it in its forty-sixth meeting.
34. The Board considered the draft “Tool to determine the baseline efficiency of thermal or electric energy generation systems” and agreed to launch a call for public inputs on the draft tool, highlighting issues with regards it's ease of application, starting on 18 February and ending on 31 March.
35. The Board agreed to approve the guidance to calculate adipic acid production in cases where it cannot be measured directly. This guidance takes the elements from the revision of AM0021 and is applicable to all versions of AM0021 with immediate effect. This guidance is contained in annex 13 to this report.
36. The Board discussed the draft “Tool to assess the validity of the original/current baseline and to update the baseline on renewal of the crediting period” and agreed to ask secretariat to revise the document taking into consideration the views of Board members. The revised document will be discussed in the forty-sixth meeting of the Board. The Board requested the secretariat to annex the document to the annotated agenda of forty-sixth meeting of the Board.

**Further schedule**

37. The Board took note that the thirty-seventh meeting of the panel will be held from 2 to 6 March 2009, as per annex 16 of the forty-third meeting of the Board.

38. The Board took note that the deadline for the twenty-seventh round of submissions of proposed new methodologies is 16 February 2009 and the deadline for submission of requests for revision and requests for clarification to be considered at the thirty-eighth meeting shall be 23 March 2009.

Agenda sub-item 3 (d): Matters relating to programme of activities

39. The Board took note of an assessment by the secretariat of public inputs regarding issues encountered in the implementation of the procedures for registration of a programme of activities as a single CDM project activity, discussed the recommendations for revisions to the procedures, and requested the secretariat to prepare a proposed revision to the procedures and any associated documents for consideration at its forty-sixth meeting.

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

40. The Board took note that 1391 CDM project activities have been registered by 13 February 2009. 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

41. 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 113 requests for registration.

42. The Board agreed to register, as corrected, the project activity:

(a) “Korea Land Corporation Pyeongtaek Sosabul-district new and renewable energy model city (Photovoltaic system + solar water heating system)” (1827) if the revised PDD and revised validation report submitted by the project participants and DOE (KEMCO) in response to the request for review are displayed in the UNFCCC CDM website;

(b) “Sichuan Greenleaf 60MW Hydropower Project” (1943) if the revised PDD and revised validation report submitted by the project participants and DOE (DNV) in response to the request for review are displayed in the UNFCCC CDM website.

43. The Board agreed to register with corrections the project activities:

(a) “Yeong Yang 61.5 MW Wind Farm Project” (1841) if the project participants and the DOE (KFQ) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the additional information provided in response to the request for review, regarding the suitability of the input values used in the investment analysis, the project start date, the baseline emissions calculation and the monitoring plan;

(b) “Montalban Landfill Methane Recovery and Power Generation Project” (1853) if the project participants and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include:

(i) The information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the investment analysis; and



- (ii) The quantification of a risk-premium over and above the risk-free return of the government bonds and therefore the benchmark.
- (c) “Hunan Chenxi Dafutan Hydropower Station” (1872) if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised validation report which incorporate the information submitted in the response to the request for review regarding the:
- (i) Suitability of the input values in line with EB 38 paragraph 54(c) guidance;
 - (ii) Common practice analysis, in particular, the exclusion of hydropower plants consisting of installed capacity below 50 MW; and
 - (iii) The inconsistency in the similar projects identified, compared to the PDD.
- (d) “Animal Manure Management System (AMMS) GHG Mitigation Project , Shandong Minhe Livestock Co. Ltd., Penglai, Shandong Province, P.R. of China” (1891) if the project participants and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and a corresponding validation report which incorporate the responses submitted to the request for review regarding the project starting date, and the revised calculation of the average nitrogen per head and other fuels;
- (e) “Sichuan Pingshan Pingbian & Guanyintuo Hydropower Station” (1897) if the project participants and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of benchmark, suitability of input values, and start date of project activity;
- (f) “SANTECH - Saneamento & Tecnologia Ambiental Ltda. -SANTEC Resíduos landfill gas emission reduction Project Activity” (1908) if the project participants and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of grid emission factor;
- (g) “Jiaozuo Coal Mine Methane (CMM) Power Generation Project of Jiaozuo Coal Industrial Group Co. Ltd., Jiaozuo City, Henan Province” (1918) if the project participants and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and a corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to request for review, regarding the appropriateness of the benchmark, input values in the investment analysis and the selection and validation of alternative baselines;
- The Board further noted that the issue regarding the benchmark is not being further assessed as the project IRR is below the lowest possible power industry benchmark in China;
- (h) “Ramirana Emission Reduction Project of Agrícola Super Limitada” (1919) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and validation report which incorporate the explanations submitted in response to the request for review regarding the financial analysis, the prior consideration of CDM, and the monitoring plan;
- (i) “Durban Landfill-Gas Bisasar Road” (1921) if the project participants and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD, spreadsheet and corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the baseline calculation, emission reduction calculation and monitoring plan;



- (j) “Jincheng Fengrun CMM Utilisation from Nine Mines in Jincheng City Shanxi Province China” (1928) if the project participants and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate:
- (i) The information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the CMM price and the applicability of the methodology;
 - (ii) The evidence for prior consideration of CDM;
 - (iii) The monitoring and checking of the project pipeline and the source of the gas feeding the pipeline to ensure that the methodology remains applicable throughout the crediting period;
 - (iv) The precise metering and monitoring arrangements and layouts; and
 - (v) The exact locations of each project site.
- (k) “Jinling Coal Mine Methane (CMM) Power Generation Project of Dengfeng City, Henan Province” (1931) if the project participants and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of the benchmark, ownership details of PP and Jinling Coal mine, project boundary, baseline selection, and monitoring plan;
- (l) “Guangxi Youjiang Naji Navigation and Power Generation Project” (1938) if the project participants and DOE (JCI) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in the response to the request for review regarding the:
- (i) Suitability of the input values in line with EB 38 paragraph 54 (c) guidance; and
 - (ii) Common practice analysis, in particular, the exclusion of the similar projects with the capacity of 33 MW and commissioned before 2002, and differentiation between the project activity and similar projects.
- (m) “Guizhou Taijiang Yanzhai Hydropower Station” (1953) if the project participants and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which include the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of the benchmark, tariff and gap between annual electricity generation and electricity supply to grid. The explanation regarding gap between annual electricity generation and electricity supply to grid has been accepted due to the fact that project IRR does not cross the benchmark with an effective power coefficient of 1;
- (n) “Hubei Laifeng Najitan Hydropower Station” (1955) if the project participants and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding prior consideration of the CDM and common practice analysis;
- (o) “Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region Tekesi River Shankou Hydropower Station” (1956) if the project participants and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which:
- (i) Incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis and exclusion of the hydropower plants with installed capacity below 50 MW in the common practice analysis; and



- (ii) Include a revised monitoring plan, which monitor the electricity transactions with each sub-stations separately.
- (p) “Sichuan Miaopu Hydropower Project” (1961) if the project participants and DOE (JCI) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate:
 - (i) The additional information provided in response to the request for review; and
 - (ii) A spreadsheet containing the sensitivity analysis for the electricity output, for which the DOE should give a positive validation opinion that the variation required for the project’s IRR to reach the benchmark is not likely to occur.
- (q) “Laowuhe Erji 10 MW Hydropower Project in Yunnan Province” (1978) if the project participants and DOE (TÜV-NORD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the responses and evidence submitted to the request for review regarding the flat tariff and project start date;
- (r) “Guangdong Shaoguan Yizhou Hydro Power Station” (1980) if the project participants and the DOE (TÜV-NORD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding prior consideration of CDM, suitability of the benchmark and gap between annual electricity generation and electricity supply to the grid. The explanation regarding gap between annual electricity generation and electricity supply to grid has been accepted due to the fact that project IRR does not cross the benchmark with an effective power coefficient of 1;
- (s) “Sichuan Wanyuan Baiyangxi Hydropower Station” (1984) if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised validation report which incorporate the information submitted in the response to the request for review regarding the:
 - (i) Suitability of the benchmark;
 - (ii) Continuing and real actions taken to secure the CDM status for the project activity;
 - (iii) Suitability of the input values in line with EB 38 paragraph 54(c) guidance; and
 - (iv) Common practice analysis, in particular, the discrepancy in the number of similar projects identified.
- (t) “Yunnan Yingjiang Zuanshui River Hydropower Station Project” (1988) if the project participants and the DOE (TÜV-NORD) submit a revised PDD and a corresponding validation report which incorporate the responses given for this request for review regarding the issue of the suitability of the 10% benchmark and the clarification of project starting date (15 April 2005 when the construction contract was signed);
- (u) “Guangnan Shangshilong Hydro Project” (1995) if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submits a revised validation report which incorporates the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of the benchmark and the common practice analysis;
- (v) “Yunnan Yingjiang County Binglang River Mangkang Hydropower Station”(1997) if the project participants and DOE (TÜV-NORD) submit a revised PDD and a corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to this request for review regarding the issue of the suitability of the benchmark, start date of the project activity and actions taken to secure CDM status in parallel with implementation;



- (w) “Fujian Pingnan Daixi 50 MW Hydropower Project” (1998) if the project participants and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of the input values, net electricity supplied to the grid, and common practice analysis;
- (x) “Yunnan Yingjiang Yinhe Hydropower Station” (2000) if the project participants and DOE (TÜV-NORD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the benchmark and prior consideration of CDM;
- (y) “Yunnan Guangnan Duimen River Hydropower Station”(2003) if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submits a revised validation report which incorporates the additional information provided in response to the request for review regarding the variations required for the project’s IRR to reach the benchmark and provide further confirmation to what is stated by the PP in its response, in particular:
- (i) The actual electricity supplied to the grid; and
 - (ii) That the actual tariff received by the project activity is in line with the PPA signed in February 2008.
- (z) “Shaanxi Shiba 14MW Hydropower Project” (2005) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and a corresponding validation report which incorporates information provided in response to the request for review regarding 10% benchmark, the prior CDM consideration and the ex-ante grid emission factor;
- (aa) “Hebei Haixing 49.5MW Wind Farm Project” (2007) if the project participants and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include:
- (i) The response provided to the request for review on the validation of the input values to the investment analysis; and
 - (ii) An amended grid emission factor calculated based on data available at the time of commencement of validation.
- (ab) “Sichuan Jiayang Qianfoyan Hydro Project” (2009) if the project participants and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of input values and the prior consideration of the CDM;
- (ac) “Dachunhe 50 MW Hydropower Project in Yunnan Province” (2010) if the project participants and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of the benchmark, the common practice analysis, the monitoring of electrical output, and the real actions taken by the project participant to secure the CDM status in parallel with the project’s implementation;
- (ad) “China Shaibeitan Hydropower Project” (2011) if the project participants and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the input values to the investment analysis, the common practice analysis, the project start date and the real actions taken by the project participant to secure the CDM status in parallel with the project’s implementation;



- (ae) “China Jintan Hydropower Project” (2014) if the project participants and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised validation report which confirms the analysis of the selection of the baseline scenario in the PDD and the amended emission factor and corresponding recalculation of emission reductions;
- (af) “Lijiang Yulong County Longbahe River Hydropower Project” (2020) if the project participants and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and a corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to this request for review regarding the issue of the suitability of the benchmark, input values to the investment analysis, and actions taken to secure CDM status in parallel with implementation;
- (ag) “Fugong Mukeji Hydropower Project” (2030) if the project participants and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of benchmark, gap between annual electricity generation and electricity supply to grid and suitability of input values. The explanation regarding gap between annual electricity generation and electricity supply to grid have been accepted due to the fact that project IRR will only cross the benchmark with a variation of +26.56% in electricity generation;
- (ah) “Jiadu River Zhentong Power Plant Project” (2033) if the project participants and DOE (DNV) submit a revised validation report which incorporates the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of the benchmark;
- (ai) “Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited (BPCL)’s Wind Power Project, India” (2036) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) submit revised PDD and validation report which incorporate the explanations submitted in response to the request for review regarding the prior consideration of CDM and the financial analysis;
- (aj) “Ninglang County Mudiqing Secondary Hydropower Plant” (2044) if the project participants and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit revised PDD and validation report which which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the input values and actions taken to secure CDM status in parallel with project's implementation;
- (ak) “Mujiatia Yiji 18.9MW Hydropower Project in Yunnan Province” (2045) if the project participants and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and a corresponding validation report which incorporate:
- (i) The additional information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the full interlinked investment analysis spreadsheet; and
 - (ii) Complete revalidation of the grid emission factor. In conducting the revised validation the DOE should begin with the value contained in the PDD submitted for validation and clearly and unambiguously identify any corrective action requests raised regarding this value, and where necessary justify any inconsistency of such corrective action requests with previous validation opinions issued regarding this value.
- (al) “Sichuan Cong'en 8MW Hydropower Project” (2046) if the project participants and the DOE (LRQA Ltd) submit revised PDD and validation report which incorporate the information on the benchmark and prior consideration of CDM submitted in the response to the request for review;
- (am) “Shaanxi Shenyang 10MW Hydropower Project” (2060) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) submit revised PDD and a corresponding Validation Report which incorporate the



information submitted in response to request for review, regarding the benchmark IRR value used in the investment analysis, prior consideration of CDM and the reason for updating the emission factor;

(an) “Cangxi Liyuan Hydropower Station” (2066) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) submit revised PDD and a corresponding validation report which incorporate the information provided in response to the request for review regarding the issue of the suitability of the benchmark and prior consideration of the CDM;

(ao) “Cangxi Donghe Dongxi Hydropower Station” (2069) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and a corresponding validation report which incorporate the responses given for this request for review regarding the issue of the suitability of the 10% benchmark;

(ap) “Shaanxi Hongchun and Shangba 11.4MW Hydropower Project Bundle” (2074) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) submit revised PDD and validation report which incorporate the information submitted in the response to the request for review regarding the benchmark, the project start date, and the prior consideration of CDM;

(aq) “Hubei Yuhuangtan 10MW Small-Scale Hydropower Project” (2077) if the project participants and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and a corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to request for review regarding the benchmark and key input values for the investment analysis, information of the reservoir in the project activity, and the correct information reference list;

(ar) “China Hunan Gaoyongdong Small Hydropower Project” (2081) if the project participants and the DOE (TÜV-RHEIN) submit a revised PDD and a corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the issue of the suitability of the 10% benchmark;

(as) “Cangxi Donghe Yangmousi Hydropower Station” (2084) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised validation report which incorporates the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of the benchmark;

(at) “Sichuan Guohe 20MW Hydropower Project” (2085) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate:

- (i) The additional information provided in response to the request for review; and
- (ii) A reassessment of the common practice analysis using local available data for the range 10-25 MW.

(au) “25.5 MW Xinnali Hydropower Project” (2087) if the DOE (DNV) submits a revised validation report which incorporate the information submitted in the response to the request for review regarding:

- (i) The suitability of the benchmark;
- (ii) The criteria for selection of similar projects in the common practice analysis; and
- (iii) The suitability of the input values in line with by EB 38 paragraph 54(c) guidance.

(av) “Ayishan Small Hydropower Project in Gansu Province” (2089) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate



the explanations submitted in response to the request for review regarding the source of funding, consistent with the financial spreadsheet, prior consideration of CDM benefits, and actions taken to secure CDM status after the start of the project activity;

(aw) “Dongshan Hydro Power Project in Guangdong Province China” (2091) if the project participants and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of the input values and gap between annual electricity generation and electricity supply to grid. The explanation regarding gap between annual electricity generation and electricity supply to grid have been accepted due to the fact that project IRR does not cross the benchmark with an effective power coefficient of 1;

(ax) “Baishuiquan Hydropower Project, Guizhou Province, China” (2104) if the project participants and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which:

- (i) Further explain the essential distinction between the project activity and the similar projects in the common practice analysis; and
- (ii) Amend the emission factor based on the most up-to-date data at the start of validation and the corresponding recalculation of emission reductions.

(ay) “Gansu Datonghe Tiecheng Hydropower Station Project” (2108) if the project participants and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate:

- (i) The information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the investment analysis; and
- (ii) A complete validation of the grid emission factor, as the DOE has stated that the factor applied in the PDD is based on data available at the time of PDD submission but did not provide a validation opinion for the calculations used.

(az) “Banna Liusha River Fifth Level Power Plant Project” (2111) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the responses given for this request for review regarding the issue of the suitability of the 10% benchmark;

(ba) “Shri Bajrang RE Project” (2128) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which demonstrate the additionality of the project activity using investment analysis, including the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of prime lending rate, as the Board does not consider that the prevailing practice barrier has been substantiated;

(bb) “25MW Liangwan Hydropower Development Project” (2131) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate:

- (i) The information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of the benchmark; and
- (ii) A complete revalidation of the grid emission factor, as the DOE has stated that the factor applied in the revised PDD is that published by the NDRC in December 2006 which is not true and the DOE has not provided any validation of the revised calculation.



In conducting the revised validation the DOE should begin with the value contained in the PDD submitted for validation and clearly and unambiguously identify any corrective action requests raised regarding this value, and where necessary justify any inconsistency of such corrective action requests with previous validation opinions issued regarding this value.

(bc) “Chao Khun Agro Biogas Energy Project” (2138) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the responses given to this request for review regarding the validation of the barriers;

(bd) “Longyou 18 MW Hydropower Project in Zhejiang Province” (2142) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which:

(i) Incorporate the additional information provided in response to the request for review;

(ii) Demonstrate the reassessment of the common practice analysis using local available data for the range 15-25 MW (which the DOE should validate accordingly); and

(iii) Indicate a complete revalidation of the grid emission factor, as the DOE has not provided any validation of the revised calculation. In conducting the revised validation the DOE should begin with the value contained in the PDD submitted for validation and clearly and unambiguously identify any corrective action requests raised regarding this value, and where necessary justify any inconsistency of such corrective action requests with previous validation opinions issued regarding this value.

(be) “Jiratpattana Biogas Energy Project” (2144) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the responses given to this request for review, regarding the validation of the barriers and baseline calculations related to total quantity of biogas generation and amount of fuel oil to be replaced;

(bf) “Cangxi Donghe Beituo Hydropower Station” (2154) if the project participants and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the responses given for this request for review regarding the issue of the suitability of the 10% benchmark;

(bg) “Shimenkai Hydropower Project” (2167) if the project participants and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to request for review regarding the validation of the input values and the IRR benchmark;

(bh) “Modification and retrofitting of the existing 34 MW hydropower plant at Bhandardara -2 (project activity) in Maharashtra state in India by Dodson – Lindblom Hydro Power Private Limited (DLHPPL)” (2173) if the project participants and the DOE (BVC) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the calculation and validation of the benchmark;

(bi) “Xinning County Dalong Small-scale Hydropower Bundled Project” (2175) if the project participants and the DOE (TÜV-NORD) submit revised PDD and validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the benchmark, the previous projects undertaken without CDM, the project starting date, and the prior consideration of CDM;



- (bj) “Shaanxi Baiguoshu 13MW Hydropower Project” (2179) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and validation report which incorporate the information on prior consideration of CDM submitted in the response to the request for review;
- (bk) “Hubei Yuquanhe 25.2MW Hydropower Project” (2188) if the project participants and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review on the sensitivity analysis, common practice analysis, and prior consideration of the CDM;
- (bl) “Tianquan Qieshan Hydro Power Project” (2189) if the project participants and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding suitability of the benchmark and common practice analysis;
- (bm) “Tianquan Xiacun Hydro Power Project” (2192) if the project participants and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding:
- (i) The suitability of the benchmark; and
 - (ii) The gap between the designated capacity and electricity supplied to the grid and suitability of input values. The explanation regarding gap between designated capacity and electricity supply to grid have been accepted due to the fact that project IRR will only cross the benchmark with a variation of +43% in electricity generation.
- (bn) “Longwangtan 15MW Hydro Power Project in Guizhou Province” (2204) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to request for review regarding the validation of the input values and the IRR benchmark;
- (bo) “Sichuan Jiulong Shaping Hydropower Project” (2206) if the project participants and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of tariff;
- (bp) “Puping Hydro Power Project” (2208) if the project participants and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the responses given for this request for review regarding the issue of the suitability of the 10% benchmark.
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 activity is displayed as registered.
45. The Board agreed to undertake a review of the project activity:
- (a) “The model project for renovation to increase the efficient use of energy in brewery” (1516) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 14](#) to this report;¹
 - (b) “Installation of Wind power project by Kilburn Chemicals Ltd” (1690) submitted for registration by the DOE (BVC) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 15](#) to this report;²
 - (c) “Coke Dry Quenching (CDQ) Waste Heat Recovery for Power Generation Project of Wugang No. 9 and 10 Coke Ovens” (1695) 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 16](#) to this report;³

(d) “2*6 MW Coke Oven Gas Power Generation Project in Xiangcheng County” (1721) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 17](#) to this report;⁴

(e) “Ceran’s 14 de Julho Hydro Power Plant CDM Project Activity” (1829) 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 18](#) to this report;⁵

(f) “Budhil Hydro Electric Project, India (BHEP)” (1844) 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 19](#) to this report;

(g) “Power Prospect 9.9 MW Rice Husk Power Plant (the “Project” or “project activity” (1851) submitted for registration by the DOE (JQA) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 20](#) to this report;

(h) “Integrated Energy Ltd. Grid Connected Electricity Generation Plant using Natural Gas” (1870) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-NORD) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 21](#) to this report;⁶

(i) “Guangdong Huizhou LNG Power Generation Project” (1884) 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;⁷

(j) “Gansu Zhouqu County Hujia’ai Hydropower Station Project” (1886) 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 23](#) to this report;⁸

(k) “Jincheng Sihe Coal Mine CMM Generation Project” (1896) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 24](#) to this report;⁹

(l) “Electricity grid interconnection San Gabán – Mazuko – Puerto Maldonado” (1901) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 25](#) to this report;¹⁰

(m) “Yixing Shuanglong Cement Plant.s Low Temperature Waste Heat Power Generation Project” (1914) 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 26](#) to this report;¹¹

(n) “China Guangdong Shenzhen Qianwan LNG generation project” (1915) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 27](#) to this report;¹²

(o) “Jiangsu Jiaoqiao Cement Plant’s Low Temperature Waste Heat Power Generation Project” (1916) 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 28](#) to this report;¹³

(p) “Daning Coal Mine Methane Power Generation Project in Jincheng City Shanxi Province, China” (1922) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is



relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 29](#) to this report;

(q) “Wuchang Natural Gas Generation Project” (1927) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 30](#) to this report;¹⁴

(r) “Reduction in clinker usage in the production of cement through the increase in the use of additives at Lafarge Malayan Cement Berhad (LMCB)” (1933) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 31](#) to this report;¹⁵

(s) “Langxiang 30 MW Hydro Power Project in Guizhou Province China” (1941) 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;¹⁶

(t) “FEDEPALMA Sectoral CDM umbrella project for methane capture, fossil fuel displacement and cogeneration of renewable energy” (1942) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 33](#) to this report;¹⁷

(u) “Yingpeng HFC23 Decomposition Project” (1947) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 34](#) to this report;¹⁸

(v) “Sichuan Shimian Xieluo Wanba River Hydropower Station” (1969) 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;¹⁹

(w) “Sichuan Kangding Sandaoqiao Hydropower Station” (1991) 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;²⁰

(x) “Siam Quality Starch Wastewater Treatment and Energy Generation Project in Chaiyaphum, Thailand” (1993) 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 37](#) to this report;

(y) “Yunnan Nujiang Fugong Guquan River Hydropower Station” (2006) 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;²¹

(z) “Shunchang Yangkou Hydro Power Project, Fujian, China” (2008) 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;²²

(aa) “Nimoo-Bazgo Hydroelectric Project” (2023) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 40](#) to this report;²³

(ab) “Chutak Hydroelectric Project” (2025) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 41](#) to this report;²⁴



- (ac) “Jiangxi Taojiang Hydropower Project” (2039) submitted for registration by the DOE (JCI) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 42](#) to this report;²⁵
- (ad) “The Rotem Amfert Negev (RAN) Natural Gas Fuel Switch Project” (2042) 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 43](#) to this report;
- (ae) “Sichuan provincial Longchi & Caoyuan 9 MW Small-scale Hydro Power Bundle Project” (2071) 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 44](#) to this report;²⁶
- (af) “Yaoping 10 MW Small Hydropower Project in Shaanxi Province, China” (2090) 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 45](#) to this report;²⁷
- (ag) “24 MW Perla Mini Hydel Project, Karnataka, India” (2112) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 46](#) to this report;²⁸
- (ah) “China Hunan Yuzitang Small Hydropower Project ” (2121) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV Rhein) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 47](#) to this report;
- (ai) “Tongren Tianshengqiao Hydropower Project, Guizhou Province, China” (2136) 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 48](#) to this report;²⁹
- (aj) “Mengzhushan 15 MW Small Hydropower Project in Shaanxi Province, China” (2137) 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 49](#) to this report;³⁰
- (ak) “Zhejiang Quzhou Jutai clinker production project by using calcium carbide residue in the raw mix” (2139) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 50](#) to this report;³¹
- (al) “Sichuan Tongjiang Gaokeng Hydropower Station Project ” (2147) 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 51](#) to this report;³²
- (am) “Inner Mongolia Baotou Bayin Wind Power Project” (2153) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 52](#) to this report;³³
- (an) “Erbaqu Small Hydropower Project in Gansu Province” (2159) 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 53](#) to this report;³⁴
- (ao) “8.75 MW Wind Power Project by Taurian Iron & Steel Company Private Limited in District” (2163) 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 54](#) to this report;³⁵



- (ap) “Zhoujiayuan Hydropower Project in Hubei Province” (2212) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 55](#) to this report;³⁶
- (aq) “Zuo XI Hydropower power plant” (2214) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 56](#) to this report;³⁷
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 41 of the CDM modalities and procedures, the Board considered the recommendations of the review teams for 17 of the project activities which were placed “Under review” at the forty-fourth meeting of the Board.
48. In accordance with paragraphs 17 and 18 (b) of the procedures mentioned in paragraph 47, the Board agreed to register, subject to satisfactory corrections, the project activities:
- (a) “Energy efficiency measures at cement production plant” (1068) if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which incorporates further clarification of the use of the operating hours in the emission reduction calculation formulae and removes reference to algorithm 2, as this relies on a method of calculation which is not in compliance with the methodology applied;
- (b) “Saldanha Small Hydroelectric Project” (1526) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of input values, the calculation of the emission factor, the monitoring plan, and the investment analysis in spreadsheet form;
- (c) “Roncheng Wind Power Project, 48.75MW” (1755) if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the additional information provided in response to the review team’s question regarding validation of sensitivity analysis and common practice analysis;
- (d) “Valdivia biomass power plant” (1787) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which:
- (i) Further substantiates the prior consideration of the CDM by means of a detailed timeline of the real and continuing actions to secure CDM status for this project activity; and
- (ii) Applies the default values of the applied methodology for the parameter $EF_{\text{burning,CH}_4,k,y}$
- (e) “Fengguang 24.9MW Hydropower Project in Guangdong Province” (1817) if the project participant and the DOE (JCI) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which:
- (i) Further substantiate the reasons why the project participant is constrained to bear the costs for the counter reservoir; and
- (ii) Include the information on the other additional investment costs borne by the project developer which has been submitted in response to the review team’s questions;



- (f) “Sichuan Kangding Simaiao 24 MW Hydroelectric Project” (1848) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which further substantiate and incorporate a comprehensive assessment of projects similar to the project activity, and thoroughly presents the essential distinctions between them and the project activity. The Board is not satisfied with the current means of validation employed by the DOE and therefore expects a full assessment of all projects which have an installed capacity within the range of 15 to 30 MW;
- (g) “Jinji 25.2 MW Hydropower Project (the Project) in Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region, China” (1849) if the project participant and the DOE (JCI) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the additional information provided in response to the request for review and review question regarding:
- (i) Prior consideration of CDM and project start date;
 - (ii) Input values to the investment analysis;
 - (iii) Common practice analysis; and
 - (iv) Grid emission factor;
- (h) “25.3MW WHR Project of Zhejiang Leomax Group” (1874) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which include the information submitted in response to the review on the electricity tariff used for the investment analysis, the calculation of the "other tax" value and the NPV analysis which shows that the project activity is not economically attractive without CDM revenues;
- (i) “Energy efficiency improvement of existing Frame V Gas Turbine by steam injection and change of drive (from steam to electricity) of Ammonia cooling water pumps at NFCL” (1893) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report incorporate the information submitted in response to the review, regarding:
- (i) Why project emissions from the project activity has been considered as zero;
 - (ii) No overlapping of the project boundary with the other two proposed CDM projects by the PP;
 - (iii) The correct application of baseline methodology regarding the calculations of the baseline emission from the steam used by the pumps and project emissions due to steam required for steam injection in the gas turbine; and
 - (iv) The monitoring of the energy flow of the project activity;
- (j) “Duerping Coal Mine Methane Utilization Project” (1900) if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review on the investment analysis;
- (k) “Electrotherm 30 MW combined waste heat recovery and coal based captive power plant at Kutch” (1903) if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which incorporate improved investment and barrier analyses to establish the additionality of the project activity, as the Board does not consider that the current barriers as described are sufficient to demonstrate the additionality of the project activity and the investment analysis. Applying the assumptions available at the point of the



investment decision indicates that the project could have been considered economically attractive;

(l) “Avoidance of methane emissions from Municipal Solid Waste and Food Waste through Composting” (1904) if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review on the barrier analysis;

(m) “Generation of power from process waste heat at Hi-Tech Carbon, Tamil Nadu” (1905) if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which incorporate further clarification on the suitability of assumptions used to calculate the return on equity (benchmark) and whether the assumptions are reasonable for the project activity;

(n) “Nantong Coalmine Methane” (1929) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review;

(o) “Anaerobic digestion swine wastewater treatment with onsite power project (ADSW RP2001)” (1951) if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which which include:

(i) The information on why coal is not considered a "low-cost/must run" resource submitted as a response to the review; and

(ii) A build margin calculated as per ACM0002 and EB 29, para. 74 requirements.;

(p) “Sichuan Miyaluo Hydroelectric Station” (1966) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review on the capacity of the project activity.

49. In accordance with paragraphs 17 and 18 (c) of the procedures mentioned in paragraph 47, the Board could not register the project activity “Biomass based Hot Air Generation at Fertilizer Unit of Tata Chemicals Ltd., Haldia, West Bengal” (1890) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) because the DOE and project participant failed to substantiate:

(i) the selection of the baseline scenario, in particular that the unit cost of energy assumed represented market prices when the investment decision was made, or that real actions were taken to switch from furnace oil to coal fired HAGs; and

(ii) the baseline emissions calculations, in particular that the assumed NCVs (both for coal and biomass) in the emission reductions calculations are appropriate.

50. In accordance with the clarifications to paragraph 10 of the procedures referred to in paragraph 47 the Board considered two project activities for which corrections had been submitted in response to the outcome of a previous request for review.

51. The Board agreed to undertake a review of the project activities:

(a) “Ma Steel (new plant) CDQ and waste heat utilization project” (1726) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 57](#) to this report;

(b) “Shanxi Datuhe Coal Mine Methane Utilization Project” (1801) 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 58](#) to this report.

52. 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.

53. In accordance with the clarifications to paragraph 18 (b) of the above-mentioned procedures the Board considered 11 project activities for which corrections had been submitted in response to the outcome of a previous review.

54. The Board agreed to register, as corrected, the project activities:

(a) "SSPL 4.5 MW WHRB CPP" (1640) submitted for registration by the DOE (BVC);

(b) "Top Gas Pressure Recovery based Power Generation from 'G' Blast Furnace" (1648) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV);

(c) "Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Digang Conch Cement Company Limited" (1672) submitted for registration by the DOE (TUV-SUD);

(d) "Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Huaining Conch Cement Company Limited" (1673) submitted for registration by the DOE (TUV-SUD);

(e) "Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Jiande Conch Cement Company Limited" (1674) submitted for registration by the DOE (TUV-SUD);

(f) "Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Tongling Conch Cement Company Limited" (1675) submitted for registration by the DOE (TUV-SUD);

(g) "Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Zongyang Conch Cement Company Limited" (1676) submitted for registration by the DOE (TUV-SUD).

55. The Board could not register the project activities:

(a) "Power generation from coking waste heat utilization project at Shanxi Shouyang County Boda Industries Co., Ltd in Shanxi, China" (1703) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV), because the corrections submitted by the DOE and project participant have failed to substantiate the suitability of the benchmark, as the project activity is designed for the purpose of exporting electricity to the grid and not for captive purposes the Board did not consider that the benchmark reflected the risk profile of the project activity;

(b) "Power generation from coking waste heat utilization project at Lan County Fengda Coking and Chemicals Smelting Co., Ltd in Shanxi, China" (1704) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV), because the corrections submitted by the DOE and project participant have failed to substantiate the suitability of the benchmark, as the project activity is designed for the purpose of exporting electricity to the grid and not for captive purposes the Board did not consider that the benchmark reflected the risk profile of the project activity;

(c) "Power generation from coking waste heat utilization project at Qinyuan County Mingyuan Coal and Coke Co., Ltd in Shanxi, China" (1720) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV), because the corrections submitted by the DOE and project participant have failed to substantiate the suitability of the benchmark, as the project activity is designed for the purpose of exporting electricity to the grid and not for captive purposes the Board did not consider that the benchmark reflected the risk profile of the project activity;

(d) "36 MW Power generation from coking waste heat generated in the clean-type heat-recovery coke ovens at Shanxi Qinxin Coal and Coke Co., Ltd, China" (1724) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV), because the corrections submitted by the DOE and project participant have failed to substantiate the suitability of the benchmark, as the project activity is designed for the purpose of exporting electricity to the grid and not for captive purposes the Board did not consider that the benchmark reflected the risk profile of the project activity.

56. The Board considered four requests for deviation from approved methodologies related to project activities undergoing validation, agreed to answer them, and requested the secretariat to inform the DOEs accordingly.

57. 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 the request for renewal of the crediting period for the project activity "Nova Sinceridade Small Hydroelectric Power Plant - Brascan Energética Minas Gerais S.A. (BEMG) Project Activity" (0543) and agreed to renew the crediting period for a seven year period on the basis of the updated baseline, taking account of the comments submitted by the project participant and DOE (DNV) in response to the request for review.

General guidance

58. The Board took note on the progress report from the secretariat on the implementation of the CDM timelines for requests for registration, welcomed the progress in reducing delays in completeness checks and agreed to monitor the progress in the future meetings.

59. The Board agreed to adopt "Procedures for modalities of communications between project participants and the Executive Board", as contained in [annex 59](#) of this report, and a standardized form for such modalities of communication, as contained in [annex 60](#) of this report.

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

60. The Board took note that 254,608,649 CERs have been issued as of 13 February 2009 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

61. 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 31 requests for issuance.

62. In accordance with paragraph 10 of these procedures, the Board agreed, subject to a check by the secretariat of the revised documentation and in consultation with the Chair of the Board, to instruct the CDM registry administrator to issue CERs for:

- (a) "Huitengxile Windfarm Project" (0064), if the DOE (DNV) submits a revised verification report including the clarification submitted in response to the request for review regarding the installation of separate meters for monitoring electricity generated from non-CDM wind turbines;
- (b) "Southeast Caete Mills Bagasse Cogeneration Project (SECMBCP)" (0206), if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised monitoring report and a revised verification report including their clarification on the increase in emission reduction during the monitoring period;



- (c) "Electricity generation at 8 MW captive power plant using enthalpy of flue gases from blast furnace operations of Kalyani Steels Limited, in Karnataka state of India" (0427), if the revised verification report submitted by the DOE (SGS) in response to the request for review is displayed in the UNFCCC CDM website;
- (d) "Catalytic N₂O destruction project in the tail gas of the Nitric Acid Plant of Abu Qir Fertilizer Co." (0490) for the monitoring period of 01 April 2008 - 30 June 2008, if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report including the clarification on the operation of destruction facility at normal efficiency and the back up plans for measuring equipments, provided in response to the request for review;
- (e) "Catalytic N₂O destruction project in the tail gas of the Nitric Acid Plant of Abu Qir Fertilizer Co." (0490) for the monitoring period of 01 July 2008 - 30 September 2008, if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report including the clarification on the repeated equipment failures, systematic measure for quality assurance for monitoring data during analyser down times, and the plant efficiency when the analysers were out of operation, provided in response to the request for review;
- (f) "Eecopalsa - biogas recovery and electricity generation from Palm Oil Mill Effluent ponds, Honduras" (0492), if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which include the *ex post* calculation of grid emission factor, and the clarification regarding the double-check of electricity sales receipts;
- (g) "La Vuelta and La Herradura Hydroelectric Project" (0735), if the revised verification report submitted by the DOE (ICONTEC) which incorporates clarification on the cross-check of electricity supplied against the receipts of sales is displayed in the UNFCCC CDM website;
- (h) "Omnia Fertilizer Limited Nitrous Oxide (N₂O) Reduction Project" (0752), if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit:
- (i) a revised monitoring report which includes the revised spreadsheet provided in response to the request for review;
 - (ii) a revised verification report which incorporates clarification on the application of the default N₂O emission factor and the verification on the monitoring of nitric acid production against the monitored amount of ammonia input; and
 - (iii) a new request for issuance form which corresponds to the correct number of certified emission reductions.
- (i) "Frio Industrias Argentinas S.A ("FIASA") Hydro-fluorocarbon 23 ("HFC23") Capture, Storage and Decomposition Project" (0807), if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which include clarifications on the missing HFC23 flowmeter zero check in one week during this monitoring period and the monitoring of stored HFC23;
- (j) "Kaifeng Jinkai N₂O Abatement Project" (0837), if the revised verification report submitted by the DOE (SGS) which incorporates clarifications on the verification of QAL3 and the nitric acid production submitted in response to the request for review is displayed in the UNFCCC CDM website;



(k) "Shenzhen Xiaping Landfill Gas Collection and Utilization Project" (0887), for the monitoring period of 01 July 2007 - 01 September 2007, if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which include:

- (i) Clarification on the periodical measurement of methane content in LFG and the flare efficiency provided in response to the request for review; and
- (ii) Flare efficiency test certificate as a documentary evidence of test conducted in June 2007.

(l) "Shenzhen Xiaping Landfill Gas Collection and Utilization Project" (0887), for the monitoring period of 02 September 2007 - 01 January 2008, if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which include:

- (i) Clarification on the periodical measurement of methane content in LFG and the flare efficiency provided in response to the request for review; and
- (ii) Flare efficiency test certificate as a documentary evidence of test conducted in June 2007.

(m) "Jinan Landfill Gas to Energy Project" (0933), if the revised spreadsheet submitted by the project participant and the DOE (SGS) is displayed in the UNFCCC CDM website;

(n) "Bundled Wind power project in Tamilnadu, India co-ordinated by the TamilNadu Spinning Mills Association (TASMA)" (0991), if the revised monitoring report and verification report submitted by the DOE (DNV) which include the exclusion of electricity generated from 2 WEGs connected to HTSC 740 and the daily meter readings at project site are displayed in UNFCCC CDM website and the DOE submits a new request for issuance form which corresponds to the corrected certified emission reductions;

(o) "N₂O Emission Reduction in nitric acid plant Paulinia, SP, Brazil" (1011), if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding verification report which incorporate:

- (i) Corrected calculation of baseline N₂O emission factor (by including the nitric acid production values measured beyond the normal campaign length while N₂O values measured during the same period should be eliminated);
- (ii) Clarification on the project monitoring of stack gas temperature and pressure;
- (iii) Clarification on the compliance with EN14181; and
- (iv) Clarification on the inconsistent normal operating temperature and pressure, and normal campaign length data in the documents, provided in response to the request for review.

(p) "4.5 MW Industrial Waste based Grid-connected Power Project" (1045), if the revised monitoring report, revised spreadsheet and corresponding revised verification report submitted by the DOE (DNV) which apply the grid emission factors based on latest official data are displayed in UNFCCC CDM website and the DOE submits a new request for issuance form which corresponds to the corrected certified emission reductions;



- (q) "Jiangxi Fengcheng Mining Administration CMM Utilization Project" (1135), if the revised verification report submitted by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) is displayed in the UNFCCC CDM website;
- (r) "Coronel landfill gas capture project" (1219), if the revised monitoring report, revised spreadsheet and corresponding revised verification report submitted by the DOE (SGS) which apply the lower bound of the 95% confidence interval are displayed in UNFCCC CDM website and the DOE submits a new request for issuance form which corresponds to the corrected certified emission reductions;
- (s) "MEN-Tangerang 13.6MW Natural Gas Co-generation Project" (1313), if the revised monitoring report, revised spreadsheet and corresponding revised verification report submitted by the DOE (SGS) which apply the net calorific value and density of the natural gas from gas analysis in March 2008 are displayed in UNFCCC CDM website and the DOE submits a new request for issuance form which corresponds to the corrected certified emission reductions;
- (t) "Beijing Taiyangong CCGT Trigeneration Project" (1320), if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report and a revised verification report which include the clarification on the measurement of net electricity supplied to the grid provided in response to the request for review;
- (u) "Beijing No.3 Thermal Power Plant Gas-Steam Combined Cycle Project Using Natural Gas" (1373), if the revised monitoring report, spreadsheet, revised verification report submitted by the DOE (TÜV-NORD) in response to the request for review are displayed in the CDM UNFCCC website, and the DOE submits a new request for issuance form which corresponds to the corrected certified emission reductions.
63. In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 10 of the procedures referred in paragraph 61, the Board agreed to undertake a review of the request for issuance of CERs and to appoint members of the review team for:
- (a) "Thermal Efficiency Improvement Initiatives in Coal Fired Boiler System" (0266), submitted by the DOE (SGS), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 61](#) to this report;
- (b) "AWMS GHG Mitigation Project BR05-B01, Minas Gerais, Brazil" (0335), submitted by the DOE (DNV), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 62](#) to this report;
- (c) "Blended cement with increased blend" at Orient cement's Devapur and Jalgaon plants in India" (0456), submitted by the DOE (SGS), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 63](#) to this report;³⁸
- (d) "Avoidance of Wastewater and On-site Energy Use Emissions and Renewable Energy Generation in IFB Agro Distillery Unit" (0496), submitted by the DOE (DNV), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 64](#) to this report;³⁹
- (e) "India-FaL-G Brick and Blocks Project No. 1" (0707), submitted by the DOE (DNV), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 65](#) to this report;
- (f) "8.75 MW Wind Power Project in Gujarat" (0776), submitted by the DOE (TÜV-NORD), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as



contained in [annex 66](#) to this report;

(g) "Partial substitution of fossil fuels with biomass in cement manufacture" (0876), submitted by the DOE (SGS), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 67](#) to this report;

(h) "Project for the catalytic reduction of N₂O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia reactor of the N₃ nitric acid plant at Haifa Chemicals Ltd., Israel" (1174), submitted by the DOE (DNV), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 68](#) to this report;⁴⁰

(i) "Palmas del Espino – Biogas recovery and heat generation from Palm Oil Mill Effluent (POME) ponds, Peru" (1249), 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 69](#) to this report;⁴¹

(j) "Project for the catalytic reduction of N₂O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia reactor of the nitric acid plant at Dongbu Hannong Chemicals Ltd., Ulsan, Korea ("Dongbu")" (1443), submitted by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 70](#) to this report.⁴²

64. 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.

65. In accordance with the procedures for review as referred to in paragraph 65 of the CDM modalities and procedures, the Board considered the recommendation of the review team for two project activities which was placed "Under review" at the forty-fourth meeting of the Board.

66. The Board agreed to instruct the CDM registry administrator to issue CERs, subject to satisfactory corrections, for:

(a) "Yanling Shendu Hydropower Project" (0695) for the monitoring period 16/02/2007 - 23/12/2007, if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report, a corresponding revised verification report, and a new request for issuance form that correctly apply the concept of deduction (by decreasing the electricity export and increasing the import) by 0.5% as per the meter specification. .

(b) "Demand side energy conservation and reduction measures at ITC Tribeni Unit" (0745) for the monitoring period 01/01/2007 - 31/12/2007, if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding verification report which include clarifications on fluke meters measurement provided in response to the review, and a new request for issuance form.

67. The Board considered 21 requests for deviation related to monitoring reports undergoing verification, agreed to answer them and requested the secretariat to inform the DOEs accordingly.

General guidance

68. The Board discussed situations in which the implementation of registered CDM projects may differ from description of the project in the registered PDD. The Board requested the secretariat to prepare a note regarding changes from project description in the PDD and propose options and procedures to address such changes, taking into account views expressed by members, for its consideration in the forty-sixth meeting.



69. The Board took note on the progress report from the secretariat on the implementation of the CDM timelines for requests for issuance, welcomed the progress in reducing delays in completeness checks and agreed to monitor the progress in the future meetings.

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

CDM-MAP

70. In accordance with decision 2/CMP.4 relating to the Management Plan (CDM-MAP), the Board considered the CDM-MAP 2009 prepared by the secretariat to cover CDM activities in 2009 which included the needs identified by the Board and addressing the requests identified by the CMP. After agreeing to the one correction highlighted by the secretariat, the Board approved the CDM-MAP 2009 (version 01), as contained in [annex 71](#) to this report.

71. The Board encouraged the secretariat to continue its good record in ensuring geographical and gender balance among professional staff and to increase its efforts to accelerate the recruitment of urgently needed staff.

Resources

72. The Board took note of information provided by the secretariat on the status of resources received as reflected in [annex 72](#). It was noted that since 1 January 2009, the CDM has received USD 1,831,872 from share of proceeds generated by 14 projects and USD 647,227 as a result of the payment of 15 registration fees. Considering the above income and level of expenditure in January 2009, the carry over from 2008 and the revised reserve (USD 45 million), the resources available in 2009 amount to USD 17 million.

Agenda item 5. Other matters

Agenda sub-item 5 (a): CMP Guidance

73. The Board took note of the decision 2/CMP.4 "Further guidance to the clean development mechanism". It considered a table prepared by the secretariat which structures the guidance, mandates, tasks, actors and indicated initial timelines. The Board requested the secretariat to cluster the requests by CMP by issues and to update the Board on the status of implementation of the CMP requests every two meetings. The Board invited the panels and working groups to consider the table of CMP requests with a view to progressing in the work. Furthermore, the Board requested the secretariat to prepare draft terms of reference for the requests by the CMP which involve strategic actions by the Board in the area of improving the CDM process for consideration by the Board at its next meeting.

74. With reference of the request by CMP to assess the implications of the possible inclusion of lands with forests in exhaustion as A/R CDM project activities, taking into account technical, methodological and legal issues, and report back to CMP5 (2/CMP.4, paragraph 42), the Board requested the Afforestation and Reforestation Working Group to work on a draft terms of reference to address this task for approval by the Board as soon as possible.

75. With regard to the request by the CMP to assess the implications of the possible inclusion of CCS in geological formations as CDM project activities, taking into account technical, methodological and legal issues, and report back to CMP5 (2/CMP.4, paragraph 41). The Board requested the secretariat in consultation with a group of Board members and alternate members to work on a draft terms of reference to address this task for approval by the Board as soon as possible.



76. Following the request by the CMP to classify, index and publish decisions, clarifying the hierarchy of its decisions, to demonstrate the relationship between new and previous decisions, to further substantiate decisions and make public the rationale for its decisions (2/CMP.4, paragraph 12), the Board agreed to definitions and preliminary classification of documents types of the Board, as contained in [annex 73](#) of this report. This is a first step in a series of actions that the Board will take in 2009 with the objective of improving accurate, transparent and timely access to Board decisions.

Agenda sub-item 5 (b): Code of conduct

77. Due to time constraints the Board did not consider this agenda item. The Board agreed to consider the issue at its next meeting.

Agenda sub-item 5 (c): Privileges and immunities

78. Due to time constraints the Board did not consider this agenda item. The Board agreed to consider the issue at its next meeting.

Agenda sub-item 5 (d): Regional distribution

79. The Board also took note of the various requests by the CMP related to regional and sub-regional distribution and requested the secretariat to prepare a note containing options on how to address these requests for consideration by the Board at its next meeting, with a view to agree on actions to be taken. The Board also encouraged panels and working groups to explore ways in which they can support the Board in this task.

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

80. The Board took note of the status of planning and preparation for the next meeting of the DNA Forum to be held on 25- 26 April 2009 in Bonn, Germany, which will be held in conjunction with the annual CDM Joint Coordination Workshop to be held on 27-28 April 2009 in Bonn, Germany.

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

81. The Chair of the DOE/AE Coordination Forum, in response to the request from the Board in the last meeting, highlighted typical steps by the DOEs in the validation and verification process and indicated timelines for completing validation and verification functions by DOEs. The Board took note of the information provided by the Chair of the Forum and requested to continue sharing such information with the Board.

82. The Chair of the DOE/AE Coordination Forum elaborated the inputs received from entities for the consideration of the Board, and sought guidance from the Board on the following:

- (a) Consideration of grant of re-accreditation period of operational entities for 5 year instead of three years as specified in the CDM M&P;
- (b) Change of project participant prior to registration request;
- (c) Validation of post registration changes to PDDs and change of project design after registration;
- (d) Retroactive application of guidance/decisions of the Board;
- (e) Liability of DOEs in Programme of Activities.

The Chair of the Forum also highlighted some other issues for the consideration of the Board.



83. The Board members responded to some of the questions raised by the Chair of the DOE/AE Forum.

84. The Chair of the Board thanked Mr. Siddharth Yadav and stressed the need for the forum to also identify possible answers to the questions raised by the Board members, during its next interaction.

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

85. The Board met with registered observers for an informal interaction on the last day of the meeting 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.

86. The Board further agreed to continue to meet with the same type of arrangement, with space being made available for 70 observers, and to reconsider the issue when necessary. Observers to the forty-fifth meeting of the Board shall have registered with the secretariat by **2 March 2009**. 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 (h): Other business

87. The Board further took note with appreciation of the invitation of Mr. Hugh Sealy, on behalf of the Government of Grenada to host a meeting of the Board in Grenada in July 2009. The meeting is planned to be held in conjunction with other events to raise awareness of the CDM in the region. The Board requested the secretariat to start preparing the formal, legal and logistical arrangements for these meetings.

88. The Board agreed to the revised calendar of meetings for 2009, which is contained in [annex 74](#) to this report.

89. The Board agreed on the provisional agenda for its forty-sixth meeting (23 -25 March 2009) as contained in [annex 75](#) to this report, with an open session on the 24 - 25 March 2009.

Agenda item 6. Conclusion of the meeting

90. The Chair summarized the main conclusions.

91. The Board expressed its deep appreciation to the outgoing Chair, Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sethi, and Vice-Chair, Mr. Lex de Jonge, for the outstanding leadership and dedication. The Board also thanked all outgoing members and alternate members for their hard work and dedication to the process during their tenure.

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

92. 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

93. The Chair closed the meeting.



Annexes to the report

Membership issues

Annex 1 - Documents related to conflict of interest

Methodologies

Annex 2 - AM0075 "Methodology for collection, processing and supply of biogas to end-users for production of heat" (version 01)

Annex 3 - AM0076 "Methodology for implementation of fossil fuel trigeneration systems in existing industrial facilities" (version 01)

Annex 4 - AM0077 "Recovery of gas from oil wells that would otherwise be vented or flared and its delivery to specific end-users" (version 01)

Annex 5 - AM0078 "Point of use abatement device to reduce SF₆ emissions in LCD manufacturing operations" (version 01)

Annex 6 - Revision to AM0021 "Baseline Methodology for decomposition of N₂O from existing adipic acid production plants" (version 03)

Annex 7 - Revision to AM0023 "Leak reduction from natural gas pipeline compressor or gate stations" (version 02.1)

Annex 8 - Revision to AM0049 "Methodology for gas based energy generation in an industrial facility" (version 03)

Annex 9 - Revision to ACM0001 "Consolidated baseline and monitoring methodology for landfill gas project activities" (version 10)

Annex 10 - Revision to ACM0002 "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" (version 09)

Annex 11 - Revision to ACM0006 "Consolidated methodology for electricity generation from biomass residues" (version 07)

Annex 12 - Revision to ACM0014 "Mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions from treatment of industrial wastewater" (version 03)

Annex 13 - Guidance to calculate adipic acid production in cases where it cannot be measured directly (version 01)

Matters relating to the registration of CDM project activities

Annex 14 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1516

Annex 15 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1690

Annex 16 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1695

Annex 17 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1721

Annex 18 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1829

Annex 19 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1844



- Annex 20 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1851
- Annex 21 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1870
- Annex 22 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1884
- Annex 23 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1886
- Annex 24 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1896
- Annex 25 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1901
- Annex 26 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1914
- Annex 27 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1915
- Annex 28 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1916
- Annex 29 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1922
- Annex 30 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1927
- Annex 31 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1933
- Annex 32 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1941
- Annex 33 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1942
- Annex 34 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1947
- Annex 35 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1969
- Annex 36 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1991
- Annex 37 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1993
- Annex 38 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2006
- Annex 39 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2008
- Annex 40 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2023
- Annex 41 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2025
- Annex 42 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2039
- Annex 43 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2042
- Annex 44 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2071
- Annex 45 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2090
- Annex 46 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2112
- Annex 47 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2121
- Annex 48 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2136
- Annex 49 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2137



- Annex 50 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2139
- Annex 51 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2147
- Annex 52 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2153
- Annex 53 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2159
- Annex 54 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2163
- Annex 55 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2212
- Annex 56 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2214
- Annex 57 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1726
- Annex 58 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1801
- Annex 59 - Procedures for modalities of communication between project participants and the Executive Board (version 01)
- Annex 60 - Modalities of Communication Form (version 01)

Matters relating to the issuance of CERs and the CDM registry

- Annex 61 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0266
- Annex 62 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0335
- Annex 63 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0456
- Annex 64 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0496
- Annex 65 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0707
- Annex 66 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0776
- Annex 67 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0876
- Annex 68 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 1174
- Annex 69 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 1249
- Annex 70 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 1443

Resources

- Annex 71 - CDM Management Plan (CDM-MAP) 2009 (version 01)
- Annex 72 - Status of resources and pledges to support 2009 CDM activities

Other matters

- Annex 73 - Classification of documents issued by the Board (version 01)
- Annex 74 - Calendar of meetings for 2009 (version 02)
- Annex 75 - Provisional agenda for EB46



Endnotes

1. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and a corresponding validation report which incorporate the additional information and corrections submitted in response to the request for review regarding the project start date and the calculation of the grid emission factor.
2. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report that includes the response submitted for the review with regards to the sensitivity and emission factor calculation, and which removes the prevailing practice barrier.
3. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report that incorporate the information submitted in the request for review regarding baseline determination and remove the investment barriers.
4. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report with change in start date of project activity from the date of construction permit (01 June 2006) to the date of signing of the turbine-generator unit purchasing contract (01 March 2006).
5. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report that incorporate the information on sensitivity analysis, prior consideration of the CDM, and start date of project activity as submitted in the request for review.
6. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report incorporating the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding suitability of benchmark, suitability of input values, sensitivity analysis and monitoring plan and submit the emission reductions calculations spreadsheet.
7. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a further revised PDD and validation report which incorporates the information provided in response to the request for review regarding the validation of gas price trends; natural gas availability, baseline determination and monitoring plan.
8. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the DOE will be required to submit a revised validation report which incorporates the information regarding the validation of input values submitted in response to the review.
9. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report that includes the response submitted in request for review with regards to investment analysis, baseline conditions of the mines and monitoring plan.
10. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report that incorporate the information on prior consideration of CDM, investment comparison analysis and common practice.
11. If the Board ultimately decide to register the project activity the PP and DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report, which: a) includes the correct project start date, the table with the milestones of the project activity and the validation of the input values to the investment analysis submitted in response to the request for review; and b) removes the barrier analysis which has not been validated by the DOE.



12. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the DOE will be required to submit revised PDD and corresponding validation report that incorporate the information submitted in the request for review regarding validation of the starting date of the project activity, suitability of the input values to the investment analysis, selection of the similar projects in the common practice analysis, applicability of the methodology, in particular, the implementation of the project will not limit natural gas based power capacity additions in the region, and validation of the economic comparison of baseline alternatives, in particular, varying the assumption of the load factor.
13. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report which incorporate the response submitted for the request for review regarding the project start date. The DOE should also provide a positive validation opinion on the elimination of alternative 3 to the baseline scenario, as the issue raised in the request for review was not fully addressed.
14. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report that includes the response submitted in request for review with regards to (a) the assumed load hours and tariffs and (b) economic comparison of alternatives, and excludes any reference to a reassessment of the financial viability or additionality of the project activity.
15. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the DOE will be required to submit a revised validation report with start date of project activity as 14 June 2006 (signing of Tanjung Bin PFA handling facility tender).
16. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the DOE will be required to submit a revised validation report that incorporate the information submitted in the request for review regarding validation of common practice analysis.
17. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a further revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report that includes the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the financial analysis for each of the 32 plants, the project start date and the monitoring plan.
18. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the revised PDD and its corresponding revised validation report including the response submitted in the request for review related to the prior consideration of the CDM and the monitoring of sold HFC23 will be uploaded in the CDM interface.
19. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report that incorporate the information on suitability of input values in particular tariff and common practice analysis.
20. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report incorporating the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding suitability input values and benchmark.
21. If the Board ultimately decide to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report, which includes the explanation on the validity of this benchmark submitted in response to the request for review.
22. If the Board ultimately decide to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include the information provided in the response to the request for review regarding the sensitivity and common practice analyses, the correct project start date and with the amended grid emission factor and corresponding recalculation of the



baseline emissions and emission reductions.

23. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report which incorporate the additional information and corrections submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of input values to the investment analysis, the update in the grid emission factor and the monitoring plan.
24. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and a corresponding validation report that includes the response submitted in request for review regarding the input values to the investment analysis, the differences between the project activity and other similar projects in the common practice analysis, and the CDM prior consideration.
25. If the Board ultimately decide to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report, which include the explanation on the investment analysis submitted in response to the request for review.
26. If the Board ultimately decide to register the project activity the DOE will be required to submit a revised validation report which include the additional information regarding the suitability of the benchmark and a validation of the grid emission factor contained in the PDD submitted for global stakeholder consultation.
27. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report that includes the response submitted in request for review with regards to benchmark IRR value, validation of the investment analysis and prior CDM consideration.
28. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report that includes the response submitted in request for review with regards to (a) the appropriateness of the country risk premium used, (b) the sensitivity analysis for the O&M cost and, (c) the essential distinction between the project activity and the remaining similar project activities considered in the common practice analysis.
29. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and a corresponding validation report which includes the recalculated emission factor using the most updated data at the commencement of validation and the corresponding recalculated emission reductions.
30. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report that include the response submitted in the request for review related to the suitability of the benchmark and the expenses prior to the project starting date in 2007.
31. If the Board ultimately decide to register the project activity the DOE will be required to submit a revised validation report which includes the response to the request for review regarding how it has been determined that the reference plant has the highest performance in the region.
32. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and validation report which include the response to the request for review regarding the benchmark and updates the grid emission factor according to the PDD published for global stakeholder consultation.
33. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and a corresponding validation report which incorporate the additional information and corrections submitted in response to the request for review regarding the update in investment costs



and the electricity tariff used in the calculations. In addressing this issue, the DOE should validate what is stated by the PP in the response (i.e. that the actual investment was verified to be higher than the value described in the PDD), describing the means of this validation.

34. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report that includes the response submitted in the request for review related to the project starting date and emission factor.
35. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding prior consideration of CDM.
36. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD which incorporates the response to the request for review regarding the validation of the input values and benchmark and the updates to the grid emission factor.
37. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP/DOE will be required to submit revised PDD and corresponding validation report that incorporate the information submitted in the request for review regarding validation of the suitability of the benchmark and input values to the investment analysis.
38. If the Board ultimately decides to issue the CERs, the DOE will be required to submit a revised verification report which includes clarification on the increased grinding capacity provided in response to the request for review.
39. If the Board ultimately decides to issue the CERs, the DOE will be required to submit a revised verification report which includes clarification on the implementation status of 140 kW turbine, quantity of biogas that would have been destroyed in boiler-1 in absence of the project, and calibration certificates for the last calibration.
40. If the Board ultimately decides to issue the CERs, the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which include clarifications on the monitoring of temperature and pressure and monitored data provided in response to the request for review.
41. If the Board ultimately decides to issue the CERs, the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which include clarifications on the flare efficiency when temperature below 500C and verification by the DOE on the occurrence of temperatures below 200C and its impacts to the calculation of emission reduction.
42. If the Board ultimately decides to issue the CERs, the PP/DOE will be required to submit a revised spreadsheet which includes the calculation steps from raw data to the final emission reductions, and a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which incorporate clarifications on the compliance with EN18141 provided in response to the request for review.