



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

Date: 25 March 2009  
Ref: CDM-EB-46

EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE CLEAN DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM  
FORTY-SIXTH MEETING

Report

**Date of meeting:** 23 - 25 March 2009

**Location:** Bonn, Germany

**Attendance:** The names of members and alternate members present at the forty-sixth 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
<b>Mr. Lex de Jonge</b> <sup>2</sup>	<b>Mr. Pedro Martins Barata</b> <sup>2</sup>
<b>Mr. Kamel Djemouai</b> <sup>1</sup>	<b>Mr. Samuel Adeoye Adejuwon</b> <sup>1</sup>
<b>Mr. Philip M. Gwage</b> <sup>2</sup>	<b>Mr. Xuedu Lu</b> <sup>2</sup>
<b>Mr. Martin Hession</b> <sup>1</sup>	<b>Mr. Thomas Bernheim</b> <sup>1</sup>
<b>Mr. Shafqat Kakakhel</b> <sup>1</sup>	<b>Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sethi</b> <sup>1</sup>
<b>Mr. Clifford Mahlun</b> <sup>2</sup>	<b>Mr. Noah Idechong</b> <sup>2</sup>
<b>Mr. Paulo Manso</b> <sup>2</sup>	<b>Mr. Hussein Badarin</b> <sup>2</sup>
<b>Mr. Victor Nicolae</b> <sup>2</sup>	<b>Ms. Diana Harutyunyan</b> <sup>2</sup>
<b>Mr. Hugh Sealy</b> <sup>1</sup>	<b>Mr. José Domingos Miguez</b> <sup>1</sup>
<b>Mr. Peer Stiansen</b> <sup>1</sup>	<b>Mr. Akihiro Kuroki</b> <sup>1</sup>

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

<sup>2</sup> 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. Mr. Lex de Jonge, Chair of the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism (CDM) (hereinafter referred to as the Board) opened the meeting and asserted that the quorum requirement was met. 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, Mr. Hugh Sealy and Mr. Peer Stiansen also requested that their signed statements regarding conflict of interest be attached to this report, as contained in annex 1 to this report.

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

2. The Board adopted the agenda and agreed to the agenda of the meeting.

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

3. The Board took note of the thirtieth progress report on the work of the CDM Accreditation Panel (CDM-AP), and an oral report by the Vice-Chair, Mr. Samuel Adeoye Adejuwon. The report summarized information relating to the work of the panel including the status of applications and developments with respect to desk reviews, on-site assessments, witnessing activities and other accreditation related issues.

***Case specific***

4. The Board considered the recommendation of the CDM-AP, and agreed to accredit and provisionally designate the entity 'Japan Quality Assurance Organization (JQA)' for the validation functions in the sectoral scope 13 (Waste handling and disposal).

***General guidance***

5. The Board adopted the "CDM accreditation standard for operational entities", as contained in annex 2 to this report. The Board also requested the CDM-AP and the secretariat to start applying the requirements of the document with immediate effect in the assessment work of operational entities.

6. The Board adopted the revised accreditation procedure, as contained in annex 3 to this report. The Board requested the CDM-AP and the secretariat to start applying the revised accreditation procedure with immediate effect in the assessment work of operational entities.

7. The Board, pursuant to its decisions to streamline the accreditation process at its forty-second and forty-third meeting, decided to accredit for three (3) years for both functions (validation and verification/certification) and sectoral scopes indicated below the following entities that have successfully completed on-site assessment under re-accreditation:

- (a) Japan Quality Assurance Organization (JQA) (sectoral scopes 1-15);
- (b) Det Norske Veritas Certification AS (DNV) (sectoral scopes 1-15);
- (c) TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH (TÜV-SÜD) (sectoral scopes 1-15);
- (d) SGS United Kingdom Ltd. (SGS) (sectoral scopes 1-15);
- (e) TÜV Rheinland Japan Ltd. (TÜV Rheinland) (sectoral scopes 1-13).



8. The Board, pursuant to its decisions to streamline the accreditation process at its forty-second and forty-third meeting, also decided to accredit for three (3) years for both functions (validation and verification/certification) and sectoral scopes indicated below the following entities which were issued an indicative letter within 12 months before the forty-third meeting of the Board:

- (a) The Korea Energy Management Corporation (KEMCO) (sectoral scopes 1-15);
- (b) ERM Certification and Verification Services Ltd (sectoral scopes 1-5, 8-10, 13);
- (c) Swiss Association for Quality and Management Systems (SQS) (sectoral scopes 1-15);
- (d) China Environmental United Certification Center Co., Ltd. (CEC) (sectoral scopes 1-3, 8, 10);
- (e) RINA S.p.A (RINA) (sectoral scopes 1-8, 10, 11, 13-15);
- (f) SIRIM QAS INTERNATIONAL SDN.BHD (sectoral scopes 1-4, 13);
- (g) Korean Standards Association (KSA) (sectoral scopes 1-5, 13);
- (h) Environmental Management Corp. (EMC) (sectoral scopes 1-8, 13-15);
- (i) Japan Management Association (JMA) (sectoral scopes 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 14);
- (j) Germanischer Lloyd Certification GmbH (GLC) (sectoral scopes 1-3, 7, 10, 13);
- (k) China Quality Certification Center (CQC) (sectoral scopes 1-13).

9. The Board further decided to conduct an additional focused on-site assessment to be completed in six (6) months for following entities which were issued an indicative letter more than 12 months before the forty-third meeting of the Board:

- (a) PricewaterhouseCoopers Aarata Sustainability Certification Co., Ltd.;
- (b) KPMG AZSA Sustainability Co., Ltd.;
- (c) Conestoga Rovers & Associates Limited (CRA);
- (d) Ernst&Young Shin Nihon Sustainability Institute Co., Ltd. (Shin Nihon);
- (e) Nippon Kaiji Kentei Quality Assurance Limited (NKKKQA);
- (f) Perry Johnson Registrars Clean Development Mechanism, Inc. (PJR CDM);
- (g) LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ CTC).

The Board decided that failure to complete the additional focused on-site assessment within six (6) months shall lead to rejection of the accreditation application.

10. The Board further agreed that the entities currently in the process of re-accreditation shall receive their accreditation for both functions (validation and verification/certification) and all sectoral scopes applied for after successful completion of their on-site assessment under re-accreditation.



11. The Board also agreed to extend accreditation to both functions (validation and verification/certification) and sectoral scopes indicated below of the following entities that have recently successfully completed regular surveillance:

- (a) Lloyd's Register Quality Assurance Ltd (LRQA) (sectoral scopes 1-13);
- (b) Colombian Institute for Technical Standards and Certification (ICONTEC) (sectoral scopes 1-5, 8, 13-15).

12. The Board agreed to make all accredited entities subject to performance monitoring, as provided for in the revised accreditation procedure. The Board also agreed to consider on-going witnessing activities as performance assessment activities.

13. The Board took note of an update on the analysis of the performance of entities, based on currently available data, and requested the secretariat to update the Board on the progress of this work at its forty-seventh meeting.

#### *Further schedule*

14. The Board noted that the forty-first meeting of the CDM-AP will be held from 29 April to 1 May 2009.

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

15. The Board took note of the report of the thirty-seventh meeting of the panel on baseline and monitoring methodologies (Meth Panel), and an oral report by the Chair of the panel, Mr. Philip Gwage, on the work of the panel.

#### *Case specific*

16. Taking into consideration the inputs by experts (desk reviewers), the public, and the recommendations of the Meth Panel, the Board agreed to **approve case AM0079** - "Prevention of SF<sub>6</sub> venting following tests of Gas insulated electrical equipment", which was proposed as NM0251 (South Korea SF<sub>6</sub> capture and recycling project) and link it to scope 11 (Fugitive emissions from production and consumption of halocarbons and sulphur hexafluoride), as contained in the [annex 4](#) of this report.

17. Due to the time constraints the Board did not consider the issue of permanence, in relation to the cases NM0267 and NM0297, and agreed to discuss this issue in its forty-seventh meeting.

18. **Not to approve cases:** NM0290, NM0296, NM0298, and NM0299 which, if revised taking into account comments, can be resubmitted but will require new expert and public input.

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

20. In consideration of a request for deviation from the approved consolidated methodology ACM0009, the Board noted that the methodology calculates baseline emissions using the emission factor of the least carbon intensive fuel for the cases where multiple fuels are used in the baseline. The Board agreed that such provisions, though conservative, reduce the emission reduction claims of project participants unreasonably, particularly in cases where usage of multiple baseline fuels can be clearly monitored. The Board requests the Meth Panel to explore the possibility of incorporating an option in the methodology facilitating the use of weighted average emission factor of multiple baseline fuels, while clearly stipulating the requirements for the monitoring of baseline fuels. The Meth Panel was also requested to consider removing start-up fuels from the baseline fuels to be accounted for in the



calculation of the baseline emission factor.

21. In its consideration of a request for deviation on issuance for a project activity applying Scenario 12 of ACM0006, the Board noted that project proponents propose to deviate from the methodological requirement of using three years data of historical generation for the existing power plant to calculate baseline emissions. The deviation is due to the absence of the three years data, as the existing power plant operated for less than one year. The deviation is to calculate electricity generation based on the specifications of the existing turbines, 90% of average plant capacity utilization and operation time instead of using three years of historical data. The Board requested the Meth Panel to assess whether the use of the calculated data can replace the three years historical generation data of the existing power unit required by the approved methodology and the absence of three year historical data may result in the application of different scenarios of the methodology.

***Responses to requests for clarification***

22. The Board took note of the responses to clarifications provided by the Meth Panel on the cases AM\_CLA\_0125, AM\_CLA\_0139 and AM\_CLA\_0140.

***Responses to requests for revisions***

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

- (a) Not to accept request AM\_REV\_0106 concerning revision of the approved methodology ACM0006 to broaden the applicability of the methodology to project activities which involve the installation of a new biomass residue fired cogeneration plant at a site where no power was generated prior to the implementation of the project activity, electricity was totally obtained from the grid, and heat was generated using a mix of biomass and fossil fuel boilers;
- (b) Accept request AM\_REV\_0109 concerning revision of the approved methodology AM0009 to expand the scope of the methodology by allowing the use of gas coming to the surface from gas-lift systems. See also paragraph 24 below;
- (c) Accept request AM\_REV\_0118 concerning revision of the approved methodology ACM0006 to include a new scenario which is applicable to project activities that involve the replacement of an existing biomass residue fired cogeneration plant by a new biomass residue fired cogeneration plant, which is operated next to (an) existing fossil fuel fired cogeneration plant(s) co-fired with minor quantity of biomass residues. See also paragraph 24 below;
- (d) Accept request AM\_REV\_0133 in its part concerning revision of the approved methodology ACM0015 to include a more conservative and simpler option in the project emissions section. See also paragraph 24 below. Not to accept a part of the request in AM\_REV\_0133 which intends to modify the applicability condition removing the quantification (1.5 times) of AMC surplus and including the provision to discount emission reductions in cases where AMC availability is not a surplus;
- (e) Not to accept request AM\_REV\_0135 concerning revision of the approved methodology ACM0006 to include a new scenario that involves fuel switch from fossil fuels to biomass residues at an existing power plant which is connected to the grid.
- (f) Not to accept request AM\_REV\_0136 concerning revision of the approved methodology AM0036 to broaden its applicability of the methodology to project activities in which a new petcoke/coal power plant under construction would replace some of its fossil fuel use by co-firing biomass residues.



- (g) Not to accept request AM\_REV\_0137 concerning revision of the approved methodology AM0058 to broaden its applicability to project activities that recover the heat from existing grid-connected power plants with less than three years of historical data available.

### *Revision of approved methodologies*

24. The Board revised the following approved methodologies:

(a) **AM00009:** The revision is made in response to the request for revision AM\_REV\_0109. The revision: (1) expands the scope of the methodology by allowing the use of gas coming to the surface from gas-lift systems; (2) modifies the project activity diagram; (3) adjusts the table for emission sources in the project boundary section; (4) includes provisions to identify plausible alternative baseline scenarios for a gas processing facility and gas-lift gas; (5) simplifies the procedure to calculate baseline emissions; (7) removes the leakage emissions section due to impracticability of the previous requirements; and (8) simplifies the monitoring section. The revised approved methodology is contained in annex 5 to this report;

(b) **ACM0006:** The revision is made in response to the request for revision AM\_REV\_0118. The revision includes new scenario which is applicable to project activities that involve the replacement of an existing biomass residue fired cogeneration plant by a new biomass residue fired cogeneration plant, which is operated next to (an) existing fossil fuel fired cogeneration plant(s) co-fired with minor quantity of biomass residues. The replacement increases the power generation, heat generation and the biomass residue firing capacity. In the absence of the project activity, the existing biomass residue plant would also be replaced by a new biomass residue fired power plant (referred to as "reference plant"), however, this reference plant would have a lower efficiency of electricity generation than the project plant e.g. by using a low-pressure boiler instead of a high-pressure boiler. The revised approved methodology is contained in annex 6 to this report;

(c) **ACM0008:** The revision is made in response to the request for clarification AM\_CLA\_0125. The current version 05 of the methodology does not allow the use of benchmark analysis as a part of investment analysis of the tool, even in cases when the baseline scenario is use of electricity from the grid. In such cases the guidance on the assessment of investment analysis as approved at EB41 (see annex 45, EB41 report) recommends the use of benchmark analysis as a part of investment analysis. The revision is made to align the methodology with the above mentioned guidance. The revised approved methodology is contained in annex 7 to this report;

(d) **ACM0013:** The editorial revision is made in response to the request for clarification AM\_CLA\_0140. The revision to the approved methodology corrects an error in the units and unit conversion factor from GJ to MWh in equations. The revised approved methodology is contained in annex 8 to this report;

(e) **ACM0015:** The revision is made in response to the request for revision AM\_REV\_0133. The revision includes a more conservative and simpler option in the project emissions section. The revised approved methodology is contained in annex 9 to this report.

25. The revised versions of the methodologies referred to in the paragraphs above will come into effect on 8 April 2009, 24:00 GMT, in accordance with the procedure for the revision of approved methodologies.

26. The Board agreed not to approve an editorial revision to AM0034 as recommended by the Meth Panel and requested the Meth Panel to reconsider the monitoring requirements of the methodology. In



particular, the Board agreed that more flexibility should be provided to project participants in selecting appropriate monitoring practices, including national and international performance standards. The Board also requested the Meth panel to review approved methodologies where a specific standard is prescribed as the mandatory requirement for monitoring.

### *General guidance*

27. 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. The Board requested a group of members to work on a proposal for consideration at its forty-seventh meeting of the Board.

28. Due to the time constraints the Board did not consider (i) the input received as a response to the call for inputs on the proposal for the enhanced barrier test, along with (ii) 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-seventh meeting.

29. The Board agreed to approve the guidance on expansion of industrial gases recovery methodologies to new facilities, covering such industrial gases as N<sub>2</sub>O, SF<sub>6</sub> and PFC, as contained in [annex 10](#) to this report. The Board decided not to include in this guidance issues regarding possible displacement of production from Annex I countries. The Board agreed to further consider these issue once specific cases are submitted.

30. 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-seventh meeting.

31. The Board agreed to put on hold the approved consolidated methodology ACM0005 due to difficulties encountered in demonstrating barriers to the implementation of project activities applying this methodology. The Board requested the Meth Panel to prepare a revised version of ACM0005 addressing the issue of barrier analysis for consideration of the Board at its fiftieth meeting.

32. The Board agreed to approve the “Tool to assess the validity of the original/current baseline and to update the baseline on renewal of the crediting period”, and to approve the revision to the “Procedures for renewal of the crediting period of a registered CDM project activity”, to include reference to the tool, as contained in [annex 11](#) to this report. This tool will provide steps to (i) assess the continued validity of the original baseline of a project activity and (ii) update the baseline if required. The Board requested the Meth Panel to assess approved methodologies as to their consistency with the above procedures and the tool and advise the Board on possible implications of revising those approved methodologies requiring reassessment of the baseline scenario at the renewal of the crediting period of a registered project activity.

33. The Board took note of the progress of work done in developing draft terms of reference (ToR) to assess the implications of the possible inclusion of CCS in geological formations as CDM project activities and requested a group of members to continue to work on the draft ToR, in order to finalize it as soon as possible. The Board also agreed to launch a call for experts with suitable experience in CCS in geological formations, with in particular technical, methodological and legal experience for assessing the implications of the possible inclusion of CCS in geological formations as CDM project activities as requested by Decision 2/CMP.4 paragraph 41, starting on 27 March 2009 and ending on 4 May 2009. Applicants will be considered by the Board at its forty-seventh meeting.

34. The Board revised the “Terms of Reference of the Methodologies Panel” as contained in [annex 12](#) to this report. The revision is made to align the Terms of Reference with the latest approved procedures



relating to methodological issues and reflect the tasks assigned to the panel by the Board.

35. The Board took into account the applications received in response to the call for experts in order to reconstitute the Meth Panel. The Board agreed to appoint the following experts as members of the Meth Panel for a term of one year, starting 1 June 2009: Mr. Amr Abdel-Aziz, Mr. Dinesh Aggarwal, Mr. Jean-Jacques Becker, Mr. Luis Alberto De La Torre, Mr. Felix Dayo, Mr. Juerg Fuessler, Mr. Ludovic Lacrosse, Mr. Jan-Willem Martens, Mr. Narendra Parachuri, Mr. Daniel Perczyk, Mr. AK Perumal, Mr. Braulio Pikman, Mr. Roberto Schaeffer, Mr. Lambert Schneider, Ms. Ciska Terblanche, and Mr. Kenichiro Yamaguchi. The Board expressed its deep appreciation to the outgoing member Mr. Massamba Thioye. The Board also requested the new member Mr. AK Perumal to attend the thirty-eighth meeting of the Meth Panel to enable a smooth transition.

#### *Further schedule*

36. The Board took note that the thirty-eighth meeting of the panel will be held from 4 to 8 May 2009.

37. The Board took note that the deadline for the twenty-eighth round of submissions of proposed new methodologies is 14 April 2009 and the deadline for submission of requests for revision and requests for clarification to be considered at the thirty-ninth meeting shall be 23 March 2009.

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

38. The Board took note of the report on the work of the twenty-second meeting of the A/R WG and an oral report by its Chair, Mr. José Domingos Miguez, on the work of the group.

#### *Case specific*

39. Taking into consideration the inputs by experts (desk reviewers), the public, and the recommendations of the A/R WG, the Board agreed to approve the consolidated methodology AR-ACM0002 "Afforestation or reforestation of degraded land without displacement of pre-project activities" as contained in [annex 13](#) to this report, and link it to the sectoral scope 14.

40. The Board further agreed to withdraw approved methodologies AR-AM0001 and AR-AM0008 at the fiftieth meeting of the Board, as they have been replaced by the consolidated methodology mentioned above.

#### *Responses to requests for clarifications*

41. The Board took note of the response to request for clarification provided by the A/R WG on the case AR-AM\_CLA\_0006.

#### *Revision of approved methodologies*

42. The Board revised the approved consolidated methodology AR-ACM0001 "Afforestation and reforestation of degraded land" which is affected by the guidance provided at its forty-fourth meeting on significance of selected GHG emissions related to A/R CDM project activities, as contained in [annex 14](#) to this report.

43. The Board revised the approved methodology AR-AMS0005 "Simplified baseline and monitoring methodology for small-scale afforestation and reforestation project activities under the clean development mechanism implemented on lands having low inherent potential to support living biomass", as contained in [annex 15](#) to this report.





44. The revised version of the methodology referred to in the paragraph 37 above will come into effect on 8 April 2009, 24:00 GMT, in accordance with the procedure for the revision of approved methodologies.

### *General guidance*

45. The Board agreed to the “Guidance on conditions under which the change in carbon stocks in existing live woody vegetation are insignificant”, as contained in [annex 16](#) to this report. The guidance allows for simplification of estimation of baseline net GHG removals by sinks in large scale A/R CDM project activities.

46. The Board agreed to the “Guidelines on conservative choice of default data for estimation of biomass stocks and change in woody vegetation”, as contained in [annex 17](#) to this report. The guidelines provide supplemental information on satisfying requirements of applying conservative manner regarding the choice of approaches, assumptions, parameters and data sources.

47. The Board agreed to the A/R methodological tool: “Estimation of changes in the carbon stocks of existing trees and shrubs within the boundary of an A/R CDM project activity”, as contained in [annex 18](#) to this report. The tool provides two approaches on the estimation of changes in carbon stocks in pre-project trees and shrubs which unify equivalent approaches applied in all approved afforestation and reforestation baseline and monitoring methodologies applicable to large scale A/R CDM project activities.

48. The Board revised the A/R methodological tool: “Calculation of the number of sample plots for measurements within A/R CDM project activities”, as contained in [annex 19](#) to this report, to further clarify practical aspects on location of permanent sample plots for data collecting and improve clarity of formulae.

49. The revised version of the tool referred to above will come into effect on 08 April 2009, 24:00 GMT, in accordance with the procedure for the revision of approved methodologies.

50. The Board took note of terms of reference to assess the implications of the possible inclusion of lands with forests in exhaustion as A/R CDM project activities, as requested by CMP (2/CMP.4, paragraph 42), and agreed to continue consideration of the document in its forty-seventh meeting.

51. The Board considered a shortlist of applicants to the A/R WG prepared according to the paragraph 39 of the report of the Board, at its forty-fourth meeting. The Board agreed to appoint Mr. Neil Bird, Mr. Nagmeldin G. Elhassan, Mr Walter Oyhantcabal, Mr. Marcelo Rocha, Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh and Mr. Xiaquan Zhang as members of the A/R WG for a term of one year beginning from 1 June 2009. The Board expressed its deep appreciation to the outgoing A/R WG members, Mr. Craig Trotter and Mr. Willy Makundi.

### *Further schedule*

52. The Board noted that the twenty-fourth meeting of the A/R WG is scheduled from 29 April to 1 May 2009.

53. The Board reminded project participants that the deadline for the twenty-second round of submissions of proposed new A/R methodologies is 15 June 2009. The Board also reminded project participants that new baseline and monitoring methodologies could be submitted at any time prior to this deadline.

54. The Board reminded project participants that the deadline for consideration of request for revision and request for clarification of A/R methodologies at the twenty-fifth meeting shall be 10 August 2009.

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

55. The Board took note of the report on the work of the nineteenth meeting of the working group to assist the Board in reviewing proposed methodologies for small-scale CDM project activities (SSC WG) and of an oral report by its Vice Chair, Mr. Peer Stiansen, on the work of the group.

*Case specific*

56. The Board approved a new small-scale methodology “AMS-III.Z Fuel switch, process improvement and energy efficiency in brick manufacture” assigned to sectoral scope 04 as contained in [annex 20](#) of this report. The methodology covers activities involving change in fuels, raw materials and/or the production process of brick manufacture to result in reduced or avoided fossil fuel combustion.

The Board considered one request for deviation from an approved small-scale methodology related to a project activity undergoing validation and agreed to answer it and requested the secretariat to inform the DOEs accordingly.

*Revisions of approved methodologies*

57. The Board agreed to the revised approved small-scale methodologies:

(a) “AMS I.C Thermal energy for the user with or without electricity” as contained in [annex 21](#) of this report; The recommended revision includes additional baseline scenarios and results in expanded applicability of the methodology for renewable biomass based heat and/or power generation project activities (including cogeneration) that supply: (a) electricity to a grid and/or displace grid electricity or both; (b) electricity and/or thermal energy for on-site consumption or for consumption by other facilities. It includes guidance on estimating thermal energy output of technologies/measures such as biomass stoves or water heaters whose metering of thermal energy output is not plausible.

(b) “AMS-III.H Methane Recovery in Wastewater Treatment”, as contained in [annex 22](#) of this report, to clarify the methods for determination of baseline for Greenfield projects. Further, minimum requirements concerning sludge removal interval in the baseline anaerobic lagoon have been specified.

(c) “AMS III.N Avoidance of HFC emissions in rigid Poly Urethane Foam (PUF) manufacturing”, as contained in [annex 23](#) of this report, to expand the applicability of the methodology to include integral skin type of polyurethane foam (PUF) that uses HFC refrigerants in existing facilities.

58. The Board considered the revised version of the methodology 'AMS-III.B Switching from high carbon to low carbon intensive energy source' however did not agree to approve it as proposed. The Board noted that the revision broadens the applicability of the methodology to project cases involving multiple fuel use, grid electricity use and Greenfield projects and requires a mandatory financial analysis to determine the baseline scenario. It requested the SSC WG to consider the option to propose one or more new methodologies to cover cases involving multiple fossil fuel use, Greenfield projects and grid electricity use while maintaining the simplified requirement to determine the baseline and prove additionality applied in the current version of the approved methodology. The Board further requested that recommendations for revisions and new methodology should be available for consideration by the Board in its forty-seventh meeting.

59. The revised versions of the SSC methodologies referred to in the paragraph above will come into effect on 8 April 2009, 24:00 GMT in accordance with the procedure for the revision of approved SSC methodologies.

*General guidance*

60. The Board clarified that procedures for determining the occurrence of debundling do not require the consideration of the start date of the project.

61. The Board considered applications received in response to a call for experts (see paragraph 51, EB 44) and agreed to appoint the following experts as members of the SSC WG for a term of one year: Mr. Gilberto Bandeira De Melo, Mr. Felix Babatunde Dayo, Mr. Ten Hoopen Michiel, Mr. Daniel Perczyk, Mr. Steven Schiller and Mr. A.K Perumal. The Board expressed its deep appreciations to the outgoing SSC WG member Mr. Binu Parthan. The term of the appointed members shall begin from 1 June 2009.

*Further schedule*

62. The Board noted that the twentieth meeting of the SSC WG meeting is scheduled on 29 April–02 May 2009 .

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

63. The Board took note of an update regarding the revision of the Procedures for registration of a Programme of Activities as a single CDM project activity. The Board requested the secretariat to prepare a revised version of the procedures taking account of inputs received and the policy discussion undertaken by the Board at its forty-fifth and forty-sixth meeting. The Board will consider this draft revision of the procedures at its forty-seventh meeting.

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

64. The Board took note that 1515 CDM project activities have been registered by 25 March 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*

65. 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 59 requests for registration.

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

(a) “Sichuan Carbide Calcium Residues Based Cement Plant Project in Leshan City” (2134) submitted for registration by the DOE (LRQA) if the revised PDD, corresponding validation report, and relevant annexes, including the emission reductions and financial analysis spreadsheets, submitted in response to the request for review are displayed on the UNFCCC CDM website;

(b) “CYY Biopower Wastewater treatment plant including biogas reuse for thermal oil replacement and electricity generation Project, Thailand” (2141) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-NORD) if the revised PDD, corresponding validation report, and relevant annexes, submitted in response to the request for review are displayed on the UNFCCC CDM website;

(c) “2.25 MW Rice Husk based cogeneration plant at Siddeshwari Industries Pvt Ltd” (2235) submitted for registration by the DOE (SGS) if the revised PDD, corresponding validation report, and relevant annexes, submitted in response to the request for review are displayed on the UNFCCC CDM website;

(d) “13.25 MW Wind Power Generation by RMTL, in Kutch, Gujarat” (2247) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-NORD) if the revised PDD, corresponding validation report, and



relevant annexes, submitted in response to the request for review are displayed on the UNFCCC CDM website;

(e) “Federal Intertrade Pengyang Solar Cooker Project” (2307) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV Rheinland) if the revised PDD, corresponding validation report, and relevant annexes, submitted in response to the request for review are displayed on the UNFCCC CDM website.

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

(a) “Zhongfang County Pailou Hydro Project, China” (2001) if the DOE (TÜV-NORD) submit a revised validation report which incorporate the additional information and responses submitted in response to the request for review regarding the prior consideration of the CDM, investment analysis, emission factor and monitoring plan. In doing so, the DOE should provide a clear validation opinion on the actions and dates cited in the PP’s response to the issue regarding the actions taken to secure the CDM status in parallel with the project’s implementation as these dates are not mentioned in the validation report nor in the DOE’s response;

(b) “Yunnan Dayao County Yupao River 3rd Level Hydropower Station” (2015) 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, additional investment for transmission line and suitability of input values;

(c) “Yunnan Yingjiang Wakuhe Hydropower Station” (2052) if the project participants and the DOE (TÜV-NORD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which:

(i) Incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the monitoring plan; and

(ii) Provide further explanation on: (i) how the DOE has validated that the transmission line had been constructed and the actual cost of its construction; and (ii) the common practice analysis with an installed capacity range between 0~75 MW, as the project activity has a total installed capacity of 51 MW but consists of four hydropower stations with an installed capacity between 4 MW and 17 MW;

(d) “Guizhou Xingyi Laojiangdi Hydropower Station” (2065) 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 CDM;

(e) “Expansion Project of Sanjiangkou Hydro-electric Power Station in the reach of Supa River, Yunnan province, China” (2075) if the project participants and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the:

(i) Information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the common practice analysis, in particular, the higher tariff and higher IRR of similar projects and further explains why the project activity, considering that it is an expansion project, faces a higher investment cost than the two other similar projects; and

(ii) Incorporate the amended grid emission factor and recalculation of emission reductions, submitted in response to the request for review;



- (f) “Binglang River Tucang Hydropower station in Yunnan province, China” (2080) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) 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 CDM, suitability of input values and suitability of grid emission factor. 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;
- (g) “CGN Jilin Daan 49.5 MW Wind Power Project” (2083) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which:
- (i) Incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding additional investment for transmission line; and
  - (ii) Change start date of project activity from 01 June 2007 (date of construction permission) to 12 March 2007 (date of signing of new transmission line contract);
- (h) “CGN Gansu Anxi Daliang 49.5 MW Wind Power Project” (2109) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report, which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the investment analysis, in particular, the suitability of the total investment cost assumed;
- (i) “Yunnan Yingjiang Mangya River 1st Hydropower Station” (2116) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which:
- (i) Incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the calculation of the electricity tariff used in the IRR calculation, the grid emission factor and the monitoring plan;
  - (ii) Provide further validation opinion on how the DOE has validated the cost of the construction of the transmission line and its allocation to all hydropower station owners connected to the same substation; and
  - (iii) Remove the barrier analysis as agreed by the PP and DOE;
- (j) “Hubei Xuan.en Tongziying Hydropower Station” (2122) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the project start date, the continuing and real actions taken to secure the CDM status for the project activity in parallel with its implementation, the validation of the input values and the grid emission factor;
- (k) “Inner-Mongolia Ximeng Abag 49.5 MW Wind Power Project” (2135) if the project participants and the DOE (TÜV-NORD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which:
- (i) Incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding start date of the project activity and suitability of the input values in accordance with EB 38, paragraph 54 guidance; and
  - (ii) Provide further validation opinion on how the DOE has validated the source of the similar projects identified in the common practice analysis;



- (l) “Bioenergia Anaerobic Digestion and Biogas Generation Project” (2180) 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 the prior consideration of CDM;
- (m) “Sichuan Ya’an Shaping Hydropower Station Project” (2197) if the project participants and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which:
- (i) Incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of input values; and
  - (ii) Provide further justification on why the project activity has higher investment costs than the two other similar project activities in the province;
- (n) “48 MW Duduluo River Hydroelectric Power Plant” (2199) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of input values and the common practice analysis;
- (o) “Municipal Solid Waste based Composting at Kolhapur, Maharashtra” (2217) 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 the prior consideration of CDM, the baseline scenario (open dumping), and the monitoring requirements (quality control program);
- (p) “Shilong Small-Scale Hydro Power Project” (2256) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) 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 CDM;
- (q) “8.5 MW Wind Energy Project by KS Oils Limited, India” (2266) if the project participants and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the investment analysis which clearly indicates how the Capacity Utilization Factors used for both sites were determined, and how the sensitivity analysis was conducted;
- (r) “Rocky Farms, Inc. Methane Recovery and Electricity Generation Project” (2277) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the prior consideration of the CDM; all the parameters in the monitoring plan; and the monitoring of the biogas flow;
- (s) “Lanatan Agro-Industrial Inc. Methane Recovery and Electricity Generation Project” (2303) if the project participants and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the prior consideration of the CDM; all the parameters in the monitoring plan; and the monitoring of the biogas flow submitted in response to this request for review;



- (t) “Anaerobic digestion of animal manure at Farma Andreou & Costi Ltd., Cyprus” (2329) if the project participants and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate:
- (i) The information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the measurement of the biogas flow and methane content;
  - (ii) The amended grid emission factor using data available at the time of commencement of validation; and
  - (iii) A separate monitoring plan for each sub-project and on-site inspections for each farm in section B.7.1 of the PDD, in line with paragraph 17 of the methodology.
68. 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.
69. The Board agreed to undertake a review of the project activity:
- (a) “Fujian Zhouning Qianping Hydropower Project” (1752) 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 24](#) to this report;<sup>1</sup>
  - (b) “Heilongjiang Fujin Phase II 18 MW Wind Power Project” (1866) 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 25](#) to this report;<sup>2</sup>
  - (c) “Yuquan 16 MW Hydro-electric Power Station Project” (2002) 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;<sup>3</sup>
  - (d) “Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region Wuzhou Wangcun Hydropower Station” (2004) 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 27](#) to this report;<sup>4</sup>
  - (e) “Inner Mongolia Siziwangqi Bayin’ aobao Wind Power Project” (2053) 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 28](#) to this report;<sup>5</sup>
  - (f) “Sichuan Jiangyou Longfeng Hydropower Station” (2061) 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 29](#) to this report;<sup>6</sup>
  - (g) “Heilongjiang Yilan Hezuolinchang Wind Power Project” (2062) 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;
  - (h) “Yunnan Jinping Miao-Yao-Dai Autonomous County Kesikou Hydropower Station” (2064) 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 31](#) to this report;
  - (i) “Yunnan Dayingjiang Meng’e Hydro Power Station” (2073) 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;<sup>7</sup>



- (j) “Inner Mongolia Bayannaer Chuanjingsumu Wind Power Project” (2099) 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;
- (k) “Yunnan Lianghe Hulukou Hydropower Station” (2106) 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;<sup>8</sup>
- (l) “Lijiang Wulanghe Secondary Hydropower Project” (2114) 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;<sup>9</sup>
- (m) “Nanning Shizuo Non-Carbonated Raw Material for Cement Production Renovation Project” (2143) 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 36](#) to this report;<sup>10</sup>
- (n) “Sichuan Baishuijiang Shuanghe Hydro Power Project ” (2155) 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 37](#) to this report;<sup>11</sup>
- (o) “Fujian Shouning Xiadongxi 25 MW Hydropower Project” (2156) 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;<sup>12</sup>
- (p) “Zilenghe 24 MW Hydropower Project in Yunnan Province” (2164) 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 39](#) to this report;<sup>13</sup>
- (q) “Rialma Companhia Energética III S/A. – Santa Edwiges III Small Hydro Power Plant – Small Scale CDM Project” (2165) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 40](#) to this report;<sup>14</sup>
- (r) “Waixiong Hydropower plant project” (2171) 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 41](#) to this report;<sup>15</sup>
- (s) “Sichuan Yanyuan Yongning River Hydropower Station ” (2190) 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 42](#) to this report;<sup>16</sup>
- (t) “Hebei Wanquan Yulong Wind Power Project ” (2205) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 43](#) to this report;
- (u) “Dalian Tuchengzi Wind Power Project 30 MW ” (2209) 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;<sup>17</sup>
- (v) “Santa Cruz S.A. - Açúcar e Álcool - Cogeneration Project” (2211) 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 45](#) to this report;





- (w) “Guohua Tongliao Kezuo Zhongqi Phase I 49.5 MW Wind Farm Project” (2216) 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;
- (x) “Liaoning Changtu Quantou Wind Power Project” (2219) 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 47](#) to this report;<sup>18</sup>
- (y) “Surac Bagasse Plant Project” (2231) 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;<sup>19</sup>
- (z) “Catalytic N<sub>2</sub>O Abatement Project in the tail gas of the Caprolactam production plant in Thailand” (2232) 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 49](#) to this report;
- (aa) “Thermal energy from biomass at Mohota Mills” (2233) submitted for registration by the DOE (TUV-Nord) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 50](#) to this report;<sup>20</sup>
- (ab) “Bromine Compounds Fuel-Switch Project” (2237) 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 51](#) to this report;
- (ac) “Dead Sea Magnesium (DSM) Fuel-Switch Project” (2248) 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 52](#) to this report;
- (ad) “11.4 MW Bundled Small Hydropower Project in Shanjunyan and Liaoli, Guizhou Province, P. R. China” (2251) submitted for registration by the DOE (JACO) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 53](#) to this report;<sup>21</sup>
- (ae) “12.82 MW Bundled Small Hydropower Project in Qiandongnan Autonomous Region, Guizhou Province, P. R. China” (2253) submitted for registration by the DOE (JACO) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 54](#) to this report;<sup>22</sup>
- (af) “Dead Sea Works Ltd. Small Scale Fuel Switch Project” (2263) 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 55](#) to this report;
- (ag) “INPA Fuel Switch Project” (2319) 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;<sup>23</sup>
- (ah) “Anaerobic digestion at Armenis Farm Ltd., Cyprus” (2334) 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 57](#) to this report;<sup>24</sup>

70. 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.



71. 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 44 of the project activities which were placed “Under review” at the forty-fifth meeting of the Board.
72. In accordance with paragraphs 17 and 18 (b) of the procedures mentioned in paragraph 71, the Board agreed to register, subject to satisfactory corrections, the project activities:
- (a) “Installation of Wind power project by Kilburn Chemicals Ltd” (1690) if the DOE (BVC Holdings SA) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include the information provided in the response to the review, regarding:
    - (i) How benefits from CDM are seriously considered prior to the implementation of the project activity;
    - (ii) Continuous and real actions to secure CDM status for the project in parallel with its implementation; and
    - (iii) How key project milestones including land purchasing, foundation works can be delivered within the reported timeframe
  - (b) “Coke Dry Quenching (CDQ) Waste Heat Recovery for Power Generation Project of Wugang No. 9 and 10 Coke Ovens” (1695) if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include the information provided in the response to the review, regarding the suitability of fixed input values and prior consideration of the CDM;
  - (c) “2\*6 MW Coke Oven Gas Power Generation Project in Xiangcheng County” (1721) if the DOE (DNV) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include the information provided in the response to the review, regarding the suitability of benchmark and suitability of the input values, in particular, the power and fuel cost and the plant load factor;
  - (d) “Ma Steel (new plant) CDQ and waste heat utilization project” (1726) if the DOE (DNV) and the project participants submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which:
    - (i) Include the information submitted in the response to the review regarding validation of the economic comparison analysis and suitability of the selected baseline;
    - (ii) Provide further justification why the tariff is unlikely to increase by 3.37%, and
    - (iii) Further conduct the investment and economic comparison analysis either with real values or with nominal values as currently the O&M considered represents the nominal values and the tariffs as real values;
  - (e) “Shanxi Datuhe Coal Mine Methane Utilization Project” (1801) if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include the information on validation of the economic comparison analysis and suitability of the selected baseline, submitted in response to the review team’s questions;
  - (f) “Ceran’s 14 de Julho Hydro Power Plant CDM Project Activity” (1829) if the DOE (SGS) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include the information on the common practice analysis which has been submitted in response to the review team’s question;



- (g) "Budhil Hydro Electric Project, India (BHEP)" (1844) if the DOE (SGS) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include the information on the investment comparison analysis and appropriateness of parameters used in the investment comparison analysis which have been submitted in response to the review team's questions;
- (h) "Guangdong Huizhou LNG Power Generation Project" (1884) if the DOE (SGS) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include the response to the review regarding the suitability of the electricity tariff and the real and continuing actions taken to secure CDM status for the project activity in parallel to its implementation;
- (i) "Gansu Zhouqu County Hujia'ai Hydropower Station Project" (1886) if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include the information provided in the response to the review, regarding the prior consideration of the CDM;
- (j) "Jincheng Sihe Coal Mine CMM Generation Project" (1896) if the DOE (DNV) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include the information provided in the response to the review, regarding the suitability of the 15% IRR benchmark value applied for the project activity;
- (k) "Yixing Shuanglong Cement Plants Low Temperature Waste Heat Power Generation" (1914) if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include:
- (i) An explanation on how it has considered the fair value of the asset calculated by the project participant at the end of the 16-year period of IRR analysis as appropriate in line with EB 41, Annex 45, paragraph 4, or a validation of the revised IRR calculation based on a 21-year period of analysis and
  - (ii) Further explanation that the tariff used in the FSR calculation to account for the savings from avoided purchases of electricity from the grid is appropriate, including consistent calculations of this value in the PDD and validation report;
- (l) "China Guangdong Shenzhen Qianwan LNG generation project" (1915) if the DOE (DNV) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which further justify that the increase of the electricity tariff is a result of increasing the fuel price and relationship between the electricity price and the fuel price;
- (m) "Jiangsu Jiaoqiao Cement Plant's Low Temperature Waste Heat Power Generation Project" (1916) if the DOE (TÜV SÜD) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include:
- (i) Further explanation that the tariff used in the FSR calculation to account for the savings from avoided import of electricity from the grid is appropriate, as the two methods presented lead to different tariffs. In doing so, the DOE should be able to confirm and demonstrate that the IRR calculation will yield the same result as when applying the actual tariff paid by the PP to import electricity and adding the extra costs which the PP has to pay to the power supply company for its captive power station;
  - (ii) Further clarification by the DOE how the sensitivity analysis presented in the PDD has been properly validated, as replication of the calculations leads to different



results than what has been previously validated. The DOE should confirm that the sensitivity analysis was validated in line with EB 41, Annex 45, paragraphs 16 and 17 requirements;

- (n) “Wuchang Natural Gas Generation Project” (1927) if the DOE (DNV) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report, which include the information submitted in response to the review team question on the surplus availability of natural gas for power generation in the context of the applicability condition of ACM0009 and confirming the exact amount available for power generation in Wuhan City;
- (o) “Fedepalma Sectoral CDM Umbrella Project for Methane Capture, Fossil Fuel Displacement and Cogeneration of Renewable Energy” if the DOE (DNV) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report, which include the information provided to the response for review, and include a revised investment analysis for those plants which take into account the savings from the potential thermal and electricity generation resulting from firing biogas in boilers and ovens.
- (p) “Yingpeng HFC23 Decomposition Project” (1947) if the DOE (DNV) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and a corresponding validation report which incorporate the responses provided for this review regarding the application of the methodology on how the waste gas generation coefficient, ‘w’, value has been determined including the spreadsheet calculations and the evidence related to the data of HFC23;
- (q) “Siam Quality Starch Wastewater Treatment and Energy Generation Project in Chaiyaphum, Thailand” (1993) 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 regarding the common practice analysis and the prior consideration of the CDM;
- (r) “Shunchang Yangkou Hydro Power Project, Fujian, China” (2008) if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the information provided in the response to the review regarding the validation of the total investment and electricity tariff assumed, the common practice analysis and the continuing and real actions taken by the PP in order to secure the CDM status for the project activity in parallel to its implementation;
- (s) “Nimoo-Bazgo Hydroelectric Project” (2023) if the DOE (DNV) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the additional information provided in response to the review team questions, regarding the common practice analysis;
- (t) “Chutak Hydroelectric Project” (2025) if the DOE (DNV) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include the information provided in the response to the review regarding the electricity generation value assumed for the project activity;
- (u) “Jiangxi Taojiang Hydropower Project” (2039) if the DOE (JCI) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include the information provided in the response to the review, regarding the amended project start date and the additional information submitted to substantiate that the CDM was a decisive factor in the decision to proceed with or resume the implementation of the project activity;



(v) “Sichuan provincial Longchi & Caoyuan 9 MW Small-scale Hydro Power Bundle Project” (2071) if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include the information provided in the response to the review, regarding the cessation of construction and the investment analysis;

(w) “Yaoping 10 MW Small Hydropower Project in Shaanxi Province, China” (2090) if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include the information provided in the response to the review, regarding the key input values used in the investment analysis are not changed at the time of decision making and at the time when the Preliminary Design Report was approved;

(x) “24 MW Perla Mini Hydel Project, Karnataka, India” (2112) if the DOE (DNV) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the response submitted for this under review and confirm the specific circumstances that apply to the projects under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Power and to those under the Ministry of New and Renewable Energy (such as different regulatory regimes and favorable tax treatment ) in order to fully substantiate why projects that are above 25 MW capacity cannot be considered in the common practice analysis;

(y) “China Hunan Yuzitang Small Hydropower Project ” (2121) if the project participant and the DOE (TUV Rheinland) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the continuing and real actions taken by the project participant in order to secure CDM status in parallel to the project implementation;

(z) “Tongren Tianshengqiao Hydropower Project, Guizhou Province, China” (2136) if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submits a revised validation report which incorporates the response submitted to the review team question regarding its validation of the investment analysis and common practice analysis;

(aa) “Mengzhushan 15 MW Small Hydropower Project in Shaanxi Province, China” (2137) if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and a corresponding validation report which incorporate the responses provided for this review regarding the key financial differences between the original project and the project activity;

(ab) “Zhejiang Quzhou Jutai clinker production project by using calcium carbide residue in the raw mix” (2139) if the DOE (DNV) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information provided in the response to the review, regarding how it has validated that the means of calculation of the Loss of Ignition complies with the requirements of the methodology;

(ac) “Inner Mongolia Baotou Bayin Wind Power Project” (2153) if the DOE (DNV) submits a revised validation report, which include the additional information submitted in the response to this review with regards to the assumptions on the escalation rate of O&M costs and electricity output of the project activity in the last three years of the IRR analysis, that is, after the theoretical technical lifetime of the project activity;

(ad) “Erbaqu Small Hydropower Project in Gansu Province” (2159) if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include the information provided in the response to the review and the following evidence:

(i) The CDM consideration for station 6 as board meeting held in 10 January 2007;



- (ii) The CDM contract for project development signed on 28 December 2005;
  - (iii) The stakeholder meetings held on 9 November 2005, 20 January 2007, 21 April 2007 and 1 April 2008; and
  - (iv) The term-sheet for the purchases of CERs between the project owner and MGM Carbon Portfolio.
- (ae) “Zhoujiayuan Hydropower Project in Hubei Province ” (2212) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which incorporates the information submitted in response to the review regarding the real and continuing actions undertaken to attain CDM status for the project activity in parallel to its implementation;
- (af) “Zuo XI Hydropower power plant” (2214) if the DOE (DNV) and the project participant submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include the information provided in the response to the review regarding the prior consideration of the CDM.
73. In accordance with paragraphs 17 and 18 (c) of the procedures mentioned in paragraph 71, the Board could not register the following project activities:
- (a) “The model project for renovation to increase the efficient use of energy in brewery” (1516) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) because the DOE and project participant failed to substantiate that the emission reductions calculations are in line with the methodology, as the discount emission factor of 10% to the *ex-ante* baseline emissions, which was proposed by the project participants, is not in line with the methodology’s requirements. The Board further noted that the historical data used to calculate the baseline emissions was not provided either in response to the request for review or the review ;
  - (b) “Power Prospect 9.9 MW Rice Husk Power Plant (the “Project” or “project activity”)” (1851) submitted for registration by the DOE (JQA) because the DOE and project participant failed to:
    - (i) Substantiate the applicability (paragraph 3 of AMS-I.D., version 12) of the methodology to the cogeneration project activity exporting power to the grid; or
    - (ii) Request a deviation/clarification from the Board before requesting registration of this project activity;
  - (c) “Integrated Energy Ltd. Grid Connected Electricity Generation Plant using Natural Gas” (1870) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-NORD) because the DOE and project participant failed to:
    - (i) Comply with the requirements of the applicable methodology on the identification of baseline alternatives that provide similar level of output and services, as the baseline scenario of 350 MW is not comparable to the 205 MW project activity in terms of similar level of outputs and services i.e. equivalent generation capacity per year; and
    - (ii) Substantiate the suitability of input values, as many key parameters relate to the USA and are not considered to be applicable in the context of Israel, in particular the coal price;
  - (d) “Electricity grid interconnection San Gabán – Mazuko – Puerto Maldonado” (1901) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) because the DOE and project participant failed to



substantiate how the deforested area, and therefore leakage value, due to construction of the transmission line has been calculated;

(e) “Daning Coal Mine Methane Power Generation Project in Jincheng City Shanxi Province, China” (1922) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) because the DOE and project participant have failed to substantiate:

(i) The additionality of the project activity, in particular, the suitability of the CMM price assumed as the CMM extraction costs could not be segregated between the costs that are mandatory for CMM extraction and the costs associated with the commercial utilization of the CMM; and

(ii) The baseline scenario determination, in particular, the elimination of the baseline alternative of the project activity implemented by the coalmine;

(f) “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) because the DOE and project participant failed to substantiate the presented barriers would prevent an increase in blending rates above the baseline level;

(g) “Sichuan Shimian Xieluo Wanba River Hydropower Station” (1969) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) because the project participant and the DOE have failed to substantiate the additionality of the project activity due to insufficient evidence to support the assumption of a 25% gap between electricity generation and supply to the grid and its applicability to the investment analysis;

(h) “Sichuan Kangding Sandaoqiao Hydropower Station” (1991) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) because the DOE and project participant failed to substantiate the additionality of the project activity due to insufficient evidence to support the assumption of a 20% gap between electricity generation and supply to the grid and its applicability to the investment analysis;

(i) “Yunnan Nujiang Fugong Guquan River Hydropower Station” (2006) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) because the DOE and project participant failed to substantiate the additionality of the project activity due to the lack of evidence and information to support the assumption of a 15% gap between power generation and power exported to the grid applied in the investment analysis;

(j) “The Rotem Amfert Negev (RAN) Natural Gas Fuel Switch Project” (2042) submitted for registration by the DOE (SGS) because the DOE and project participant failed to demonstrate additionality of the project activity, in particular that the barriers due to uncertainty in fuel supply will prevent the implementation of the project activity or the price differential between the HFO and the NG is not the main driver to implement the project activity;

(k) “Sichuan Tongjiang Gaokeng Hydropower Station Project” (2147) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) because the DOE and project participant failed to substantiate why the project developer chose to construct a plant of the scale considered for the project activity, rather than a scale which would be capable of evacuating a larger percentage of its output to the grid as it has been confirmed that the transmission constraints have been reported prior and in parallel to the implementation of the project activity and are unlikely to be resolved by 2020 for small scale hydropower stations in Eastern Sichuan;



(l) "8.75 MW Wind Power Project by Taurian Iron & Steel Company Private Limited in District" (2163) submitted for registration by the DOE (SGS) because the DOE and project participant failed to substantiate the additionality of the project activity, in particular the suitability of the benchmark (WACC) adopted in the investment analysis, as the applied beta value of 2.04 or 1.66 does not reflect the volatility of the risks associated with the project and is substantially higher than the beta values applied to other similar wind power based CDM projects activities in India.

74. In accordance with the clarifications to paragraph 10 of the above-mentioned procedures the Board considered and agreed to register as corrected the project activity "Energía Ecológica de Palcasa S.A. EECOPALSA Biomass Project" (1877), submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD), if the revised PDD and validation report submitted in response to the additional clarifications raised.

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

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

- (a) "SHYAM DRI WHR CPP" (1642) submitted for registration by the DOE (BVC Holdings SA);
- (b) "SEPL CDM CPP" (1666) submitted for registration by the DOE (BVC Holdings SA).

### *General guidance*

77. In response to the request by the CMP through its decision 2/CMP4 to develop criteria for decision making during the review process, the Board considered means of enhancing the understanding of its decisions and decision-making processes. The Board agreed to give further consideration to this issue at its forty-seventh meeting.

78. The Board revised its "Terms of reference and procedure for a registration and issuance team (RIT)" to remove reference to its period of expiry and to indicate that appointed members would have a contract of a maximum of 12 months. The revised term of reference are contained in [annex 58](#) to this report.

79. The Board also agreed to extend the contracts of the following RIT members until 31 March 2010: Ms. Branca Americano, Mr. Aliou Ba, Mr. Jean-Jacques Becker, Ms. Clementine Chikomba, Mr. Vinay Deodhar, Mr. Martin Enderlin, Mr. A. Ricardo J. Esparta, Ms. Ayse Frey, Mr. Shinichi Iioka, Mr. Paata Janelidze, Mr. Grigol Lazriev, Mr. Deshun Liu, Ms. Carolyn Luce, Mr. Axel Michaelowa, Mr. Gustavo Mozzer, Mr. Abderrahmane Naas, Mr. Joseph Nowarski, Mr. Narendra Paruchuri, Mr. A.K. Perumal, Mr. Divaldo Jose da Costa Rezende, Mr. Marcelo Theoto Rocha, Ms. Marina Shvangiradze, Mr. Francesco Nicola Tubiello, Ms. Simone Ullrich, Mr. Can Wang. The Board thanked the outgoing members for their service.

80. The Board agreed to launch a call for additional members of the RIT starting on 30 March 2009 and ending on 4 May 2009, with a view to selecting additional members, as required.



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

81. The Board took note that 270,130,751 CERs have been issued as of 25 March 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*

82. 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 seven requests for issuance.

83. 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) "Landfill gas extraction on the landfill Villa Dominico, Buenos Aires, Argentina" (0072), if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report that incorporates the clarifications regarding the cumulative readings from the LFG flow and the calculation of emission reductions during the period when there were incomplete communication or missing data, as well as a new request for issuance form with the corrected number of CERs.

(b) "4.5 MW Biomass (Agricultural Residue) Based Power Generation Unit of M/s Matrix Power Pvt. Ltd. (MPPL)" (0281), if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised monitoring report, a corresponding revised verification report and a new request for issuance form including recalculation of emission reductions by applying weighted average emission factor of the grid for the current generation mix, as the applied methodology requires ex-post monitoring for the approach chosen for calculation of baseline emission factor .

(c) "Methane recovery and effective use of power generation project Norte III-B Landfill" (0928), if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which include the clarification regarding the application of 90% default flare efficiency in February 2008 based on 871°C as the minimum functioning flare temperature as provided in the response to the request for review.

84. In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 10 of these procedures, referred in paragraph 46, the Board agreed to undertake a review of the request for issuance of CERs and to appoint members of the review team for:

(a) "N2O Emission Reduction in Paulínia, SP, Brazil" (0116), submitted by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD), and that the scope of the review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 59](#) to this report;

(b) "Alta Mogiana Bagasse Cogeneration Project (AMBCP)" (0181), submitted by the DOE (SGS), and that the scope of the review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 60](#) to this report;

(c) "Optimization of steam consumption by applying retrofit measures in blow heat recovery system " (0677), 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;

(d) "Fujian Pingtan Changjiang'ao 100 MW Wind Power Project " (1177), 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 62](#) to this report.<sup>25</sup>

85. 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.

86. In accordance with the procedures for review as referred to in paragraph 82 of the CDM modalities and procedures, the Board considered the recommendation of the review team for nine project activities which were placed "Under review" at the forty-fifth meeting of the Board.

87. The Board agreed to instruct the CDM registry administrator to issue CERs, subject to satisfactory corrections, for the following project activities requesting for issuance of CERs:

(a) "AWMS GHG Mitigation Project BR05-B-01, Minas Gerais, Brazil" (0335) for the monitoring period 01 October 2007 - 31 July 2008, if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report including clarification regarding the impact of installation of two digesters as compared to one at Fazenda São Bernardo site provided in response to the request for review and review.

(b) "Blended cement with increased blend" at Orient cement's Devapur and Jalgaon plants in India" (0456) for the monitoring period 01 April 2007 - 31 March 2008, if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding verification report which include:

(i) Clarifications that capacity addition conducted during this monitoring period is supposed to be completed only by December 2008, and that the investment analysis for this capacity addition was independently conducted as provided in response to the request for review; and

(ii) Additional information that these 35 electricity meters in site of Devapur were actually calibrated in June and December 2007 as provided in response to the review.

(c) "Avoidance of Wastewater and On-site Energy Use Emissions and Renewable Energy Generation in IFB Agro Distillery unit" (0496) for the monitoring period 01 January 2007 - 31 December 2007, if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report, a corresponding revised verification report, revised calculation spreadsheet and a new request for issuance form which incorporate:

(i) Clarification regarding the application of 95% confidence interval provided in response to the review and corrected number of CERs;

(ii) Clarification regarding the implementation status of 1X140 KW turbine as provided in response to request for review;

(iii) Clarification regarding the quantity of biogas that would have been destroyed in the baseline as provided in response to request for review;

(iv) Clarification regarding the calibration of methane analyser as provided in response to request for review.

(d) "India-FaL-G Brick and Blocks Project No. 1" (0707) for the monitoring period 1 April 2004 - 31 March 2007 if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which incorporate the clarifications submitted in response to the review including electricity bills, the emission reduction calculation based on rated electricity consumption, and the conservativeness of the approach for the



calculation of the emission reduction taken by the PP.

The Board further noted that the DOE is required to submit the request for revision of the monitoring plan to address the calculation of the emission reduction calculated brick production based on fly ash consumption and total electricity consumption prior to the next request for issuance.

(e) "8.75 MW Wind Power Project in Gujarat " (0776) for the monitoring period 11 February 2007 - 25 February 2008 if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-Nord) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which include the information regarding the readings of electricity generation taken on all the WTGs belong to project participant at all three wind farms, the readings taken on the transformer meters, and also the readings of the common meters provided in response to review.

(f) "Partial substitution of fossil fuels with biomass in cement manufacture" (0876) for the monitoring period 12 May 2000 - 30 September 2007, if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which include clarification regarding:

- (i) continuous monitoring of alternate fuel (peanut shells) provided in response to the review; and
- (ii) monthly measurement of calorific value of the petcoke provided in response to the request for review.

(g) "Project for the catalytic reduction of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia reactor of the N<sub>3</sub> nitric acid plant at Haifa Chemicals Ltd., Israel" (1174) for the monitoring period 3 December 2007 - 24 May 2008, if the DOE (DNV) submit a revised corresponding verification report which include the clarifications on the determination of baseline campaigns and the revised monitoring report provided in response to the review.

(h) "Palmas del Espino – Biogas recovery and heat generation from Palm Oil Mill Effluent (POME) ponds, Peru" (1249) for the monitoring period 23 September 2007 - 31 December 2007, if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised monitoring report and corresponding verification report and a new request for issuance form, which include:

- (i) Clarification on the justification how the samples selected and when the sampling were performed by the PP are representative to cover the possible variation of methane content in the biogas during the period and to give result at 95% confidence level, provided in response to the review;
- (ii) Application of the correct lower bound 95% confidence interval; and
- (iii) Clarification on flare efficiency when temperature below 500°C and verification by the DOE on the occurrence of temperatures below 200°C and its impacts to the calculation of emission reduction, provided in response to the request for review.

88. The Board could not approve the request for issuance of CERs for the project activity "Project for the catalytic reduction of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia reactor of the nitric acid plant at Dongbu Hannong Chemicals Ltd., Ulsan, Korea (Dongbu.)" (1443) for the monitoring period 01 April 2008 - 15 May 2008 submitted by the DOE (DNV), because a request for deviation has not been submitted by the DOE prior to submitting the request for issuance to address how the monitoring equipment used to monitor the baseline campaign has obtained the planned QAL 1 certification as indicated in the monitoring plan in the registered PDD and monitoring report by extended QAL2 testing.



89. In accordance with paragraph 96 of the report of the twenty-eighth meeting of the Executive Board, the Board considered requests from DOEs to be permitted to submit previously rejected request for issuance for the same monitoring period covered by the rejection and decided to permit the re-submission of the requests for issuance for the following project activities:

- (a) "Biogas Support Program - Nepal (BSP-Nepal) Activity-1" (0136) submitted by the DOE (DNV) for the monitoring period 1 August 2004 - 31 July 2006;
- (b) "Biogas Support Program - Nepal (BSP-Nepal) Activity-2" (0139) submitted by the DOE (DNV) for the monitoring period 1 August 2005 - 31 July 2006;
- (c) "Methane Capture and Combustion from Swine Manure Treatment Project at PT Indotirta Suaka Bulan Farm in Indonesia" (0450) submitted by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) for the monitoring period 31 August 2006 - 30 September 2007.

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

### *General guidance*

91. The Board considered matters relating to changes from project description in the registered PDD and the approach proposed by secretariat to address the issue. The Board requested the secretariat to prepare procedures and a guidance which reflect the elements of the discussion for its consideration in the forty-seventh meeting.

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

### *Resources*

92. The Board took note of information provided by the secretariat on the status of resources received as reflected in [annex 63](#). It was noted that since forty-fifth meeting of the Board, the CDM has received USD 2,068,834 from share of proceeds generated by 32 projects and USD 829,412 as a result of the payment of 46 registration fees. Since 1 January 2009, total revenue received from SOP fees amounts to USD 3.9 million and from registration fees USD 1.48 million. Considering the above income and level of expenditure in 2009, the carry over from 2008 and the revised reserve (USD 45 million), the resources available in 2009 amount to USD 16.35 million.

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

93. The Board approved the terms of reference for work on the strategic CDM improvements referred to in decision 2/CMP.4, as contained in [annex 64](#) to this report, in order to enable the Board to submit its recommendation to CMP5. The Board agreed to launch a public call for inputs opening on 30 March 2009 and closing on 4 May 2009 on efficiency in the operation of the CDM and opportunities for improvement, and requested the secretariat to ensure that this be brought to the attention of a wide range of CDM stakeholders, including through the DNA Forum. The Board also agreed to dedicate extra days to discuss these issues, tentatively back-to-back with its forty-eighth and forty-ninth meetings, in order to consider inputs, identify any issues to be addressed and consider potential means of improvement.

94. The Board took note of the briefing of the secretariat on the preparations of annual CDM Joint Coordination meeting planned to be held on 27 - 28 April 2009 in Bonn, Germany, which will be held back to back with the seventh meeting of the CDM DNA Forum (25 - 26 April 2009).

**Agenda sub-item 5 (a): Transparency matters**

95. The Board agreed to a workplan for the year 2009 to implement the requests by the CMP in its decision 2/CMP.4 with regard to transparency of the work of the Board. This is one 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. The workplan is contained in [annex 65](#) to this report.

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

96. Due to time constraints, the Board agreed to defer its consideration of this agenda sub-item.

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

97. Due to time constraints, the Board agreed to defer its consideration of this agenda sub-item.

**Agenda sub-item 5 (d): Regional distribution**

98. The Board took note of a brief update from the secretariat on some ongoing activities in this area and in response to the request by the CMP (decision 2/CMP.4, paragraph 53) to develop, in consultation with Designated National Authorities, ways to streamline the process relating to CDM project activities in countries hosting fewer than 10 registered CDM project activities, especially in the least developed countries, small island developing States and Africa, without compromising environmental integrity, the Board agreed to launch a call for inputs for Designated National Authorities from 30 March to 4 May 2009 to provide inputs on how to address this CMP request for consideration by the Board at its forty-seventh meeting.

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

99. The Board took note of the briefing of the secretariat on the seventh meeting of the CDM DNA Forum to be held on 25 - 26 April in Bonn, Germany, which will be held back to back with the CDM Joint Coordination meeting (27 - 28 April 2009).

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

100. 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) Responses to the issues raised by the CDM EB members during the EB45 meeting;
- (b) Verification - requesting a deviation and revision of monitoring plan simultaneously;
- (c) Possible inconsistencies between the VVM, the Guidance on the assessment of investment analysis and Tool for the assessment and demonstration of additionality;
- (d) Compatibility of software versions in report submission; and
- (e) Provision of feedback on released guidance.

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

101. Board members responded to the questions raised by the Chair of the DOE/AE Forum, including typical steps of DOEs in the validation and verification process and indicated timelines for completing validation and verification functions by DOEs. The Board took note of the detailed information provided by the Chair of the Forum and requested to continue sharing such information with the Board.



102. 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)**

103. 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.

104. 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 Executive Board shall have registered with the secretariat by **5 May 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**

105. The Board agreed to the revised calendar of meetings for 2009, which is contained in [annex 66](#) to this report.

106. The Board agreed on the provisional agenda for its forty-seventh meeting (26 - 28 May 2009) as contained in [annex 67](#) to this report, with an open session on the 27 - 28 May 2009.

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

107. The Chair summarized the main conclusions.

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

108. 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**

109. The Chair closed the meeting.

-----



## Annexes to the report

### *Membership issues*

Annex 1 - Documents related to conflict of interest

### *Accreditation*

Annex 2 - CDM Accreditation Standard for Operational Entities.

Annex 3 - Procedure for Accrediting Operational Entities by the Executive Board of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM).

### *Methodologies*

Annex 4 - AM0079 "Prevention of SF<sub>6</sub> venting following tests of Gas insulated electrical equipment" (version 01)

Annex 5 - Revision to AM0009 "Recovery and utilization of gas from oil wells that would otherwise be flared or vented" (version 04)

Annex 6 - Revision to ACM0006 "Consolidated methodology for electricity generation from biomass residues" (version 08)

Annex 7 - Revision to ACM0008 "Consolidated methodology for coal bed methane, coal mine methane and ventilation air methane capture and use for power (electrical or motive) and heat and/or destruction through flaring or flameless oxidation" (version 06)

Annex 8 - Revision to ACM0013 "Consolidated baseline and monitoring methodology for new grid connected fossil fuel fired power plants using a less GHG intensive technology" (version 02.1)

Annex 9 - Revision to ACM0015 "Consolidated baseline and monitoring methodology for project activities using alternative raw materials that do not contain carbonates for clinker production in cement kilns" (version 02)

Annex 10 - Guidance on expansion of industrial gas recovery methodologies to new facilities (version 01)

Annex 11 - Procedures for renewal of the crediting period of a registered CDM project activity (version 05)

Annex 12 - Terms of Reference for the Methodologies Panel (version 06)

### *Afforestation and reforestation*

Annex 13 - AR-ACM0002 "Afforestation or reforestation of degraded land without displacement of pre-project activities" (version 01)

Annex 14 - Revision to AR-ACM0001 "Afforestation and reforestation of degraded land" (version 03)

Annex 15 - Revision to AR-AMS0005 "Simplified baseline and monitoring methodology for small-scale afforestation and reforestation project activities under the clean development mechanism implemented on lands having low



inherent potential to support living biomass” (version 02)

Annex 16 - Guidance on conditions under which the change in carbon stocks in existing live woody vegetation are insignificant (version 01)

Annex 17 - Guidelines on conservative choice of default data for estimation of biomass stocks and change in woody vegetation (version 01)

Annex 18 - A/R methodological tool: “Estimation of changes in the carbon stocks of existing trees and shrubs within the boundary of an A/R CDM project activity” (version 01)

Annex 19 - Revision to the A/R methodological tool: “Calculation of the number of sample plots for measurements within A/R CDM project activities” (version 02)

#### *Small- scale*

Annex 20 - AMS-III.Z "Fuel switch, process improvement and energy efficiency in brick manufacture" (version 01)

Annex 21 - Revision to AMS I.C "Thermal energy for the user with or without electricity" (version 14)

Annex 22 - Revision to AMS-III.H "Methane Recovery in Wastewater Treatment" (version 11)

Annex 23 - Revision to AMS III.N "Avoidance of HFC emissions in rigid Poly Urethane Foam (PUF) manufacturing"(version 03)

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

Annex 24 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1752

Annex 25 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1866

Annex 26 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2002

Annex 27 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2004

Annex 28 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2053

Annex 29 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2061

Annex 30 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2062

Annex 31 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2064

Annex 32 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2073

Annex 33 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2099

Annex 34 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2106

Annex 35 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2114





- Annex 36 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2143
- Annex 37 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2155
- Annex 38 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2156
- Annex 39 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2164
- Annex 40 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2165
- Annex 41 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2171
- Annex 42 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2190
- Annex 43 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2205
- Annex 44 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2209
- Annex 45 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2211
- Annex 46 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2216
- Annex 47 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2219
- Annex 48 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2231
- Annex 49 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2232
- Annex 50 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2233
- Annex 51 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2237
- Annex 52 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2248
- Annex 53 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2251
- Annex 54 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2253
- Annex 55 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2263
- Annex 56 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2319
- Annex 57 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2334
- Annex 58 - Terms of reference and procedures for the Registration and Issuance Team (RIT) (version 06)

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

- Annex 59 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0116
- Annex 60 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0181
- Annex 61 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0677
- Annex 62 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 1177



***Resources***

Annex 63 - Information Note: Status of resources and pledges to support 2009 CDM activities

***Other matters***

Annex 64 - Draft Terms of Reference Strategic CDM improvements referred to in Decision 2/CMP.4

Annex 65 - Information Note: 2009 Workplan for improving transparency and access to decisions of the Board

Annex 66 - Calendar of meetings for 2009 (version 03)

Annex 67 - Provisional agenda for EB47

-----



## Endnotes

1. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding grid emission factor.
2. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of input values.
3. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the additional information on the prior consideration of the CDM and the explanations regarding the discrepancy in the IRR calculation between the PDR and the spreadsheet submitted in response to the request for review.
4. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the amended grid emission factor and corresponding recalculation of the baseline emissions and emission reductions.
5. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the investment cost assumed.
6. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding additional investment for transmission line.
7. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding grid emission factor.
8. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the coefficient of effective electricity supply.
9. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding: (i) the investment analysis; (ii) the common practice analysis; (iii) the emission factor and; (iv) the monitoring plan submitted in response to this request for review; and if the DOE further explains the means, with documentary evidence, for validating that the six project activities considered for the common practice analysis are stated-owned or publicly listed.
10. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding baseline selection.
11. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the grid emission factor used.
12. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding: (i) the sales tax and additional cash outflow item; (ii) the annual operating hours; and (iii) the corrected grid tariff.



13. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the expenses incurred before the restart of construction and suitability of input values.
14. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding project start date to be 19 July 2007 when the turbine purchase contract was signed and which removes the barrier analysis as the DOE does not validate additionality based on this.
15. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding sensitivity analysis with electricity exports to the grid, common practice analysis and grid emission factor.
16. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding common practice analysis.
17. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of supplementary FSR and suitability of input values.
18. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the amended grid emission factor and corresponding recalculation of the baseline emissions and emission reductions.
19. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the commercial relationship and the monitoring of the surplus of biomass.
20. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall 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 CDM.
21. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall 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 CDM.
22. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the prior consideration of the CDM and the monitoring of the electricity generated using back-up meters.
23. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding start date of the project activity, monitoring of thermal energy, the availability of biomass, and specific fuel consumption.
24. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response



to the request for review regarding: (i) the barrier analysis; (ii) the adjustments made to the IPCC default value for VS values and the calculation of emissions due to leakage; and (iii) the monitoring plan, in particular, the flare efficiency and the testing and calibration requirements for the flow meters.

25. If the Board ultimately decides to issue CERs, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised monitoring report and a revised verification report with their clarification regarding the calculation of net electricity exported as provided in response to the request for review.