



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

Date: 11 September 2009
Ref: CDM-EB-49

EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE CLEAN DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM

FORTY-NINTH MEETING

Report

Date of meeting: 8 -11 September 2009

Location: Bonn, Germany

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

Members	Alternates
Mr. Lex de Jonge²	Mr. Pedro Martins Barata²
Mr. Kamel Djemouai¹	Mr. Samuel Adeoye Adejuwon¹
Mr. Philip M. Gwage²	Mr. Xuedu Lu²
Mr. Martin Hession¹	Mr. Thomas Bernheim¹
Mr. Shafqat Kakakhel¹	Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sethi¹
Mr. Clifford Mahlun²	Mr. Noah Idechong²
Mr. Paulo Manso²	Mr. Hussein Badarin²
Mr. Victor Nicolae²	Ms. Diana Harutyunyan²
Mr. Hugh Sealy¹	Mr. Josè Domingos Miguez¹
Mr. Peer Stiansen¹	Mr. Akihiro Kuroki¹

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. 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. Lex de Jonge, 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.
2. The Board noted that the secretariat was informed that Mr. Thomas Bernheim and Mr. Noah Idechong were unable to attend the meeting and had provided proper justification for their absence.

Agenda item 2. Adoption of the agenda

3. The Board agreed to not consider the agenda item "Relations with Designated Operational and Applicant Entities" and adopted the revised agenda of the meeting.

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

4. The Board took note of the thirty-third progress report on the work of the CDM Accreditation Panel (CDM-AP), and an oral report by the Chair, Mr. Martin Hession. 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, performance assessments and other accreditation related issues. The Board requested the CDM-AP to provide more information for consideration at its fiftieth meeting on the volume of planned assessments, on the level of assessment resources and on the training interventions planned for the assessors.

Case specific

5. The Board, taking into consideration the recommendation of the CDM-AP, the response of the DOE including the proposed corrective actions and the oral presentation at the hearing, decided to recommend to CMP to suspend the accreditation and designation of the designated operational entity SGS United Kingdom Ltd (Er-0010). In accordance with paragraph 103 of the Accreditation Procedure this suspension is with immediate effect.
6. The Board agreed that 'SGS United Kingdom Ltd' could continue to process existing activities in relation to requests for registration and issuance which have been submitted to the Board prior to this suspension. 'SGS United Kingdom Ltd' may therefore:
 - (a) Respond to issues related to completeness checks of requests for registration and issuance;
 - (b) Respond to issues raised in reviews and requests for reviews of requests for registration and issuance; and
 - (c) Submit documentation requested by the Board as part of the outcome of a previous request for review or review.
7. Until the termination of the suspension, and in accordance with paragraph 109 of the CDM Accreditation Procedure, 'SGS United Kingdom Ltd' may continue to undertake activities related to validation and verification under existing contracts, with the exception of the following:
 - (a) Upload PDDs for public comments as part of the validation process;



- (b) Upload monitoring reports as part of the verification process;
- (c) Submit new requests for registration for CDM project activities;
- (d) Submit new requests for issuance of certified emission reductions;
- (e) Submit new requests for renewal of crediting periods;
- (f) Submit new requests for revision of monitoring plan;
- (g) Submit new request for deviation; and
- (h) Submit new request for changes from the PDD.

The Board further agreed that the DOE shall undertake corrective actions to address the non-conformities listed in [annex 2](#) within a period of 6 months. On the request of the DOE and in accordance with paragraph 104 of the Accreditation Procedure the CDM-AT shall undertake a further on-site assessment to verify the implementation of the corrective actions.

8. The Board considered an appeal submitted by a DOE against recommendation of the CDM-AP. The Board, in accordance with the CDM Accreditation Procedure, decided to establish a three member appeal panel and requested it to prepare a report for the consideration of the Board at its fiftieth meeting. The Board also agreed that the appeal panel members shall be compensated for three (3) days of work in accordance with United Nations rules and regulations.

9. The Board considered a recommendation of the CDM-AP and agreed to re-accredit the entity 'JACO CDM Ltd' for three (3) years for validation and verification/certification functions for sectoral scopes 1 to 15.

General guidance

10. The Board agreed on the policy framework to monitor performance and address non-compliance by DOEs in a systematic manner, as contained in [annex 3](#) to this report. The Board requested the secretariat to prepare a proposal for implementation of the policy framework, including the categorization of non-compliance, proposed thresholds and applicable sanctions, for the consideration of the Board at its fifty-first meeting.

11. The Board took note of an oral report by the secretariat, including timelines, on a workplan for updating of the Validation and Verification Manual (CDM-VVM). The Board agreed to the proposed timelines and to the following approach to update the CDM-VVM:

- (a) A review of the document on a six month basis would be undertaken in the future. The scope of such a review would include the appropriate incorporation of evolving decisions of the Board and also allow minor editorial consistency checks;
- (b) A more comprehensive revision of the document would take place every two (2) years. The scope of this type of revision would allow the incorporation of all relevant decisions of the Board, undertake comprehensive editorial, technical and legal consistency check as well as any other relevant changes to improve the user-friendliness of the document.

The Board further agreed that in exceptional cases further unscheduled revisions of the document can be undertaken and requested the secretariat to prepare a review of the VVM in accordance with this paragraph 11 (a) above for its consideration at its fifty-first meeting.



12. Due to lack of time, the Board could not consider the introductory presentation on the concept of materiality and requested the secretariat to do some further work on the concepts of materiality/level of assurance and also prepare some examples of the impact of applying these concepts in CDM project activities for consideration of the Board at its fiftieth meeting.

13. The Board agreed to launch a call for experts starting on 14 September 2009 and ending on 13 October 2009 in order to replace one outgoing member of the CDM-AP with methodological expertise. The Board requested the secretariat to prepare a short-list of the candidates for the consideration of the Board at its fifty-first meeting. The Board further agreed to extend the term of the outgoing member until the appointment of new panel member.

14. The Board requested the secretariat to prepare a proposal for establishing an appeal process against Designated Operational Entities by the Project Participants for the consideration of the Board at its fifty-first meeting. The proposal shall address possible policy options and the associated implications.

15. The Board noted that the forty-fourth meeting of the CDM-AP is scheduled for 21 - 23 September 2009.

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

Case specific

16. The Board considered one request for deviation from the approved methodology ACM0006 related to a project activity undergoing validation, in view of response provided by the Meth Panel (MP37, paragraph 34) to the request of forty-fifth meeting of the Board. The Board agreed to respond to it and requested the secretariat to inform the DOE accordingly.

General guidance

17. The Board considered the guidance on the barrier "first-of-its-kind" and requested a group of members to further discuss the issue in order to finalize a new proposal. The Board agreed to consider this issue again once an agreed proposal by the group is submitted to the Board.

18. The Board considered the guidance on the common practice analysis and requested a group of members to further discuss the issue in order to finalize a new proposal. The Board agreed to consider this issue again once an agreed proposal by the group is submitted to the Board.

19. The Board agreed to the "Procedures for requests to the Executive Board for deviation from an approved methodology" and its related form "Form for submission of requests for deviation from methodology (F-CDM-DEV-METH)", as contained in [annex 4](#) and [annex 5](#) to this report. This procedure and its related form, along with the "Procedures for requests to the Executive Board for deviation prior to submitting request for issuance" (EB 49, annex 26), replaces the Procedures for requests for deviation to the Executive Board (version 02, EB 24, Annex 30) and its related form and includes revisions in the procedures with respect to requesting deviation from an approved methodology.

20. The Board considered a detailed analysis prepared by the secretariat¹ including: the performance of the process of considering methodologies related submissions such as new methodologies, requests for revision and request for clarification; reasons for delay in consideration; synthesis of public inputs on the call to invite comments on reasons for no / low use of methodologies in project activities; specific improvements required to be achieved in methodologies and the process of consideration of methodologies; and several proposals to bring the improvements. The Board agreed to request the secretariat to (a) prepare a synthesis summary of this analysis including a work programme of specific actions to be taken based on this analysis; (b) revise the procedures for consideration of new methodologies, request for revision and request for clarification, based upon their specific improvement



proposals presented in the analysis. Both requests are to be considered by the Board at a future meeting.

21. In view of the analysis presented by the secretariat, the Board also requested the Meth Panel to revise approved methodologies to further improve their objectivity, applicability, usability and consistency. For carrying out this task, the Board also requested the Meth Panel to communicate with the project proponents and the developers of respective methodologies, if required. The Board requested the secretariat to report on the progress of this work, for the consideration at a future meeting.

22. The Board considered the document² concerning the implications of the possible inclusion of carbon capture and storage (CCS) in geological formations as CDM project activities, prepared by external consultants selected by the Board, according to EB47 paragraph 36. The Board agreed that further substantial work on the report is required before it can be considered by the Board again. Although the report provided a broad review of carbon capture and storage in geological formation as mitigation option based on guidelines and reports of international institutions, it has not addressed the core element of the terms of reference, about a detailed assessment of the implications of possible inclusion of carbon capture and storage in geological formation as CDM project activities. Therefore, the Board requested the secretariat to provide feedback to the consultants based upon the issues discussed by the Board and requested the consultants to review the report for the consideration of the Board at its fiftieth meeting.

Further schedule

23. The Board took note that the fortieth meeting of the panel will be held from 14 - 18 September 2009 and the forty-first meeting of the panel will be held from 19 - 23 October 2009.

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

General guidance

24. The Board considered the first draft of the experts' report on the assessment of the implications of the possible inclusion of lands with forests in exhaustion as A/R CDM project activities³ and agreed to continue its work with a view to prepare a recommendation to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol at its fifth session as requested in paragraph 42 of the Decision 2/CMP.4.

25. The Board further requested the A/R WG to consider, at the highest priority, the above mentioned experts' report at its twenty-fifth meeting and provide the Board with its input on options for definition of forest in exhaustion. The Board requested a small group of members to consider this input and to provide the Board with a recommendation to be considered at its fiftieth meeting.

Further schedule

26. The Board noted with appreciation an invitation by the Chair of the A/R WG Mr. José Domingos Miguez to hold one of the meetings of the group planned for year 2010 in Brazil and requested the secretariat to proceed with legal and logistical matters.

27. The Board took note that the twenty-fifth meeting of the A/R WG will be held from 21 - 23 September 2009 and the twenty-sixth meeting of the A/R WG will be held from 28 - 30 October 2009.

28. The Board reminded project participants that the deadline for consideration of requests for revision and requests for clarification of A/R methodologies at the twenty-sixth meeting is 16 September 2009.



29. The Board reminded project participants that the deadline for the twenty-fourth round of submissions of proposed new A/R methodologies is 26 October 2009. The Board also reminded project participants that new baseline and monitoring methodologies could be submitted at any time prior to this deadline.

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

General guidance

30. The Board considered the request from the SSC WG, as detailed in paragraph 14 of the twentieth meeting report of the SSC WG, to provide guidance with regard to further work in defining the consideration of baseline penetration (BP) of project technology in small scale methodologies. The Board agreed that there are cross cutting issues between baseline penetration and other issues related to demonstration of additionality under the consideration of the Board such as 'common practice' and 'first of its kind' while there may be some issues unique to consideration of baseline penetration. The Board agreed to continue to consider the issue together with consideration of common practice and first of its kind, in the mean time it requested the SSC WG to address the issue as indicated in paragraph 21 of twenty-eighth meeting report of the Board i.e. on case to case basis in the proposed new methodologies.

31. The Board requested the secretariat to revise the procedures for submission and consideration of proposed new simplified methodologies and procedures for revision of simplified approved methodologies to adjust the fees provided to the SSC WG members with the ones provided to the members of the Meth Panel. The draft revision of these procedures should be provided to the Board along with the changes requested in paragraph 20 above.

Further schedule

32. The Board took note that the twenty-second meeting of the SSC WG will be held from 21 to 24 September 2009 and the twenty-third meeting of the SSC WG will be held from 27 to 30 October 2009.

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

33. The Board took note with appreciation the first registration of a programme of activities as a single CDM project activity.

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

34. The Board took note that 1,809 CDM project activities have been registered by 11 September 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

35. 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 thirty-two (32) requests for registration.



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

(a) “Jiangsu Longyuan Donghai Biomass Power Project” (1892) if the project participant and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report, which include the information submitted in the response to the request for review, regarding the validation of the input values to the investment analysis, justification for elimination of baseline alternatives (P5 and P6) and the justification that biomass residues will carry a price despite being dumped. The DOE shall document the response in the validation report regarding the documentation and independent crosschecking of input values applied (including the number itself), particularly for investment cost and O&M cost.

(b) “CECIC Zhangbei Gaojialiang Wind farm Project” (1895) if the project participant and DOE (BVC) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report, which indicate the correct value of project IRR and include the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the appropriateness of the electricity tariff. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers that the project activity is additional as, with the application of highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark.

(c) “Tal Dman Landfill Gas Capture Project in Aleppo” (2453) if the project participant and DOE (JQA) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report, which:

(i) Incorporate the information submitted in the response to the request for review, regarding the validation of input values in the investment analysis and the fact that the project is first-of-its kind; and

(ii) Apply the correct versions of methodological tools in the PDD.

(d) “NISCO Converter Gas Recovery and Utilization for Power Generation Project” (2469) if the project participant and DOE (JQA) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report, which:

(i) Incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the barrier analysis;

(ii) Validate the PDD as per version 3 of the methodology; and

(iii) Include the BFG and COG units as part of the project boundary to avoid any miscalculations of the energy generated from the project activity.

(e) “Reduction of Methane Emissions from Ruseifeh Landfill” (2487) if the project participant and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report, which incorporate the additional information provided in response to the request for review regarding the project start date and actions taken to secure CDM status for the project activity in parallel with its implementation.

(f) “Bayi Steel CDQ (1#, 2#) and Waste Heat Utilization Project” (2506) if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD):

(i) Validate the proposed project activity using the methodology ACM0012 version 3;



(ii) Further substantiate:

- The suitability of the input values to the investment analysis in line with the guidance of EB38 paragraph 54 (c), in particular concerning O&M cost and total investment; and

- Why the O & M expenditure of CWQ system, and the capacity/demand charge if same was paid to grid in pre-project scenario, are not considered as revenue in the investment analysis; and

(iii) Submit the revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of input values to the investment analysis, sensitivity analysis, and elimination of alternatives.

(g) “El Panul – EcoMethane Landfill Gas Project” (2512) if the project participant and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporates the responses given to this request for review regarding the host party Letter of Approval, the prior consideration of the CDM, the validation of the cost analysis and the validation of the MCF value.

(h) “Shanxi Changyuan 24 MW waste heat recovery and utilization for electricity generation project” (2515) if the project participant and 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 validation of “other cost” in the investment analysis; and

(ii) Revalidates the PDD fully with the provisions of version 3 of the methodology. While the concern of the Board on the suitability of “other cost” has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the removal of the “other cost”, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark.

(i) “Zibo Hongda Coking Co. Ltd. Coke Dry Quenching and Waste Heat Utilization for Power Generation Project” (2516) if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD):

(i) Validates the proposed project activity using the methodology ACM0012 version 3;

(ii) Further substantiates:

- The suitability of the input values to the investment analysis inline with the EB38 paragraph 54 (c), in particular, O & M cost and the O & M expenditure of CWQ system; and

- Why the capacity/demand charge if same was paid to grid in pre-project scenario, is not considered as revenue in the investment analysis; and

(iii) Submits a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which include the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the use of electricity generated, suitability of input values to the investment analysis, waste heat in the pre-project scenario, and unreadable appendix.



(j) “Wuxue Huaxin Cement 18 MW Waste Heat Recovery as Power Project” (2521) if the project participant and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which:

(i) Incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding:

- The validation of “other cost” in the investment analysis;
- The clarification provided on the issue of baseline selection; and
- The clarification on the non-venting of waste heat prior to the project activity;

and

(ii) Validate the PDD as per version 3 of the methodology. While the concern of the Board on the suitability of “other cost” has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the removal of the “other cost”, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark.

(k) “Dalian Maoyingzi Landfill Gas Recovery for Power Generation Project” (2523) if the project participant and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which include the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the occurrence of landfill gas flaring in the baseline scenario and clearly demonstrate compliance with the methodology regarding the determination of the quantity of methane destroyed by generation of electricity.

(l) “The Bogeda 40.5 MW Wind-Farm Project in Urumqi, Xinjiang, China” (2537) if the project participants and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the tariff, the input values, the IRR and sensitivity analysis, and the grid emission factor.

(m) “Gujarat Narmada Valley Fertilizer Company (GNFC) Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project” (2550) if the project participant and DOE (SGS) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which include the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding :

(i) The reason for excluding the fourth historical campaign from the determination of the normal campaign length; and

(ii) The validation of the overall uncertainty of the monitoring system.

(n) “Zhongliangshan Coal Mine Methane Project” (2558) if the project participant and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which incorporate the information provided for this request for review regarding the project start date, the benchmark, the O&M costs, and the validation of the baseline alternatives.

(o) “Wastewater treatment with Anaerobic Digester at Truong Think starch processing plant in Tay Ninh, Vietnam” (2571) if the project participant and DOE (JQA) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted to this request for review, regarding the validation of the investment analysis as per paragraphs 109, 111 and 112 of the VVM.



- (p) "Wastewater treatment with Anaerobic Digester at Viet Ma starch processing plant in Tay Ninh, Vietnam" (2572) if the project participant and DOE (JQA) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted to this request for review, regarding the validation of the investment analysis as per paragraphs 109, 111 and 112 of the VVM.
- (q) "Guizhou Kaiyang Zijiang Hydropower Station Project" (2574) if the project participant and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the additional information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of the electricity tariff, total investment cost, plant load factor, and electricity output applied to the investment analysis.
37. 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.
38. The Board agreed to undertake a review of the project activity:
- (a) "Nanchang Maiyuan Landfill Gas Recovery and Utilisation Project" (1745) 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 6](#) to this report;⁴
- (b) "Heilongjiang Huanan Hengdaishan East (II) Wind Power Project" (2124) 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 7](#) to this report;
- (c) "Waste Gas based Power Generation Project at Ankit Metal & Power Limited" (2127) 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 8](#) to this report;
- (d) "Heilongjiang Wuerguli Wind Power Project" (2152) 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 9](#) to this report;⁵
- (e) "Inner Mongolia Meiyaoshan Wind Farm Project" (2381) 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 10](#) to this report;
- (f) "Inno-Kwantas Mewah- Palm Oil Mill Waste Recycle Scheme, Malaysia" (2427) 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 11](#) to this report;⁶
- (g) "Pure-low Temperature Waste Heat Recovery for Power Generation (2×7MW) in Guangdong Tapai Cement Co., Ltd." (2445) submitted for registration by the DOE (JQA) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 12](#) to this report;⁷
- (h) "BFG-fired Power Generation Project in Baosteel Co Ltd., Shanghai, P. R. China" (2461) 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 13](#) to this report;⁸
- (i) "Sintex 7.5 MW Natural gas based package cogeneration project, Gujarat – India" (2471) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 14](#) to this report;⁹



- (j) "Utilization of waste gas heat for power generation" (2504) 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 15](#) to this report;¹⁰
- (k) "Waste Heat Recovery based Captive Power Project of Adhunik Metaliks Limited" (2507) 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 16](#) to this report;¹¹
- (l) "Hebei Wasted Gas based Captive Power Plant Project in Longgang Group" (2508) 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 17](#) to this report;¹²
- (m) "The Waste Heat Recovery Based Coke Dry Quenching Power Generation Project of Xingang Company" (2511) 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 18](#) to this report;¹³
- (n) "Bhushan Power and Steel Limited–Waste Heat Recovery based Captive Power Project" (2519) submitted for registration by the DOE (SGS) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 19](#) to this report;¹⁴
- (o) "Shandong Laizhou phase I Wind Power Project" (2530) 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 20](#) to this report;
39. 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.
40. 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 thirty-one (31) of the project activities which were placed "Under review" at the forty-eighth meeting of the Board.
41. In accordance with paragraphs 17 and 18 (a) of the procedures mentioned in paragraph 40, the Board agreed to register the project activities:
- (a) "Jilin Xijingou Hydropower Project" (2435) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV). The Board noted that it had not been fully demonstrated that the method of "adjusted income tax" applied in the investment analysis was appropriate in the context of the CDM, however the Board did consider that the additionality had been demonstrated as the application of the actual projected income tax, a more conservative treatment, would not result in the IRR crossing the applied benchmark.
- (b) "Zhangjiagang Nature Gas Power Generation Project" (2439) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV). The Board noted that it had not been fully demonstrated that the method of "adjusted income tax" applied in the investment analysis was appropriate in the context of the CDM, however the Board did consider that the additionality had been demonstrated as the application of the actual projected income tax, a more conservative treatment, would not result in the IRR crossing the applied benchmark.
- (c) "Zhejiang Wenling Donghaitang Wind Power Project" (2449) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD). The Board noted that it had not been fully demonstrated that the method of "adjusted income tax" applied in the investment analysis was appropriate in the context of the CDM, however the Board did consider that the additionality had been demonstrated as the application of the actual projected income tax, a more conservative treatment, would not result in



the IRR crossing the applied benchmark.

42. In accordance with paragraphs 17 and 18 (b) of the procedures mentioned in paragraph 40, the Board agreed to register, subject to satisfactory corrections, the project activities:

(a) "CGN Inner Mongolia Zhurihe Phase I Wind Farm Project" (1577) if the PP and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which further substantiate the suitability of the tariff as a means of demonstrating the additionality of the project activity. In undertaking these corrections the project participant and DOE should note the Board's concerns regarding the suitability of the tariff as indicated in paragraph 48 below.

(b) "Inner Mongolia Huitengliang Phase II Wind Power Project" (1815) if the PP and the DOE (BVC) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the additional information submitted in response to the review. Although the concern of the Board on the trend of the tariffs for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the region the project IRR does not cross the benchmark.

(c) "Phuoc Hiep I sanitary Landfill gas CDM project in Ho Chi Minh City" (1913) if the PP/DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate:

(i) The information provided earlier about the power purchase agreement and the validation of the electricity tariff; and

(ii) The information provided in response to the request for review regarding the common practice analysis.

(d) "Yunnan Yingjiang Wakuhe Hydropower Station" (2052) if the PP/DOE (TÜV NORD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the review regarding on the validation of the transmission line construction costs.

(e) "Henan Nanyang Zhenping Cement Waste Heat Recovery and Utilization for Power Generation Project" (2095) if the PP and DOE (BVC) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in the response to the review regarding the calculation of tariff, and proceed to fully validate the project activity against the requirements of methodology ACM0012 version 3, as three years production data is not available for the line with 6,000t/day production capacity.

(f) "Huadian Kulun 201 MW Wind Farm Project" (2100) if the PP and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which further substantiate the suitability of the tariff as a means of demonstrating the additionality of the project activity. In undertaking these corrections the project participant and the DOE should note the Board's concerns regarding the suitability of the tariff as indicated in paragraph 48 below. The Board noted that it had not been fully demonstrated that the method of "adjusted income tax" applied in the investment analysis was appropriate in the context of the CDM, however the Board did consider that the additionality had been demonstrated as the application of the actual projected income tax, a more conservative treatment, would not result in the IRR crossing the applied benchmark.

(g) "Heilongjiang Yilan Hezuolinchang Phase II Wind Power Project" (2117) if the PP and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which further



substantiate the suitability of the tariff as a means of demonstrating the additionality of the project activity. In undertaking these corrections the project participant and DOE should note the Board's concerns regarding the suitability of the tariff as indicated in paragraph 48 below.

(h) "Guohua Hebei Huanghua 49.5 MW Wind Farm Project (Phase I)" (2125) if the PP and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which include the information submitted in response to the review team's questions regarding the suitability of input values to the investment analysis and appropriateness of the electricity tariff. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark.

(i) "V.P. Farms Pig Manure Methanisation, Methane Recovery and Energy Production Project" (2218) if the PP and the DOE (TÜV-SUD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report that:

(i) Incorporate the additional information submitted in response to the review team's question regarding the investment and technological barriers.

(ii) Provide further validation on the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis, in particular: the annual operating hours, electricity price, and fertilizer price assumed; and on the sensitivity analysis, including why the variations in the parameters that would make the payback time reach the 5-years payback time benchmark are not likely to occur.

(iii) Correct the discrepancies in the input values and calculation between the spreadsheets submitted and the information referred in the PDD and validation report related to the capacity installed for the V.P.F. Farm and the payback time of the project activity.

(iv) Further substantiate the technological barrier in line with the requirements of paragraphs 115 & 116 of the VVM (EB44, Annex 3).

(j) "Heilongjiang Yilan Jiguanlazishan Wind Farm Project" (2360) if the PP and the DOE (BVC) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which:

(i) Incorporate the additional information submitted in response to the review team's question regarding the *ex-ante* emission factor; and

(ii) Further substantiate the suitability of the tariff as a means of demonstrating the additionality of the project activity. In undertaking these corrections the project participant and DOE should note the Board's concerns regarding the suitability of the tariff as indicated in paragraph 48 below.

(k) "Heilongjiang Dongning Dajiazishan and Xidagang Wind Farm Project" (2361) if the PP and the DOE (BVC) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which:

(i) Incorporate the additional information submitted in response to the review team's question regarding the *ex-ante* emission factor; and

(ii) Further substantiate the suitability of the tariff as a means of demonstrating the additionality of the project activity. In undertaking these corrections the project participant and DOE should note the Board's concerns regarding the suitability of the



tariff as indicated in paragraph 48 below.

(l) “GHG emission reductions through waste gas based power generation at Visa Steel Limited” (2369) if the DOE (SGS) submits a revised validation report which:

(i) Includes the information submitted in response to the review team's questions regarding the suitability of input values to the investment analysis and suitability of the baseline selection, and

(ii) Provides further clarification on how it has validated the estimates used to calculate the new baseline alternatives (#4).

(m) “Jiangsu Qishuyan Natural Gas Based Power Generation Project” (2382) if the PP and DOE (TÜV SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporates the information submitted in the response to the review, regarding validation of input values to the investment analysis, and provide further information on the actions undertaken by the CDM Consultant (Jiangsu Provincial Energy Saving Technology Service Center) to secure the CDM status after signing of the consultancy agreement on 5 September 2005.

(n) “Jiangsu Wangting Natural Gas Based Power Generation Project” (2383) if the PP and DOE (TÜV SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in the response to the review, regarding validation of input values to the investment analysis, and provide further information on the actions undertaken by the CDM Consultant (Jiangsu Provincial Energy Saving Technology Service Center) to secure the CDM status after signing of the consultancy agreement on 19 August 2005.

(o) “Leak Reduction in Above Ground Gas Distribution Equipment in the KazTransgaz-Tbilisi Gas Distribution System- Tbilisi, Georgia” (2404) if the PP and the DOE (SGS) submit the clean version of the revised PDD and the corresponding validation report that have been submitted in response to the review team's questions.

(p) “Santa Cruz I Hydroelectric Power Plant” (2405) if the PP and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which include the information submitted in the response to the request for review, regarding the suitability of the benchmark applied in the investment analysis.

(q) “Xinjiang Huadian Xiaocaohu the 2nd phase of No.1 Wind Farm project” (2413) if the DOE (DNV) submits a revised validation report which:

(i) Include the information submitted in response to the review team's questions regarding the appropriateness of the electricity tariff; and

(ii) Provides further validation opinion on the choice of the region selected for comparison of tariffs and the break up of “other fees” assumed in the investment analysis.

(r) “Hubei Yihua Fertilizers Company Waste Heat Recovery and Utilization Project” (2416) if the PP and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the review questions and proceeds to fully validate the entire proposed project activity against the requirements of methodology ACM0012, version 3.



- (s) “Tianfu Coalmine Methane Project” (2418) if the PP and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report that:
- (i) Provide further substantiation on how the identified criteria (similar technology, similar scale, and comparable environment) have been deployed in identifying similar projects, in particular, further substantiation on range of production capacity of the coal mines considered and avoidance of the privately owned similar scale coal mines in identifying the similar projects; and
 - (ii) Include the information submitted in response to the review team’s questions regarding the suitability of input values to the investment analysis, limiting the common practice analysis to the Chongqing Municipality, and grid emission factor.
- (t) “Inner Mongolia Keshiketeng County Wutaohai South Wind Farm 49.5 MW Project” (2420) if the PP and the DOE (JQA) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which further substantiate the suitability of the tariff as a means of demonstrating the additionality of the project activity. In undertaking these corrections the project participant and DOE should note the Board’s concerns regarding the suitability of the tariff as indicated in paragraph 48 below.
- (u) “El Platanal Hydropower Plant” (2426) if the PP and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report, which incorporates the additional information provided in the responses to the review questions regarding the suitability of the benchmark applied in the investment analysis.
- (v) “Jiangxi Gongge 15MW Hydropower Project, China” (2433), if the PP/DOE (TECO) submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which incorporate the information provided in response to the review questions regarding the meetings held between the PP and the consultants in 2005, 2006 and 2007 as evidence of real and continuing actions taken to secure CDM status for the project activity in parallel with its implementation. The revised validation report must further substantiate how the authenticity of the Letter of Intent dated December 2006 has been validated.
- (w) “Skopje Cogeneration Project” (2437) if the PP and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised documentation, which incorporates the additional information provided in the responses to the review questions regarding:
- (i) The project activity not being a real cogeneration plant; and
 - (ii) The revised calculations to confirm the baseline selection and additionality of the project activity without including the costs for heat products and income from the sale of heat.
- (x) “Shanxi Wulushan 1st phase Wind Power Project” (2441) if the DOE (DNV) submits a revised validation report which provides further validation opinion on how it has validated the suitability of the plant load factor for the project activity and break down of the “other fees” to justify its assumed value.
- (y) “Xilinguole Huitengliang Wind Power Project Guotai Phase I” (2450) if the PP and the DOE (TUV-SUD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which include the information submitted in response to the review team’s questions regarding the appropriateness of the electricity tariff. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid has not been fully substantiated, the Board



considers the project activity additional as with the application of highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark.

43. In accordance with paragraphs 17 and 18 (c) of the procedures mentioned in paragraph 40, the Board could not register the following project activities:

(a) "73 MW Tonghua Iron & Steel Waste Gas and Heat Power Generation Project" (2304) submitted for registration by the DOE (JCI) because the DOE and project participant have failed to substantiate:

(i) The additionality of the project activity, in particular, the identified technological barriers due to prevailing practice; and

(ii) The baseline methodology, in particular, the identified baseline (waste gas is released to the atmosphere after incineration and waste heat is released to the atmosphere (W2), and captive consumption of the steel plant is sourced by power plants connected to the North East China Power Grid (P6)), is not suitable as the captive electricity had been generated fully or partially using the surplus waste gas, except during the cessation of the Gas Turbine from 02/2006.

(b) "Sichuan Liangtan Hydropower Station Second Phase Project" (2410) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) because the DOE has failed to adequately validate the input values to the investment analysis, in particular, the values used to calculate the theoretical annual gross power generation of the original power station and the project activity, the operating hours, the coefficient of effective electricity and the 0% salvage value used and therefore the additionality of the project activity is not established.

(c) "Controlled combustion of municipal solid waste (MSW) and energy generation in Linyi City, Shandong, China" (2419) submitted for registration by the DOE (JQA) because the DOE and the project participant have failed to substantiate the additionality of the project activity, in particular, the suitability of the MSW disposal price as no adequate justification is provided on the suitability of the MSW disposal price assumed to the investment analysis.

44. In accordance with the clarifications to paragraph 18 (b) of the above-mentioned procedures the Board considered three (3) project activities for which corrections had been submitted in response to the outcome of a previous review.

45. The Board could not register the project activities:

(a) "Electrotherm 30 MW combined waste heat recovery and coal based captive power plant at Kutch" (1903) submitted for registration by the DOE (SGS) as the DOE failed to submit the corrections requested by the Board at its forty-fifth meeting within the 12 weeks deadline required by the "Clarifications to facilitate the implementation of the Procedures for review" (EB38 Annex 20). The Board also noted that some of the parameters used in the revised investment analysis differ from those assumed at the time of investment decision without adequate explanations.

(b) "Yixing Shuanglong Cement Plant's Low Temperature Waste Heat Power Generation" (1914) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) as the DOE has failed to provide the further validation, requested by the Board at its forty-sixth meeting, to confirm that the electricity tariff used in the PDD is appropriate to account for the savings from avoided purchases of electricity from the grid, and therefore the additionality of the project activity has not been established.



(c) "Jiangsu Jiaoqiao Cement Plant's Low Temperature Waste Heat Power Generation Project" (1916) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) as the DOE has failed to provide the further validation, requested by the Board at its forty-sixth meeting, to confirm that the electricity tariff used in the PDD is appropriate to account for the savings from avoided purchases of electricity from the grid, and therefore the additionality of the project activity has not been established. The DOE also has failed to demonstrate how the sensitivity analysis presented in the PDD was done in line with EB41, annex 45.

General guidance

46. The Board agreed to adopt the "Guidelines for the consideration of request for review and review cases" (version 01), as contained in [annex 21](#) to this report. These guidelines compile the major criteria for decision-making during the review process as requested by paragraph 13 of decision 2/CMP.4

47. The Board agreed to adopt the revised "Guidelines on demonstration and assessment of the prior consideration of the CDM" (version 03), as contained in [annex 22](#) to this report, in order to clarify the Board's expectations with regard to the validation of real and continuing actions to secure CDM status.

48. With regard to certain project activities referenced in paragraph 42 the Board has remaining concerns related to the suitability of the applied tariff as a means of assessing additionality. These concerns are:

(a) Whether the higher tariff previously available could be considered an E- policy as it has not been demonstrated to be the result of a national or sectoral policy implemented after 11 November 2001; and

(b) That the tariff is lower than tariffs previously issued for similar projects in the same region, and this lower tariff may result in the reduction in the incentives for investment in renewable energy which may create a comparative advantage for more emissions intensive technology. It should be noted that the Board did not consider that it had been proven that the reduction in tariff was solely related to the reduction in investment costs.

49. The Board requested the secretariat, based on inputs from an independent consultant, to prepare a background document on the development of wind power globally, in particular in developing countries. This document should include information on the historical trends related to investment and operating costs and policy supports, including inter alia feed-in tariffs and renewable portfolio standards.

50. The Board considered issues regarding the validation of grid emission factors calculated by national authorities and requested the secretariat to prepare an information note containing options for ensuring that such factors comply with the requirements of the "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system" for consideration at a future meeting.

51. The Board noted with concern that in cases where further validation is requested following a review DOEs often submit documentation which merely repeats previously supplied responses to requests for clarification. The Board does not consider this to be satisfactory and requests DOEs to further substantiate validation opinions when provided with such an opportunity by the Board. The Board further requested the secretariat to prepare a proposal for "Guidelines for DOEs in addressing requests for review, reviews and requests for corrections from the Executive Board" for consideration at a future meeting.

52. The Board considered the draft revision of the "Procedures for Modalities of Communication between Project Participants and the Executive Board" and its related form F-CDM-MOC and decided to further discuss this draft documents at a future meeting.



53. The Board took note of concerns with regard to the application of its decision as contained in paragraph 41 of the report of its thirtieth meeting, regarding the withdrawal of participants during validation, and requested the secretariat to prepare a revision to the "Procedures for processing and reporting on validation of CDM project activities" to address these issues for its consideration at its fiftieth meeting.

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

54. The Board took note that 328,487,858 CERs have been issued as of 11 September 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

55. 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 12 requests for issuance.

56. In accordance with paragraph 10 of these procedures the Board agreed to instruct the CDM registry administrator to issue 21,253 CERs for "6 MW Rice Husk based cogeneration plant at Bhageshwari Papers Private Limited" (1379), taking note of the initial comments from the DOE (SGS) and project participant in response to the request for review.

57. 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) "La Esperanza Hydroelectric Project" (0009), if the DOE (RWTÜV) submits a revised verification report which corrects the statement on implementation and operation of the project activity in the verification report (p 19).
- (b) "Landfill Gas to Energy Project at Lara Landfill, Mauá, Brazil" (0091), if the DOE (SGS) submits a revised verification report which includes the clarification regarding the automatic measurement and recording of parameters in PLC and calculation of emission reduction every minute as provided in response to the request for review and the correct request for issuance form.
- (c) "Pronaca: Afortunados Swine Waste Management" (0459), if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submits a revised verification report which corrects the verification statement on treatment of solid waste and the monitoring of swine herd inventories.
- (d) "Pronaca: Tropicales-Plata Swine Waste Management" (460), if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submits a revised verification report that incorporates:
 - (i) Corrected verification statement on the treatment of solid manure;
 - (ii) Correct dates of the monitoring period; and
 - (iii) Description on how it verified the monitoring of swine herd inventories.



- (e) "Quimvale and Gas Natural Fuel Switch Project" (0828), if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submits a revised verification report which incorporates:
- (i) Clarification on the inconsistency of precision between reported data (16,073.43 tones in 2007 and 23,027.54 tones in 2008) and measurements (each pallet of 1 ton should result in no decimal point after the one level), which should refer the inconsistency of precision to the exclusion of CaCO₃ rejected and calcium phosphate additions; and
 - (ii) Clarification on how it verified the monitoring and exclusion of CaCO₃ rejected and calcium phosphate additions.
- (f) "Liaoning Changtu Wind Farm Project" (0883), if the project participant and DOE (SGS) submit:
- (i) A revised monitoring report which contains the information on the calibration of the meter for C14; and
 - (ii) The revised verification report submitted in response to the request for review.
- (g) "EnviroServ Chloorkop Landfill Gas Recovery Project" (0925), if the DOE (SGS) submits a revised verification report which includes a Forward Action Request to revise the monitoring plan to exclude:
- (i) Temperature and pressure of landfill gas, as submitted in response to the request for review; and
 - (ii) Total amount of landfill gas destroyed in application (e.g. boilers and engine) which is not applicable under the applied methodology.
- (h) "Qinghai Jinshaxia 70MW Hydropower Project" (1467), if the DOE (SGS) submits a revised verification report confirming the information provided by the project participant regarding over generation of emission reductions as compared to PDD as submitted in response to the request for review.
58. In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 10 of these procedures, referred in paragraph 55, the Board agreed to undertake a review of the request for issuance of CERs and to appoint members of the review team for:
- (a) "RIO BLANCO Small Hydroelectric Project" (0028), submitted by the DOE (SGS), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 23](#) to this report;
 - (b) "El Molle - Landfill gas (LFG) capture project" (0170), submitted by the DOE (SGS) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 24](#) to this report.
 - (c) "Mondi Richards Bay Biomass Project" (0966), submitted by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 25](#) to this report.
59. 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.



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

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

(a) "Energy efficiency through steam optimization projects at RIL, Hazira," (0261) for the monitoring period 1 August 2006 - 30 April 2008 if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which incorporate:

(i) Clarification on the use of C09; and

(ii) Clarification on the calculation of the emission reduction when the production is less than 95% submitted to the response to the under review and the new request for issuance form which includes corrected number of emission reduction.

The Board further noted that a revision of the monitoring plan should be submitted to reflect the monitoring of C09, prior to the next request for issuance

(b) "Tianji Group Line 3 N2O Abatement Project", (1441) for the monitoring period 5 March 2008 - 2 September 2008 if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report, a revised CER calculation spreadsheet, and a new request for issuance form which include:

(i) Clarification provided in response to the under review questions and corresponding changes in CERs, considering the re calculation of operating conditions and normal campaign length;

(ii) Clarification provided in response to the request for review regarding the time lag between baseline and the project campaign; and

(iii) A revised calculation of the baseline emission factor by applying hours corresponding to the normal campaign length instead of the total operating hours of the campaign.

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

General guidance

63. The Board considered the draft "Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements"¹⁵ and requested the Meth Panel to work on the part related to the proposed conservative approach in the case of delayed calibration (paragraph 4(a) and 4(b) of the draft document) for consideration of the Board at its fifty-first meeting.

64. The Board agreed to the "Procedures for requests for deviation prior to submitting request for issuance" and its related form "Form for submission of requests for deviation prior to submitting request for issuance", as contained in [annex 26](#) and [annex 27](#) to this report, respectively. This procedure and its related form, along with the "Procedures for requests to the Executive Board for deviation from an approved methodology" (EB49, annex 4), replaces the Procedures for requests for deviation to the Executive Board (version 02, EB24, annex 30) and its related form and includes revisions in the procedures with respect to requesting deviation prior to submitting the request for issuance.



65. The Board agreed to the revision of the "Procedures for revising monitoring plans in accordance with paragraph 57 of the Modalities and Procedures of the CDM" (version 02) and its related form "Form to submit request for revision of monitoring plan", as contained in [annex 28](#) and [annex 29](#) to this report, respectively. The revision was made to streamline the process and further clarify how the DOE should conduct the validation of revision of monitoring plan. The Board noted that the revised procedure does not provide indicative timelines for completeness check by the secretariat, as the secretariat is still dealing with pending submissions. The Board further requested the secretariat to report to the Board on the progress on this issue and propose to the Board a revision to the procedure which includes timeline for this step in the future.

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

Resources

66. The Board took note of the report by the secretariat on the status of implementation of activities in the 2009 CDM-MAP including the status of recruitment of positions approved. The Board further urged the secretariat to continue in its effort to fill vacant positions taking into account the proposals made by the Board, including the provision of training opportunities to complement the skills of staff and the review of requirements for vacant positions in order to broaden the pool of suitable candidates. The Board further requested the secretariat to provide an update on the status of the CDM-MAP at its fifty-first meeting.

67. The Board also considered the initial assessment of compliance with indicative timelines set by the Board in different processes and requested the secretariat to update the Board at every meeting on these timelines, including the rationale if these timelines could not be met.

68. The Board took note of information provided by the secretariat on the status of resources received as reflected in [annex 30](#). It was noted that since the forty-eighth meeting of the Board, the income generated by registration fees, share of proceeds and methodology fees has grown by an additional USD 5 million as a result of the payment of USD 3.2 million in registration fees, USD 2.8 million in share of proceeds and USD 7,984 in methodologies fees.

Agenda item 5. Other matters

Agenda sub-item 5 (a): Requests by CMP to the Board

69. In response to the request of the CMP at its fourth session, the Board considered the possible measures to improve the efficiency in the operation of the CDM identified during its policy retreat held back-to-back with this meeting. The Board requested the secretariat to prepare draft recommendations to the CMP based on the agreed elements identified at the two retreats for consideration at its next meeting.

70. The Board took note of the status of the requests made by the CMP (Decision 2/CMP.4) to the Board through a workplan prepared by the secretariat which structures the guidance, mandates, activities and timelines. The Board further agreed to the main elements to be included in its annual report and to consider the draft annual report to the CMP for adoption at its next meeting.

Agenda sub-item 5 (b): Transparency matters

71. The Board took note of the update by the secretariat in relation to the workplan responding to the request made by the CMP to the Board through the decision 2/CMP4 paragraph 12 and agreed to the revision to the "Definitions and preliminary classification of document types of the Board", as contained in [annex 31](#) to this report.

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

72. The Board discussed ways and means to enhance the communication with project participants without going through the DOEs and a proposed approach presented by the secretariat. The Board further requested the secretariat to initiate activities in this area and to report to the Board on progress at a future meeting.

73. 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.

74. 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 fiftieth meeting of the Executive Board shall have registered with the secretariat by **23 September 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 (d): Other business

75. The Board agreed on the provisional agenda for its fiftieth meeting (13 - 16 October 2009) as contained in [annex 32](#) to this report, with an open session on the 14 - 16 October 2009.

Agenda item 6. Conclusion of the meeting

76. The Chair summarized the main conclusions.

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

77. 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

78. The Chair closed the meeting.

Annexes to the report**Membership issues**

Annex 1 - Documents related to conflict of interest

Accreditation

Annex 2 - SGS United Kingdom Ltd. - Details of non-conformities and identified corrective actions

Annex 3 - Policy framework to address non-compliance by DOEs (version 01)

Methodologies

Annex 4 - Procedures for requests to the Executive Board for deviation from an approved methodology (version 01)



Annex 5 - Form for submission of requests for deviation from methodology (F-CDM-DEV-METH) (version 01)

Matters relating to the registration of CDM project activities

Annex 6 -Scope of review (registration) - Project 1745

Annex 7 -Scope of review (registration) - Project 2124

Annex 8 -Scope of review (registration) - Project 2127

Annex 9 -Scope of review (registration) - Project 2152

Annex 10 -Scope of review (registration) - Project 2381

Annex 11 -Scope of review (registration) - Project 2427

Annex 12 -Scope of review (registration) - Project 2445

Annex 13 -Scope of review (registration) - Project 2461

Annex 14 -Scope of review (registration) - Project 2471

Annex 15 -Scope of review (registration) - Project 2504

Annex 16 -Scope of review (registration) - Project 2507

Annex 17 -Scope of review (registration) - Project 2508

Annex 18 -Scope of review (registration) - Project 2511

Annex 19 -Scope of review (registration) - Project 2519

Annex 20 -Scope of review (registration) - Project 2530

Annex 21 -Guidelines for the consideration of request for review and review cases (version 01)

Annex 22 - Revision to "Guidelines for the demonstration and assessment of prior consideration of the CDM" (version 03)

Matters relating to the issuance of CERs and the CDM registry

Annex 23 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0028

Annex 24 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0170

Annex 25 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0966

Annex 26 - Procedures for requests for deviation prior to submitting request for issuance (version 01)

Annex 27 - Form for submission of requests for deviation prior to submitting request for issuance F-CDM-DEV-ISS (version 01)

Annex 28 - Procedures for revising monitoring plans in accordance with paragraph 57 of the Modalities and Procedures of the CDM (version 02)

Annex 29 - Form to submit request for revision of monitoring plan F-CDM- REVMP (version 01)



Management plan and resources for the work on the CDM

Annex 30 - Status of resources

Other matters

Annex 31 - Definitions of document types issued by the Board (version 02)

Annex 32 - Provisional agenda for EB50

- - - - -



Endnotes

1. Annex 2 and 3 to the annotated agenda
2. Annex 4 to the annotated agenda
3. Annex 6 to the annotated agenda
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 information submitted in the response to the request for review regarding: (i) the project start date; (ii) the suitability of the investment cost and the electricity tariff applied in the investment analysis; and (iii) the monitoring of the methane fraction of the LFG.
5. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PPP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted for the response to the request for review regarding the validation of key input values, except electricity tariff.
6. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the DOE shall submit a revised validation report which incorporate the information submitted in the response to the request for review regarding the amount of compost generated per tone of EFB, the amount of EFB generated per tone of FFB, the value used for the Methane Correction Factor (MCF) and the monitoring of the parameter Aj,x. In addition, the DOE is requested to submit the laboratory analysis regarding the percentage of compost generated per ton of EFB.
7. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the DOE shall: (i) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the common practice analysis; and (ii) validate the proposed project activity using the methodology ACM0012, version 3.
8. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the DOE shall: (i) validate the proposed project activity using the methodology ACM0012, version 3; and (ii) 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 assumed natural gas price, impact on TRT by the project activity, and monitoring plan.
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 for the response to the request for review regarding the boiler efficiency.
10. 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 baseline alternatives and the calculation of levelized cost per unit of generation.
11. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the DOE shall: (i) validate the proposed project activity using the methodology ACM0012, version 3; and (ii) 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 total investment and interest rate applied in the economic comparison analysis, availability of waste gas, and exclusion of monitoring the rate of other fuels used by each boilers.
12. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the DOE shall: (i) validate the proposed project activity using the methodology ACM0012, version 3; and (ii) submit a revised PDD and the



corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the waste BFG/pressure availability, electricity imports from the grid, and monitoring plan.

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: (i) incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding non-venting of waste heat prior to the project activity; and (ii) validate the proposed project activity using the methodology ACM0012, version 3.
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: (i) incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of input values to the investment cost comparison; and (ii) further conducts a sensitivity analysis on the investment cost comparison.
15. Annex 9 to the annotated agenda of 49th meeting of the Board