



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

Date: 04 December 2009  
Ref: CDM-EB-51

**EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE CLEAN DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM**

**FIFTY-FIRST MEETING**

**Report Version 01.1\***

**Date of meeting:** 30 November - 4 December 2009

**Location:** Copenhagen, Denmark

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

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

<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. Martin Hession, Mr. Lex de Jonge, 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 was unable to attend the meeting and had provided proper justification for his absence.

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

3. The Board adopted the 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-fifth progress report on the work of the CDM Accreditation Panel (CDM-AP), and an oral report by the Vice-chair, Mr. Samuel 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, performance assessments and other accreditation related issues.

***Case specific***

5. The Board considered recommendations of the CDM-AP, and decided to reject the applications of the following two (2) applicant entities, based on significant issues raised in the initial desk reviews. To date, neither AE has addressed these issues and their inaction has been deemed to be outside the time provided for by the CDM accreditation procedure.
  - (a) Clouston Environment Sdn Bhd (Clouston);
  - (b) Dahua Engineering Management Group Ltd. (DEM).
6. The Board considered a recommendation of the CDM-AP and decided to re-accredit for three (3) years the entity 'Korean Foundation for Quality' (KFQ) for the validation and verification/certification functions in sectoral scopes 1-5, 9-11 and 13.
7. The Board took note of a notification submitted by the CDM-AP on the successful outcome of a performance assessment activity for the entity 'Korea Energy Management Corporation' (KEMCO).
8. The Board took note of a notification submitted by the CDM-AP on the expiration of the accreditation of the entity 'KPMG Advisory N.V.' (KPMG).
9. The Board considered a recommendation of the CDM-AP relating to the entity under spot-check 'SGS United Kingdom Ltd.' (SGS) and decided to terminate its suspension with immediate effect. The Board decided to monitor the activities of this entity through a surveillance visit to be carried out within three (3) months to check the full implementation of all of the identified corrective actions and their effectiveness, with particular emphasis on the first and fourth non-conformities.
10. The Board decided to conduct a spot-check of the entity 'TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH' (TÜV SÜD). The Board agreed on the scope of the spot-check and requested the CDM-AP to complete



the process in an expedited manner and submit its recommendation for the consideration of the Board.

11. The Board decided to conduct a spot-check of the entity 'TÜV NORD Cert GmbH' (TÜV NORD). The Board agreed on the scope of the spot-check and requested the CDM-AP to complete the process in an expedited manner and submit its recommendation for the consideration of the Board for consideration at a future meeting.

12. The Board considered its decision contained in paragraph 8 of the report of its fiftieth meeting, with regard to the projects activities validated by the entity 'Japan Consulting Institute' (JCI) that were already in registration process, where the Board had allowed JCI to accomplish the work. The Board noted that three (3) projects activities (3039, 3041, 3042) were omitted from the text of the original decision and agreed to extend provisions of the paragraph 8 of the report of its fiftieth meeting to these three (3) project activities.

### *General guidance*

13. The Board considered an updated presentation on the concept of materiality as it relates to CDM, including three examples previously requested by the Board giving additional information on the impact of applying the concept in CDM project activities. After an extensive discussion the Board agreed that the introduction of the concept and its use was premature given the current stage of development of the CDM but could merit further consideration at a future meeting.

14. The Board agreed to the implementation plan of the policy framework to monitor performance and address non-compliance by DOEs, as contained in [annex 2](#) to this report.

15. With a view to increasing transparency in the implementation of the framework referred in the paragraph above, the Board requested the following to the secretariat:

- (a) To review the classification of issues at an earlier stage;
- (b) To ensure that the expectations and priorities of the Board are clearly communicated through the classification and weighting system;
- (c) To appropriately take account of the difference in size of the DOEs in preparing its recommendations on thresholds;
- (d) To introduce other sanctions in addition to those of a spot-check and suspension;
- (e) To present a progress update on the implementation of the framework with appropriate incorporation of its concerns and any CDM-AP input at its next meeting.

The Board further emphasized its role in the decision to trigger a spot-check.

16. Due to lack of time, the Board was unable to consider a draft procedure for establishing an appeal process against DOEs by project participants (PPs) and agreed to consider it at a future meeting.

17. The Board agreed to the revision of the Validation and Verification Manual, as version 01.1, as contained in [annex 3](#) to this report.

18. The Board requested the secretariat to develop a procedure, in collaboration with the CDM-AP, to address liability of the DOEs for excess issuance of the CERs in the context of the validation and verification activities which they have carried out. The proposal should take into account provisions stipulated in the paragraph 22 of the CDM Modalities and Procedures, Validation and Verification Manual, CDM Accreditation Standard and other relevant documents. The draft procedure should be considered by the Board at its fifty-third meeting.



19. The Board requested the secretariat, in consultation with the chair of the CDM-AP, to prepare a draft work programme of the CDM-AP for the coming year for consideration of the Board at its next meeting. The work programme should provide for a revision after the first half of the year based on the progress made and priority of the matters to be considered by the CDM-AP.
20. The Board requested the CDM-AP to review geographical distribution of the assessment experts on the roster and re-open the call for additional applications, as necessary.
21. The Board considered the shortlist of candidates prepared by the secretariat in response to the call for experts to replace an outgoing member of the Accreditation Panel. The Board agreed to appoint Mr. Vinay Deodhar as methodological expert in the Accreditation Panel for the term of two (2) years.
22. The Board thanked the outgoing member of the CDM-AP, Mr. Narendra Paruchuri, for his contribution to the work of the CDM-AP.
23. The Board agreed to launch a call for experts starting on 16 December 2009 and ending on 26 February 2010 in order to replace the outgoing members of the CDM-AP with a view to prepare a shortlist of experts for consideration by the Board at its fifty-third meeting. Members currently serving on the CDM-AP are encouraged to submit their applications, for automatic inclusion in the shortlist, should they wish to continue.
24. The Board noted that the forty-sixth meeting of the CDM-AP is scheduled for 18 - 20 January 2010.

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

25. The Board took note of the report of the forty-first meeting of the panel on baseline and monitoring methodologies (Meth Panel), and an oral report by the Vice-Chair of the panel, Mr. Pedro Martins Barata, on the work of the panel.

#### *Case specific*

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

#### *Approve cases:*

- (a) **AM0084** - "Installation of cogeneration system supplying electricity and chilled water to new and existing consumers", which was proposed as NM0288 "Installation of Combined Cooling Heating and Power (CCHP) systems in commercial buildings of DLF Building - 10, Gurgaon, India" and link it to scope 1 (Energy industries), as contained in the [annex 4](#) of this report.
- (b) **AM0085** - "Co-firing of biomass residues for electricity generation in grid connected power plants" which was proposed as NM0304 "Co-firing of Biomass Residues for Electricity Generation" and link it to scope 1 (Energy industries), as contained in the [annex 5](#) of this report.
27. **Not to approve cases:** NM0293, NM0314, NM0317 and NM0324 which, if revised taking into account comments, can be resubmitted but will require new expert and public input.

***Responses to requests for clarification***

28. The Board took note of the responses to clarifications provided by the Meth Panel on the cases requests for clarification AM\_CLA\_0163, AM\_CLA\_0165, AM\_CLA\_0166, AM\_CLA\_0167 and AM\_CLA\_0168. The Board, due to time constraint, could not consider the request made by the forty-first meeting of Meth Panel (see paragraph 14, MP41) to the Board for the guidance on applicability criteria of swing plants under AM0001, in response to the request for clarification AM\_CLA\_0164. The Board will consider this request for guidance at its next meeting.

***Responses to requests for revisions***

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

- (a) To accept request AM\_REV\_0159 concerning revision of the approved methodology AM0079 in the calculation of the project emissions for the reclamation of SF6 in the SF6 production facility, and modification of the decision making flowchart to account for emissions when a piece of equipment had to be dismantled between two different testing items during a test, due to invalid testing or equipment assembly error;
- (b) Not to accept request AM\_REV\_0165 concerning revision of the approved methodology ACM0006 to allow the installation of a new biomass residue fired power plant at a site where a fossil fuel-fired power plant has been retired;
- (c) Not to accept request AM\_REV\_0166 concerning revision of the approved methodology ACM0006 to provide a definition of Greenfield projects to those cases where no power was generated prior to the implementation of the project activity, by adding a time limitation of two years for such cases;
- (d) Not to accept request AM\_REV\_0167 concerning revision of the approved methodology ACM0006 to include a new baseline scenario;
- (e) To accept request AM\_REV\_0168 concerning revision of the approved methodology AM0036 to cover a broader range of heat generation equipment, in addition to boilers to which existing version of methodology is applicable;
- (f) To accept request AM\_REV\_0170 concerning revision of the approved methodology AM0074 to include the use of back-up fuels up to 15% on energy basis;
- (g) Not to accept request AM\_REV\_0171 concerning revision of the approved methodology ACM0006 to include biogas generated by anaerobic wastewater treatment using approved and applicable methodologies for greenfield projects.

***Revision of approved methodologies***

30. The Board revised the following approved methodologies:

- (a) **AM0036:** The revision expands the technologies for heat generation to other heat generation equipment, in addition to boilers, to which the existing methodology is applicable. The revision is contained in annex 6 of this report.
- (b) **AM0069:** The revision includes the provision that the methodology can be used for the cases where town gas is supplied to consumers through the existing town gas pipeline and that the project boundary does not cover the distribution grid. The revision is contained in annex 7 of this report.



(c) **AM0074:** The revision permits the use of back-up fuels up to 15% on energy basis. The revision is contained in annex 8 of this report.

(d) **AM0079:** The revision provides the change in calculation of the project emissions for the reclamation of SF6 in the SF6 production facility. The revision is contained in annex 9 of this report.

(e) **ACM0012:** The editorial revision corrects an error in the description of Equation (1-h) of Method 3 of capping of baseline emissions. The editorial revision is contained in annex 10 of this report.

The revised versions of the methodologies referred to in the paragraphs above will come into effect on 18 December 2009, 24:00 GMT, in accordance with the procedure for the revision of approved methodologies.

### *General guidance*

31. The Board, due to time constraints, could not consider the draft revised procedures for the submission and consideration of a proposed new methodology, procedures on requests for revisions and requests for clarifications of approved methodologies as well its related forms and agreed to consider this issue at the next meeting.

32. The Board considered the draft work programmes of the Methodologies Panel, Small Scale Working Group and Afforestation and Reforestation Working Group for the first semester of year 2010 prepared based on the action plan agreed by the Board at its fiftieth meeting and contained in annex 11 to this report, which includes the priorities agreed by the Board on its work on methodological issues.

33. By considering the draft workprogramme mentioned in the paragraph above, the Board provided several inputs to the secretariat, which have to be taken into account to revise the work programme before presenting it to the fifty-second meeting of the Board. The Board particularly emphasized that all the efforts should be made by panel and working groups to simplify the methodologies, to the extent possible.

34. The Board, while assessing request for issuance for projects applying AM0034 version 2, noted inconsistent approaches in the application of the requirements of the methodology to calculate the EFBL when the baseline campaign length is greater than normal campaign length and to re-calculate the EFBL when the project campaign length is shorter than normal campaign length. The Board agreed to provide clarification on these requirements as contained in annex 12 of this report. The Board further agreed to request the Meth Panel to revise the methodology, in the view to include the clarification it provided in this meeting and to provide further detail on how the calculation of the mean values for NCSG, VSG and the baseline emissions in different situations should be conducted.

35. The Board agreed to launch a call for experts starting on 16 December 2009 and ending on 26 February 2010 in order to replace the outgoing members of the Meth Panel with a view to prepare a shortlist of experts for consideration by the Board at its fifty-third meeting. Members currently serving on the Meth Panel are encouraged to submit their application, for automatic inclusion in the short list, should they wish to continue.

### *Further schedule*

36. The Board noted that the forty-second meeting of the panel will be held from 18 - 22 January 2010.

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

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

***General guidance***

38. The Board approved "Guidelines on conditions under which increase in GHG emissions related to displacement of pre-project grazing activities in A/R CDM project activity is insignificant", as contained in [annex 13](#) to this report.

39. The Board approved "Guidelines on conditions under which increase in GHG emissions related to displacement of pre-project crop cultivation activities in A/R CDM project activity is insignificant", as contained in [annex 14](#) to this report.

40. The Board approved the A/R methodological tool: "Estimation of the increase in GHG emissions attributable to displacement of pre-project agricultural activities in A/R CDM project activity", as contained in [annex 15](#) to this report. The Board further agreed that the tool shall supersede the approved A/R methodological tool: "Estimation of GHG emissions related to displacement of grazing activities in A/R CDM project activity" effective of 04 June 2011.

41. The Board requested the secretariat to prepare draft revisions to those approved A/R CDM baseline and monitoring methodologies that are affected by the tool and the guidelines referred to in paragraphs 38, 39 and 40 above, and in doing so further increase their consistency with each other, especially if they differ in approaches applied for similar issues.

42. The Board agreed to launch a call for experts starting on 16 December 2009 and ending on 26 February 2010 in order to replace the outgoing members of the A/R WG with a view to prepare a shortlist of experts for consideration by the Board at its fifty-third meeting. Members currently serving on the A/R WG are encouraged to submit their application, for automatic inclusion in the short list, should they wish to continue.

***Further schedule***

43. The Board noted that the twenty-seventh meeting of the A/R WG will be held from 17 - 19 February 2010.

44. The Board reminded project participants that the deadline for the twenty-fifth round of submissions of proposed new A/R methodologies is 1 March 2010. 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**

45. The Board took note of the report on the work of the twenty-third 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 Chair, Mr. Hugh Sealy, on the work of the group.

**Revisions of approved methodologies:**

46. The Board agreed to the revised approved small-scale methodologies:
- (a) “AMS-II.D Energy efficiency and fuel switching measures for industrial facilities”, to expand its applicability to cases involving energy efficiency measures in multiple industrial facilities in distributed locations, as contained in [annex 16](#) of this report. Revisions also clarify that monitoring of each of the facilities is to be undertaken in such cases.
  - (b) “AMS-III.Q Waste energy recovery (gas/heat/pressure) projects”, to include options to export of energy generated by the project activity to other facilities as well as procedures and formulae for the calculation of baseline emission from thermal energy generation. The revisions also exclude recovery of waste heat in a single-cycle power plant (e.g., gas turbine or diesel generator) to generate electricity consistent with the provisions of ACM0012. Revisions also further clarify that the methodology is only applicable to facilities existing at the start date of the project (as per para 67, EB 41). The revisions are contained in [annex 17](#) of this report.
  - (c) “AMS-II.G Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass”, to include (a) default efficiency factors for baseline cook stoves, (b) procedures for sampling (c) revised procedures for determination of quantity of woody biomass that can be considered as non renewable, and (d) clarifications as to which leakage requirements are appropriate for projects versus PoAs. The revisions are contained in [annex 18](#) of this report.
  - (d) "AMS-I.C. Thermal energy production with or without electricity”, to expand its applicability to biomass based cogeneration project activities supplying surplus electricity to a grid as contained in [annex 19](#) of this report. The revision also clarifies that leakage from biomass transportation is to be considered only for cases where biomass is transported over a distance of 200 km or more.
47. The revised versions of the SSC methodologies referred to in the paragraph above will come into effect on 18 December 2009, 24:00 GMT in accordance with the procedure for the revision of approved SSC methodologies.

**General guidance**

48. The Board agreed to launch a call for experts starting on 16 December 2009 and ending on 26 February 2010 in order to replace the outgoing members of the SSC WG with a view to prepare a shortlist of candidates for consideration by the Board at its fifty-third meeting. Outgoing SSC WG members are encouraged to submit their application, for automatic inclusion in the short list, should they wish to continue.
49. With reference to paragraph 31 of forty-ninth meeting report of the Board requesting alignment of fees paid to the SSC WG members with that of procedures of Meth Panel, the Board agreed that the revised fees be implemented with immediate effect.

**Further schedule**

50. The Board noted that the twenty-fourth meeting of the SSC WG will be held from 16 - 19 February 2010.

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

51. The Board took note that two programme of activities had been registered as CDM project activities.



52. The Board considered the draft "Guideline for the demonstration of additionality in the context of PoAs" and agreed to give further consideration to this issue at its next meeting.

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

53. The Board took note that 1938 CDM project activities have been registered by 4 December 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*

54. 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 49 requests for registration.

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

(a) "Yunnan Dehong Nongling Hydropower Project" (1930) if the project participant 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 suitability of the:

(i) Coefficient of effective electricity generation (95%) or the difference between the expected generation and the amount of electricity generation assumed in the IRR calculation; and

(ii) PLF, including the reduction of such amount by nearly 18% from year 12 onwards given the size of the project activity. Although the DOE response regarding the coefficient of effective electricity generation is not satisfactory; however, as the IRR does not cross the benchmark when 100% coefficient is applied, the Board considers the project activity additional.

(b) "CDM project of Moinho and Barracao Small Hydropower Plant" (2500) if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-NORD) 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 the: The DOE should also confirm whether Barracao plant has the earliest project starting date between the two plants; Barracao and Moinho. The PP should also include a separate monitoring plan for Moinho and Barracao hydropower plants in section B.7.2. of the revised PDD.

(i) Project activity start date;

(ii) Input values of the IRR calculation; and

(iii) Common practice analysis.

(c) "Fujian Pingnan Jinzaqiao Hydropower Project" (2596) if the project participant and the DOE (JQA) 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 the input values to the investment analysis, in particular, total static investment and PLF.

(d) "El Chaparral Hydroelectric Project (El Salvador)" (2607) if the project participant 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 change of the project activity start date and the details of the revised NPV calculations for the project activity and coal-based alternative respectively.



(e) “VN08-WWS-03, Methane Recovery and Biogas Utilization Project, Yen Bai Province, Vietnam” (2638) if the project participant 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 start date of the project activity, the *ex-ante* grid emission factor and the monitoring of  $Q_{y,ww}$  and project activity emissions; and

(ii) Confirm: (i) that the baseline wastewater treatment system is adequate for the increase in starch production to 45,000 tonnes per year, (ii) that the volume of wastewater treated will be determined based on the average of at least daily meter readings; and (iii) the correct value for the *ex-ante* grid emission factor;

(iii) Amend the monitoring plan in order to incorporate the monitoring of the quantity of air/thermal oil heated by the burner, specific heat content of air/thermal oil and hours of operation of the burner.

(f) “Eiamburapa Company Ltd. Tapioca starch wastewater biogas extraction and utilization project, Sakaeo Province, Kingdom of Thailand” (2678) if the project participant 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 sensitivity analysis for the fuel price and the prevailing practice barrier.

(g) “Pakarab Fertiliser Co-generation Power Project” (2687) if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the institutional barriers, the equipment lifetime, and the emission of methane and nitrous oxide.

(h) “Hubei Wufeng Tangjia River Hydropower Bundled Project” (2691) if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-NORD) 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 and the application of zero fair value. While the application of zero fair value of the project activity assets at the end of the assessment period has not been fully substantiated, the Board considered that the project is additional as the application of a 5 to 80% fair value to the investment analysis, the project IRR does not reach the benchmark.

(i) “Siam Cement (Ta Luang) Waste Heat Power Generation Project, Thailand (TL5&6 Project)” (2695) if the project participant 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 suitability of additional expenses, benchmark, demand charges, diesel consumption by the diesel generator sets, and electricity demand projection;

(ii) Remove the reference of barrier analysis; and

(iii) Include the monitoring of diesel consumption and account for it as project emissions.

(j) “Siam Cement (Thung Song) Waste Heat Power Generation Project, Thailand (TS5 Project)” (2696) if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of capacity and power generation; additional expenses; benchmark; and projection of electricity demand.



- (k) “15 MW Biomass Residue Based Power Project at Ghazipur, India” (2708) if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-NORD) 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, the sensitivity analysis, the prior consideration of CDM, and the availability of biomass in the region. A revised spreadsheet should also be submitted to include the updated sensitivity analysis.
- (l) “Generation of electricity from 3.3 MW installed capacity wind mills by Mission Biofuels India Private Limited (MBIPL), in Sangli District, Maharashtra, India” (2710) if the project participant 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 project activity start date, IRR input values, *ex-ante* grid emission factor and monitoring plan.
- (m) “Grid connected energy efficient power generation” (2716) if the project participant 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, the justification of the use of the levelized costs as financial indicator, the monitoring plan, the local stakeholders consultation, and the analysis of environmental impact.
- (n) “Xile and Huangqing 6.15 MW Bundled Hydropower Project in Jiangxi Province” (2743) if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the additionality of the project activity, in particular, the validation of input values.
- (o) “1.5 MW Grid connected Wind Electricity Generation at Tirunelveli District, Tamilnadu, India by Kallam Agro Products and Oils Private Limited” (2770) if the project participant and the DOE (BVC) 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 the benchmark used in the investment analysis and the appropriateness of the start date of the project activity.
- (p) “Hubei Jiugongshan Wind Farm CDM Project” (2781) if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of input values to the investment analysis.
- (q) “Luodu Small Hydropower Project” (2788) if the project participant 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 the input values and the income tax calculation. The Board has noted that the comparison of investment cost per MWh of the project activity with those of other CDM projects was inappropriate but has closed the issue based on the comparison with actual cost. The Board has also noted that the DOE has not correctly addressed the issue on the income tax calculation but has also closed the issue as the IRR does not cross the benchmark even when the income tax is calculated considering loans and interest payments.
- (r) “Santana I SHP CDM Project (JUN 1118)” (2793) if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-NORD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the sensitivity analysis and validation of input values.



56. 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.
57. The Board agreed to undertake a review of the project activity:
- (a) “Heilongjiang Daqing Ruihao Wind Farm Project” (1422) submitted for registration by the DOE (BVCH) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 20](#) to this report;<sup>1</sup>
  - (b) “Liaoning Faku Wanghaisi East Wind Power Project” (1965) 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 21](#) to this report;<sup>2</sup>
  - (c) “Inner Mongolia Wuliji Wind Farm Project” (2483) submitted for registration by the DOE (BVCH) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 22](#) to this report;<sup>3</sup>
  - (d) “Jilin Liaoyuan 50MW Level Biomass Cogeneration Project” (2563) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV SÜD) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 23](#) to this report;<sup>4</sup>
  - (e) “Yunnan Yunpeng Hydropower Project” (2580) submitted for registration by the DOE (TECO) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 24](#) to this report;<sup>5</sup>
  - (f) “Shandong Dongying 1st phase Wind Power Project” (2584) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 25](#) to this report;<sup>6</sup>
  - (g) “Jilin Da’an Dagangzi Wind Power Project Phase II” (2586) 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>7</sup>
  - (h) “Tangshan Jidong Cement Matoushan Matishan 25MW Cement Waste heat Recovery Project” (2587) 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>8</sup>
  - (i) “Fujian Zhangpu Liuaio 3rd phase Wind Power Project” (2589) 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>9</sup>
  - (j) “Inner Mongolia Keyouqianqi Wind Farm Project” (2593) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 29](#) to this report;<sup>10</sup>
  - (k) “Hainan Danzhou Eman Wind Power Project” (2604) 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;<sup>11</sup>
  - (l) “Project JBS S/A-Slaughterhouse Wastewater Aerobic Treatment-Barra do Garças Unit” (2609), 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;<sup>12</sup>



- (m) "Inner Mongolia Chifeng Saihanba Tashanzi Wind Power Project" (2615), 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 32](#) to this report;<sup>13</sup>
- (n) Inner Mongolia Chifeng Saihanba Qingmachang Wind Power Project" (2617), 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;<sup>14</sup>
- (o) "Lixo Zero Composting Project" (2628), submitted for registration by the DOE (SGS), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 34](#) to this report;<sup>15</sup>
- (p) "AGA FANO Liquid CO<sub>2</sub> production using CO<sub>2</sub> from a fermentation plant at Ingenio Providencia" (2630), submitted for registration by the DOE (ICONTEC), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 35](#) to this report;<sup>16</sup>
- (q) "Utilization of the heat content of tail gas at PT Cabot Indonesia, Cilegon" (2646), 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 36](#) to this report;
- (r) "Jiangxi Fengcheng CMM Distribution Project" (2666), 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>17</sup>
- (s) "BAJ Pakuan Agung Factory tapioca starch wastewater biogas extraction and utilization project, Lampung Province, Republic of Indonesia" (2674), 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 38](#) to this report;
- (t) "Sichuan Furong Coal Mine Methane Utilization Project" (2677), 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 39](#) to this report;<sup>18</sup>
- (u) "Gansu Yumen Diwopu Wind Power Project" (2680), submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 40](#) to this report;
- (v) "Jilin Shuangliao 2nd Phase Wind Power Project" (2685), submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 41](#) to this report;<sup>19</sup>
- (w) "Siam Cement (Kaeng Khoi) Waste Heat Power Generation Project, Thailand (KK6 Project)" (2697), submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 42](#) to this report;<sup>20</sup>
- (x) "Sichuan Xiba Small Hydro Power Project" (2725), 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 43](#) to this report;<sup>21</sup>
- (y) "Shandong Laizhou phase II Wind Power Project" (2730), submitted for registration by the DOE (BVCH), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 44](#) to this report;<sup>22</sup>



- (z) “Tangshan Jidong Cement Guye District 8 MW Cement Waste Heat Recovery Project” (2731), submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 45](#) to this report;<sup>23</sup>
- (aa) “IMAR Debaotu Wind Farm Phase I 49.5MW Project” (2732), submitted for registration by the DOE (BVCH), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 46](#) to this report;
- (ab) “Tangshan Jidong Cement Fengrun District 12 MW Cement Waste heat Recovery Project” (2733), 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 47](#) to this report;<sup>24</sup>
- (ac) “SeAH Besteel fuel switching project” (2735), submitted for registration by the DOE (KFQ), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 48](#) to this report;
- (ad) “31 MW Wind energy project in, India by Grace Infrastructure Pvt Ltd” (2813), 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 49](#) to this report;<sup>25</sup>
- (ae) “Biomass based Power Plant in Polakpalli Village, Gulbarga District, Karnataka” (2895), 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 50](#) to this report;<sup>26</sup>
58. 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.
59. 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 the 15 of the project activities which were placed “Under review” at the fiftieth meeting of the Board.
60. In accordance with paragraphs 17 and 18 (b) of the procedures mentioned in paragraph 36, the Board agreed to register, subject to satisfactory corrections, the project activities:
- (a) “Hebei Shangyi Manjing North Wind Farm Project” (1792) if the project participant and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the 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 PP and the DOE should note the Board’s concerns regarding the suitability of the tariff as indicated in EB49, paragraph 48 and the additional information contained in the general guidance section of this report below;
- (b) “Liaoning Faku Heping Wind Power Project” (1924) if the project participant and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the 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 PP and the DOE should note the Board’s concerns regarding the suitability of the tariff as indicated in EB49, paragraph 48 and the additional information contained in the general guidance section of this report below;



- (c) “Liaoning Faku Baijiagou Wind Power Project” (2123) if the project participant and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which:
- (i) Incorporate the additional information submitted in response to the request for review
  - (ii) Appropriately incorporates interest payments for the purpose of the income tax calculation
  - (iii) Further substantiate the suitability of the tariff as a means of demonstrating the additionality of the project activity. In undertaking these corrections the PP and the DOE should note the Board’s concerns regarding the suitability of the tariff as indicated in EB49, paragraph 48;
- (d) “Inner Mongolia Xinghe Hangtian Wind Farm Project” (2227) if the project participant and DOE (BVCH) submit a revised PDD and the 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 PP and the DOE should note the Board’s concerns regarding the suitability of the tariff as indicated in EB49, paragraph 48 and the additional information contained in the general guidance section of this report below;
- (e) “CERTEL - Cooperativa Regional de Eletrificação Teutônia Ltda - Small Hydropower Plants” (2375) if the PPs and DOE (SGS) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which include the information submitted in the response to the review’s teams questions, regarding the validation of the plant load factor;
- (f) “Controlled combustion of municipal solid waste and sewage sludge and energy generation in Shaoxing City, People’s Republic of China”(2446) if the PPs and DOE (JQA) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include the information submitted in response to the review team’s question regarding the suitability of input values to the investment analysis in particular:
- (i) The income tax of 33%,
  - (ii) The on-site demand for the sludge drying system of 25% and the heat loss ratio for transportation and distribution of 17%,
  - (iii) The electricity consumption of 23%; and
  - (iv) The thermal tariff of 30.97 Yuan/GJ (excl. VAT).
- (g) “Inner Mongolia Jingneng Saihan Wind Farm Phase I Project” (2567) if the project participant and DOE (BVCH) submit a revised PDD and the 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 PP and the DOE should note the Board’s concerns regarding the suitability of the tariff as indicated in EB49, paragraph 48 and the additional information contained in the general guidance section of this report below;
- (h) “Heilongjiang Fujin 48MW Wind Power Project” (2573) if the project participant and DOE (TÜV-NORD) submit a revised PDD and the 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 PP and the DOE should note the Board’s concerns regarding the suitability of the tariff as indicated in EB49, paragraph 48 and the additional information contained in the general guidance section of this report below;



- (i) "Guohua Wulate Zhongqi Phase I 49.5 MW Wind farm Project"(2597) if the project participant and DOE (BVCH) submit a revised PDD and the 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 PP and the DOE should note the Board's concerns regarding the suitability of the tariff as indicated in EB49, paragraph 48 and the additional information contained in the general guidance section of this report below;
- (j) "Project JBS S/A – Slaughterhouse Wastewater Aerobic Treatment – Vilhena Unit" (2610) if the PPs and DOE ( TÜV-SÜD ) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which include:
- (i) The information submitted in response to the review team's question regarding:  
(1) The confirmation that the readjustment considered in the baseline scenario ensures a volumetric loading rate of COD above 0.1 kg COD m<sup>3</sup> per day in line with the requirements of the applicable methodology, (2) The sensitivity analysis conducted by the PP and validated by the DOE; (3) The changes made to the investment analysis assumptions between the GSC PDD and the PDD submitted for registration;
  - (ii) A further detailed description of the changes made to the baseline assumptions during validation, including the reasons for such changes and their impact on the corresponding calculations.
- (k) "Methane Recovery Project of Fuyu Huihai Alcohol Co., Ltd." (2647) if the PPs and DOE (JCI) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in the response to the review, regarding the suitability of the 12% benchmark ;
- (l) "Xiangfan Huaxin Cement 7.5 MW Waste Heat Recovery as Power Project" (2671) if the PPs and DOE ( TÜV-SÜD ) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report that include the information submitted in response to the review team's questions regarding suitability of grid connection reserved capacity charge and "other manufacture cost", and exclusion of the capacity/demand charge as savings to the project activity ;
- (m) "Tianjin TEDA Sewage Methane Recovery Project" (2676) if the PPs 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 the suitability of the 12% benchmark ;
- (n) "10 MW bundled Luni.III & Luni.II hydroelectric projects for a grid system at Sri Sai Krishna Hydro Energies Private Limited in Kangra District, Himachal Pradesh" (2698) if the PPs and DOE (SGS) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the additional information submitted in response to the Review Team's questions, regarding the suitability of the PLF considered. While the response regarding the issue on the escalation in O&M costs is not satisfactory, the issue is considered closed as the IRR does not cross the benchmark even if no escalation is applied.

61. In accordance with paragraphs 17 and 18 (c) of the procedures mentioned in paragraph 36, the Board could not register the project activity "Sichuan Tiejue 25MW Hydro Power" (2565) as the project participant and the DOE (JCI) have failed to demonstrate that the most plausible baseline scenario has been selected, as it has not been demonstrated that the alternative for the government to buy the project activity is more attractive than the project not undertaken as CDM project activity. The Board further notes that the evidence related to total stoppage of the project activity has not been sufficiently demonstrated.



62. In accordance with the clarifications to paragraph 10 of the above-mentioned procedures the Board considered 8 project activities for which corrections had been submitted in response to the outcome of a previous request for review.

63. The Board agreed to register the project activity "NISCO Converter Gas Recovery and Utilization for Power Generation Project" (2469), taking note of the revised PDD and the revised validation report submitted by the project participant and the DOE (JQA).

64. The Board agreed to undertake a review of the project activity:

(a) "Enercon Wind Farm (Hindustan) Ltd in Rajasthan" (1168) 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;

(b) "CECIC Zhangbei Gaojialiang Wind farm Project" (1895) submitted for registration by the DOE (BVCH) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 52](#) to this report;

(c) "Liaoning Faku 1st phase Wind Power Project" (2223) 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 53](#) to this report;

(d) "Hebei Fengning Luotuogou 1st Phase Wind Power Project" (2462) 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 54](#) to this report;

(e) "Jiangsu Dongling Wind Farm Project" (2532) submitted for registration by the DOE (KEMCO) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 55](#) to this report;

(f) "The Bogeda 40.5 MW Wind-Farm Project in Urumqi, Xinjiang, China" (2537) 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 56](#) to this report;

(g) "Inner Mongolia Ximeng Zheligentü Wind Farm Phase I Project"(2566) submitted for registration by the DOE (BVCH) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 57](#) to this report;

65. In accordance with the clarifications to paragraph 18 (b) of the above-mentioned procedures the Board considered 10 project activities for which corrections had been submitted in response to the outcome of a previous review.

66. The Board could not register the project activities:

(a) "Inner Mongolia Huitengliang Phase II Wind Power Project"(1815) submitted for registration by the DOE (BVCH). The Board considered the corrected project documentation which had been submitted in response to the outcome of a review finalized at EB49. The Board noted that the corrections which had been requested following the review required the DOE to provide information as to whether the tariffs could be considered to be an E- policy and if not to assess in a quantitative manner whether the observed changes in the applicable tariff had resulted in a change in the incentives for investors. The Board considered that the DOE and project participant had failed to either clarify that the tariff could be considered an E- policy or provide a quantitative assessment. The Board could therefore not assess the suitability of the applied tariff and therefore could not register the proposed CDM project activity.



- (b) "Heilongjiang Fujin Phase II 18MW Wind Power Project"(1866) submitted for registration by the DOE (BVCH). The Board considered the corrected project documentation which had been submitted in response to the outcome of a review finalized at EB47. The Board noted that the corrections which had been requested following the review required the DOE to assess, in a quantitative manner, whether the observed changes in the applicable tariff had resulted in a change in the incentives for investors. The Board considered that the DOE and project participant had failed to provide this quantitative assessment and therefore the Board could not assess the suitability of the applied tariff or register the proposed CDM project activity.
- (c) "Inner Mongolia Siziwangqi Bayin'aobao Wind Power Project"(2053) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV). The Board considered the corrected project documentation which had been submitted in response to the outcome of a review finalized at EB47. The Board noted that the corrections which had been requested following the review required the DOE to assess, in a quantitative manner, whether the observed changes in the applicable tariff had resulted in a change in the incentives for investors. The Board considered that the DOE and project participant had failed to provide this quantitative assessment and therefore the Board could not assess the suitability of the applied tariff or register the proposed CDM project activity.
- (d) "Heilongjiang Yilan Hezuolinchang Wind Power Project"(2062) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV). The Board considered the corrected project documentation which had been submitted in response to the outcome of a review finalized at EB47. The Board noted that the corrections which had been requested following the review required the DOE to assess, in a quantitative manner, whether the observed changes in the applicable tariff had resulted in a change in the incentives for investors. The Board considered that the DOE and project participant had failed to provide this quantitative assessment and therefore the Board could not assess the suitability of the applied tariff or register the proposed CDM project activity.
- (e) "Inner Mongolia Bayannaer Chuanjingsumu Wind Power Project"(2099) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV). The Board considered the corrected project documentation which had been submitted in response to the outcome of a review finalized at EB47. The Board noted that the corrections which had been requested following the review required the DOE to assess, in a quantitative manner, whether the observed changes in the applicable tariff had resulted in a change in the incentives for investors. The Board considered that the DOE and project participant had failed to provide this quantitative assessment and therefore the Board could not assess the suitability of the applied tariff or register the proposed CDM project activity.
- (f) "Huadian Kulun 201MW Wind Farm Project"(2100) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV). The Board considered the corrected project documentation which had been submitted in response to the outcome of a review finalized at EB49. The Board noted that the corrections which had been requested following the review required the DOE to provide information as to whether the tariffs could be considered to be an E- policy and if not to assess in a quantitative manner whether the observed changes in the applicable tariff had resulted in a change in the incentives for investors. The Board considered that the DOE and project participant had failed to either clarify that the tariff could be considered an E- policy or provide a quantitative assessment. The Board could therefore not assess the suitability of the applied tariff and therefore could not register the proposed CDM project activity.
- (g) "Guohua Tongliao Kezuo Zhongqi Phase I 49.5 MW Wind Farm Project"(2216) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV). The Board considered the corrected project documentation which had been submitted in response to the outcome of a review finalized at EB47. The Board noted that the corrections which had been requested following the review required the DOE to assess, in a quantitative manner, whether the observed changes in the

applicable tariff had resulted in a change in the incentives for investors. The Board considered that the DOE and project participant had failed to provide this quantitative assessment and therefore the Board could not assess the suitability of the applied tariff or register the proposed CDM project activity.

(h) "Liaoning Changtu Quantou Wind Power Project"(2219) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV). The Board considered the corrected project documentation which had been submitted in response to the outcome of a review finalized at EB47. The Board noted that the corrections which had been requested following the review required the DOE to assess, in a quantitative manner, whether the observed changes in the applicable tariff had resulted in a change in the incentives for investors. The Board considered that the DOE and project participant had failed to provide this quantitative assessment and therefore the Board could not assess the suitability of the applied tariff or register the proposed CDM project activity.

(i) "Yichun xiaochengshan wind power Project"(2312) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV). The Board considered the corrected project documentation which had been submitted in response to the outcome of a review finalized at EB48. The Board noted that the corrections which had been requested following the review required the DOE to assess, in a quantitative manner, whether the observed changes in the applicable tariff had resulted in a change in the incentives for investors. The Board considered that the DOE and project participant had failed to provide this quantitative assessment and therefore the Board could not assess the suitability of the applied tariff or register the proposed CDM project activity.

(j) "Xinjiang Huadian Xiaocaohu the 2nd phase of No.1 Wind Farm project"(2413) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV). The Board considered the corrected project documentation which had been submitted in response to the outcome of a review finalized at EB49. The Board noted that the corrections which had been requested following the review required the DOE to provide information as to whether the tariffs could be considered to be an E-policy and if not to assess in a quantitative manner whether the observed changes in the applicable tariff had resulted in a change in the incentives for investors. The Board considered that the DOE and project participant had failed to either clarify that the tariff could be considered an E-policy or provide a quantitative assessment. The Board could therefore not assess the suitability of the applied tariff and therefore could not register the proposed CDM project activity.

### ***Registration procedure/General guidance***

67. In relation to the projects referred to in paragraph 66 the Board's concerns are noted in paragraph 48 of the report of its forty-ninth meeting.

68. From the information which has been provided to date by DOEs and project participants to support the suitability of the tariff, it has not been possible for the Board to determine whether:

- (a) The tariff can be considered to include a subsidy derived from an E-policy; or
- (b) Decreases in applicable tariffs could be attributed wholly to the reductions in unit investment costs which have occurred or could be considered to be a reduction of any subsidy.

69. In order to assess the appropriateness of the applied tariff, the Board requires project participants and DOEs to provide the quantified information required by EB49 paragraph 48. This would enable the Board to assess whether the guidance provided by the Board in relation to national and sectoral policies (EB22 Annex 3) has been properly assessed. Information on any policy or subsidy existing on or before 11 November 2001 is also required together with supporting information regarding how these policies and subsidies have changed. The Board also requires information on the source of funding for the tariffs paid



to wind power projects given that these tariffs are generally higher than the average price paid for power purchased from thermal-fired power plants.

70. The Board noted that the information provided by project participants and DOEs was insufficient to enable the Board to assess the appropriateness of the tariff. Given the importance of the tariff in the demonstration of the additionality through investment analysis the Board could not accept that the additionality of these specific project activities had been demonstrated.

71. The Board reminded the affected project participants of their right in accordance with paragraph 42 of the CDM M&P to have the proposed CDM project activities revalidated by a DOE and submitted for registration. Should project participants choose to exercise this option, they are requested to take account of and address the concerns expressed in this ruling.

72. The Board noted the important contribution which can be made by wind power to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by non-Annex I Parties and to the achievement of the ultimate objective of the Convention. The Board has and will continue to approve the registration of wind power projects which demonstrate their compliance with the rules established by Parties to the Kyoto Protocol and by the Board, including those related to additionality.

73. The Board further took note of the information presented by the secretariat in the "Initial background document on the development of wind power globally", as contained in Annex 14 to the annotated agenda of this meeting, and requested the secretariat to further develop this information by providing the Executive Board at a future meeting with further information on the policy support programmes in non-Annex I Parties for wind power.

74. The Board also requested the secretariat to draft a "Guideline for the consideration of the E+/E-policies in the demonstration of additionality" for consideration at a future meeting.

75. Due to the time constraints, the Board did not consider the "Procedure for withdrawal of requests for registration", and agreed to consider these proposed procedure at its next meeting.

76. Due to the time constraints, the Board did not consider the information note regarding the "Policy options to assess grid emission factors published by DNAs" and agreed to consider these options at its next meeting.

77. The Board agreed to adopt version 03 of the "Guidelines on the assessment of investment analysis" as contained in annex 58 to this report.

78. With the aim of increasing the transparency and understanding by stakeholders of its rulings on cases the Board agreed to adopt an "Information note regarding previous rulings related to the appropriateness of benchmarks for project activities utilizing waste heat/waste gas for power generation" as contained in annex 59 to this report.

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

79. The Board took note that 355,729,933 CERs have been issued as of 4 December 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***

80. 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 21 requests for issuance.



81. 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) "GHG emission reduction by thermal oxidation of HFC 23 at refrigerant (HCFC-22) manufacturing facility of SRF Ltd" (0115), if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding verification report which incorporates the corrected project emissions from this monitoring period only, and a new request for issuance form corresponding to the corrected amount of CERs.
- (b) "125 MW Wind Power Project in Karnataka, India" (0315), if the project participant and the DOE (BVC) submit a revised monitoring report, a corresponding revised verification report, and a new request for issuance form which include:
  - (i) The correct value of electricity imported in August/2006; and
  - (ii) A Forward Action Request to revise the Monitoring Plan to correct the description of the grid emission factor monitoring at table from item D.2.1.3, in line with VVM paragraph 185.
- (c) "Biomass based independent power project at Malwa Power Private Limited, Mukatsar, Punjab" (0331), if project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which incorporate:
  - (i) Clarification regarding the reasons of the increase in the emission reductions during the monitoring period; and
  - (ii) Correct description of the biomass used for the project activity.
- (d) "El Gallo Hydroelectric Project" (0393), if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding Verification Report and a new request for issuance form which incorporate:
  - (i) An explanation whether the actual installed capacity of the project is inline with the permits, based on evidences assessed by the DOE during on-site visit in accordance with VVM paragraph 188, and the clarification about the difference between the observed capacity and the installed capacity; and
  - (ii) The correct grid emission factor for the monitoring period in consideration, taking into account guidance provided by the Board as contained in paragraph 89 of this report.
- (e) "AWMS GHG Mitigation Project MX06-B-19, Sonora, México" (0428), if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding verification report which incorporate:
  - (i) Clarification on electricity consumption submitted in response to the request for review;
  - (ii) Further clarification by the DOE on the verification of the emission coefficient for electricity (ECy) of 0.719kg CO<sub>2</sub> /kWh submitted in response to the review and 0.523kg CO<sub>2</sub> /kWh and a revised monitoring report which includes reference data; and
  - (iii) Revised spreadsheet which contains formulae for calculation of emission reductions and the verified grid emission factor.



(f) "AWMS GHG Mitigation Project MX06-B-32, Aguascalientes and Guanajuato, México" (0463), if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report including the CER spreadsheet with calculation formulae and a corresponding revised verification report which incorporate:

(i) The clarifications provided in response to the request for review regarding the verification on the project compliance with the 95% confidence level as to methane content measurement, and the verification of the electricity consumption equipments; and

(ii) Further clarification by the DOE on how it has verified the electricity emission factor that was used in the calculation of leakage and why the revised monitoring report submitted in response to the request for review states a different value of 0.719 kg CO<sub>2</sub>/kWh while the PDD states 0.523 kg CO<sub>2</sub>/kWh.

(g) "AWMS GHG Mitigation Project BR05-B-17, Espirito Santo, Mato Grosso, Mato Grosso do Sul, and Minas Gerais, Brazil" (0467), if the DOE (DNV) submit a revised verification report that incorporates the correct means of verification for electricity consumption by the project activity and if the revised monitoring report which includes the reference data and formulae for emission reductions calculation in the spreadsheet cells is displayed in the UNFCCC CDM website.

(h) "AWMS GHG Mitigation Project BR05-B-12, Mato Grosso, Mato Grosso do Sul, Minas Gerais, and Sao Paulo, Brazil " (0472), if the revised monitoring report which includes the reference data and the revised spreadsheet which contains the formulae for emission reductions calculation in the spreadsheet cells are displayed in the UNFCCC CDM website, and the DOE (DNV) submits a revised verification report which incorporate:

(i) The clarifications on the monitoring of methane content at 95% confidence level; and

(ii) The correct means of verification for electricity consumption by the project activity.

(i) "Peruvian Fuel-Switching Project" (1073), if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit the detailed spreadsheet which includes the calculation of the project efficiency and values of all the parameters used in these calculations.

(j) "Fuel switchover from higher carbon intensive fuels to Natural Gas (NG) at Indian Farmers Fertiliser Cooperative Ltd (IFFCO) in Phulpur Village, Allahabad, Uttar Pradesh by M/s Indian Farmers Fertiliser Cooperative Ltd (IFFCO)" (1289), if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised monitoring report, a corresponding revised verification report, and a new request for issuance form which incorporate the application of monitored efficiencies in the emission reduction calculation, as provided in response to the request for review.

(k) "Inner Mongolia Zhuozi 40MW Wind Power Project" (1327), if the project participant and the DOE (BVC) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which include:

(i) Calibration result conducted on 01/04/2008; and

(ii) A Forward Action Request to revise the Monitoring Plan to include the monitoring method for electricity imported from the back up line in line with VVM paragraph 185.



(l) "Project for the catalytic reduction of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions with a secondary catalyst inside the ammonia reactor of the N1 & N2 nitric acid plants at Haifa Chemicals Ltd., Israel " (1369), if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report, a corresponding revised verification report, and a request for issuance form which include:

The baseline emission factor calculation following the Board's clarification as contained in annex 12 of this report; and

Clarifications on the normal operating temperature range N1 and N2 as provided in response to the request for review.

(m) "Irani Wastewater Methane Avoidance Project " (1410), if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding verification report which incorporate clarifications submitted in response to the request for review regarding:

- (i) Actual installed capacity of electric devices; and
- (ii) Calibration frequency in line with the actual practice.

(n) "Regional landfill projects in Chile" (1435), if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding verification report which incorporate:

- (i) Clarifications regarding manufacturer specifications of the flare;
- (ii) Clarifications regarding calibration and re-calibration dates of the temperature and pressure meters and the flare thermocouple; and
- (iii) Re-calculation of emission reductions for the months of July 2009 and September 2009 which takes into account the manufacturer specifications applied to calculate the default values of flare efficiency as provided in response to the request for review.

(o) "Tianji Group Line 2 N<sub>2</sub>O Abatement Project" (1437), if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report, a corresponding revised verification report, and a new request for issuance form which include:

- (i) Clarification on the selection of campaigns for establishing operating parameters and normal campaign length as provided in response to the request for review; and

The baseline emission factor calculation following the Board's clarification as contained in annex 12 of this report.

(p) "CTRVV Landfill emission reduction project" (1491), if the project participant and the DOE (RINA) submit a revised monitoring report, a revised verification report, and a new request for issuance form, which incorporate clarifications provided in response to the request for review regarding:

- (i) Reasons data vintage year 2007 for grid emission factor was used;
- (ii) Validity and frequency of the calibration of relevant equipments; and
- (iii) Information flow relating to the data generating, aggregating, recording and reporting in the verification.



(q) "Waste Heat based Captive Power Project in Hunan Hualing Liangang" (1686), if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which include:

- (i) A correct statement regarding the supply of the electricity generated by the project activity;
- (ii) A Forward Action Request to revise the monitoring plan to reflect the actual number of meters used to measure EGAux and the correct description of all electricity measurement instruments; and
- (iii) The correct description of the instruments used to measure electricity.

82. In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 10 of these procedures, referred in paragraph 80, the Board agreed to undertake a review of the request for issuance of CERs and to appoint members of the review team for:

- (a) "Jilin Tongyu Huaneng 100.05MW Wind Power Project" (0256), 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 60 to this report.<sup>27</sup>
- (b) "Landfill gas recovery and electricity generation at "Mtoni Dumpsite", Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania" (0908), 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 61 to this report.
- (c) "N2O decomposition project of PetroChina Company Limited Liaoyang Petrochemical Company" (1238), submitted by the DOE (SGS) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in annex 62 to this report.
- (d) "Monomeros Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project" (1428), submitted by the DOE (ICONTEC) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in annex 63 to this report<sup>28</sup>

83. 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.

84. 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 three requests for issuances which were placed "Under review" at the fiftieth meeting of the Board.

85. Noting that the calibration/accuracy testing of the meters has not been conducted as per the revised monitoring plan and the relevant guidance provided by the Board for small scale project activity, the Board agreed to instruct the CDM registry administrator to issue CERs for "Vaturu and Wainikasou Hydro Projects" (0089), for the monitoring period 1 November 2006 - 31 October 2007, submitted by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD), subject to a check by the secretariat in consultation with the Chair of the Executive Board, provided that the project participant and the DOE submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report that apply a two (2) percent deduction to the claimed emission reductions.

The Board further noted that the DOE had not addressed the issue appropriately during the verification.

86. The Board agreed to instruct the CDM registry administrator to issue CERs, subject to satisfactory corrections, for "5 MW Renewable Energy Project for a Grid system, India at Beas Nallah in Kullu district of Himachal Pradesh by M/s Sai Engineering Foundation" (0943), for the monitoring period of 5 May 2007 - 31 December 2008, submitted by the DOE (DNV), if the project participant and the DOE submit a



revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which incorporate the clarification on the increase of the total electricity generation and net electricity generation related to the difference between the actual total losses and estimate in the PDD.

87. The Board could not approve the request for issuance of CERs for the project activity "NorthWind Bangui Bay Project" (0453) for the monitoring period 26 August 2007 - 25 August 2008, submitted by the DOE (AENOR), because:

- (a) It has not been sufficiently demonstrated:
  - (i) how the formulae used by the project participant in calculating the electricity supplied to the grid by the project activity has been correctly applied, i.e. readings of the three meters used (M4, M8, and M9) are not reflected on the monitoring report or spreadsheet; and
  - (ii) whether the calculation of electricity supplied takes into account all sources of electricity imports from the grid to the project activity via both substations;
- (b) The DOE failed to request for deviation or revision of the monitoring plan, since the actual monitoring practice is not in accordance with the monitoring plan, i.e. additional meters were installed while the original monitoring plan requires the monitoring of electricity supplied to the grid by project by direct measurement.

88. In accordance with paragraph 96 of the report of the twenty-eighth meeting of the Executive Board, the Board considered a request from a DOE to be permitted to submit previously rejected request for issuance for the same monitoring period covered by the rejection. The Board decided to permit the re-submission of the request for issuance for "Mondi Richards Bay Biomass Project" (0966) submitted by the DOE (DNV) for the monitoring period of 1 October 2005 - 31 March 2007.

### *General guidance*

89. The Board emphasized that in order to ensure an accurate determination of the ex-post grid emission factor during the issuance stage, the project participants should endeavour to use the data vintage for year (y) in which the project generation occurs and report it in the monitoring report submitted to the DOE for verification.

If at the time of submission of monitoring report to the DOE, the data vintage from year y is not available and data from year (y-1) or (y-2) is being used the DOE shall, during verification, assess if more recent data has become publicly available and shall, if appropriate, raise a Corrective Action Request to project participants to incorporate the more recent data into the calculation of grid emission factor.

90. The Board discussed the requirement for the DNA to re-confirm project contribution to sustainable development in the context of requests for changes to the start of the crediting period post-registration and requests for changes from the registered Project Design Document. The Board further requested the secretariat to revise the "Procedures for requesting post-registration changes to the start of the crediting period" and "Procedures for notifying and requesting approval of changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD", taking the views expressed by members on this issue into account, for further consideration by the Board at its next meeting.

91. The Board noted an oral presentation by the secretariat on the need to develop a standardized format for monitoring report to improve consistency in reporting of the implementation and monitoring of the project activity by project participants. The Board requested the secretariat to develop this form, and associated guidelines for completing the form, for the consideration by the Board at a future meeting.



92. Due to the time constraints, the Board did not consider the "Procedure for withdrawal of requests for issuance", and agreed to consider these proposed procedure at its next meeting.

93. Due to the time constraints, the Board did not consider the revised draft "Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements", and agreed to consider this draft document at its next meeting.

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

##### *Resources*

94. The Board took note of the report by the secretariat on the status of implementation of activities which have been approved in the 2009 CDM-MAP including the status of recruitment of positions approved and encouraged the secretariat to continue in its effort to fill vacant positions. The Board was also informed by the secretariat that the drafting of the 2010 MAP is underway with the view submit the draft CDM-MAP to the Board for consideration at its fifty-second meeting in February 2010. In this respect the Board provided comments to the secretariat to be reflected in the CDM MAP 2010.

95. The Board took note of information on the status of resources as contained in [annex 64](#). It was noted that since the fiftieth meeting of the Board, the income generated by registration fees, share of proceeds and methodology fees has grown by an additional USD 6.9 million as a result of the payment of USD 3.2 million in registration fees, USD 3.6 million in share of proceeds and USD 4,954 in methodologies fees.

96. The Board took note of an assessment of compliance with indicative timelines set by the Board in different processes.

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

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

97. The Board considered a presentation of the improved version of the catalogue of decisions. The Board welcomed these developments and requested the secretariat to complete this work and to disseminate information on accessibility of documents of the Board.

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

98. The Board took note of the update by the secretariat on the eighth meeting of the CDM DNA Forum held in Singapore from 26 - 28 October 2009. The DNA Forum included a day dedicated to interactions with the private sector which was welcomed by the DNA representatives. In addition, the meeting was held in conjunction with the Asia Carbon Forum, which provided further opportunities to DNAs to interact with other stakeholders.

99. The Board further took note of the date if the Informal DNA Forum meeting, which is planned to take place during the COP15/CMP5 on Monday, 14 December 2009 at 15:00 - 17:00 at the UNFCCC conference premises in Copenhagen, Denmark.

100. The Board took note that a survey on DNAs needs that assessed training provided by DNAs as well as training needs for DNAs have been launched and that the call will be extended to receive further responses from DNAs.

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

101. The Board took note of the report by the Chair of the DOE/AE Coordination Forum, Mr. Siddharth Yadav and welcomed the opportunity to engage with him in a session at the beginning of their meeting.

102. The Chair of the Forum elaborated the input received from entities for the consideration of the Board, and sought guidance on the following issues:

- (a) The harmonisation of definition of technical areas within the sectoral scopes;
- (b) A suggested revision to CDM Accreditation Standard with regard to the area of conflict of interest; and
- (c) Validation and verification timelines.

103. The Board discussed the issues raised and requested the CDM-AP to take account of the concerns and proposals of the forum in its work on revision of the CDM Accreditation Standard.

104. The Board requested the Chair of the Forum to bring its various responses and questions, including performance against timelines, raised by the Board to the attention of the forum. The Board requested that the DOE responses on their measures to ensure compliance with the validation and verification timelines and information on their performance against them be made available to the next meeting of the Board.

105. The Chair of the Board stressed the need for the Forum to also pro-actively identify and propose possible solutions to the issues they have raised.

106. The Chair of the Board thanked Mr. Siddharth Yadav the outgoing chair of DOE/AE Forum for his contribution in the last one year and expressed that the continued communication between the DOEs/AEs through the forum will further the objectives of the CDM process.

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

107. The Board stressed the importance that stakeholders follow the existing official channels of communication to communicate to the Board and therefore avoid informal communication means that may create unbalanced treatments among stakeholders.

108. The Board agreed to meet with registered observers for an informal interaction on the last day of the meeting after the adoption of the report, if time allows. The Board 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.

109. The Board further agreed to continue to meet with the same type of arrangement and to reconsider the issue when necessary. Observers to the fifty-second meeting of the Board shall have registered with the secretariat by 18 January 2010. In order to ensure proper security and logistical arrangements, the Board emphasized that this deadline will be strictly enforced by the secretariat.

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

110. The Board agreed on the provisional agenda for its fifty-second meeting (8 - 12 February 2010) as contained in [annex 65](#) to this report, with an open session on the 10 - 12 February 2010.

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

111. The Chair summarized the main conclusions.

112. The Board expressed its deep appreciation to the outgoing Chair, Mr. Lex de Jonge, and Vice-Chair, Mr. Clifford Mahlung, for the outstanding leadership and dedication in ensuring that the CDM is operated in an efficient, cost-effective and transparent manner.

113. The Board also thanked all outgoing members and alternate members for their hard work and dedication to the process during their tenure.

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

114. 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**

115. The Chair closed the meeting at 17:28 hours (GMT +1).

- - - - -

## Annexes to the report

### *Membership issues*

Annex 1 - Documents related to conflict of interest

### *Accreditation*

Annex 2 - Implementation plan of the policy framework to monitor performance and address non-compliance by designated operational entities

Annex 3 - CDM validation and verification manual (Version 01.1)

### *Methodologies*

Annex 4 - AM0084 - "Installation of cogeneration system supplying electricity and chilled water to new and existing consumers" (version 01)

Annex 5 - AM0085 - "Co-firing of biomass residues for electricity generation in grid connected power plants" (version 01)

Annex 6 - AM0036 - "Fuel switch from fossil fuels to biomass residues in heat generation equipment" (version 03)

Annex 7 - AM0069 - "Biogenic methane use as feedstock and fuel for town gas production" (version 02)

Annex 8 - AM0074 - "Methodology for new grid connected power plants using permeate gas previously flared and/or vented" (version 02)

Annex 9 - AM0079 - "Recovery of SF6 from gas insulated electrical equipment in testing facilities" (version 02)

Annex 10 - ACM0012 - "Consolidated baseline methodology for GHG emission reductions from waste energy recovery projects" (version 03.2)

Annex 11 - Use of methodologies and timelines for the process of consideration of methodology related submissions

Annex 12 - Clarification to AM0034 (version 02): Catalytic reduction of N2O inside the ammonia burner of nitric acid plants

### *CDM afforestation and reforestation project activities*

Annex 13 - Guidelines on conditions under which increase in GHG emissions related to displacement of pre-project grazing activities in A/R CDM project activity is insignificant

Annex 14 - Guidelines on conditions under which increase in GHG emissions attributable to displacement of pre-project crop cultivation activities in A/R CDM project activity is insignificant

Annex 15 - A/R Methodological Tool "Estimation of the increase in GHG emissions attributable to displacement of pre-project agricultural activities in A/R CDM project activity"

*Issues relating to small-scale CDM project activities*

Annex 16 - AMS-II.D. Energy efficiency and fuel switching measures for industrial facilities (version 12)

Annex 17 - AMS-III.Q. Waste energy recovery (gas/heat/pressure) projects (version 03)

Annex 18 - AMS-II.G. Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass (version 02)

Annex 19 - AMS-I.C. Thermal energy production with or without electricity (version 16)

*Matters relating to the registration of CDM project activities*

Annex 20 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1422

Annex 21 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1965

Annex 22 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2483

Annex 23 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2563

Annex 24 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2580

Annex 25 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2584

Annex 26 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2586

Annex 27 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2587

Annex 28 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2589

Annex 29 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2593

Annex 30 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2604

Annex 31 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2609

Annex 32 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2615

Annex 33 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2617

Annex 34 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2628

Annex 35 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2630

Annex 36 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2646

Annex 37 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2666

Annex 38 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2674

Annex 39 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2677

Annex 40 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2680

Annex 41 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2685

Annex 42 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2697



Annex 43 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2725

Annex 44 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2730

Annex 45 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2731

Annex 46 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2732

Annex 47 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2733

Annex 48 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2735

Annex 49 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2813

Annex 50 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2895

Annex 51 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1168

Annex 52 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1895

Annex 53 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2223

Annex 54 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2462

Annex 55 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2532

Annex 56 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2537

Annex 57 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2566

Annex 58 - Guidelines on the assessment of investment analysis (version 03)

Annex 59 - Information note regarding previous rulings related to the appropriateness of benchmarks for project activities utilizing waste heat/waste gas for power generation

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

Annex 60 - Scope of reviews (issuance) - Project 0256

Annex 61 - Scope of reviews (issuance) - Project 0908

Annex 62 - Scope of reviews (issuance) - Project 1238

Annex 63 - Scope of reviews (issuance) - Project 1428

***Management plan and resources for the work on the CDM***

Annex 64 - Status of resources

***Other matters***

Annex 65 - Provisional agenda for EB52

-----



## 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 suitability of input values and energy production in the second year.
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 the response to the request for review, regarding the validation 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 information submitted in response to the request for review regarding suitability of input values to the investment analysis.
4. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report that includes the PP/DOE proposal to extend the project boundary to include the end users of heat and to measure the heat consumed at the user end and that demonstrates that heat in absence of the project activity would have come from coal and what quantity of heat will be displaced. If the baseline fuel (coal) in absence of the project activity cannot be appropriately demonstrated with certainty, then the PP/DOE, as a conservative measure, can choose not to claim baseline emissions from heat.
5. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE should submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which include the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of total investment, plant load factor and effective power coefficient.
6. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE should submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the additional information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of the input values and why a site visit was not conducted.
7. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE should submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding suitability of input values to the investment analysis and monitoring of electricity imports from the grid.
8. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the DOE should submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include the information on the validation of input values to the investment analysis, the pre-project scenario, availability of the waste gas submitted in response to the request for review.
9. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE should submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the additional information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of the input values, the sensitivity analysis and why a site visit was not conducted.
10. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE should submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding suitability of input values to the investment analysis.
11. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE should submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding suitability of input values to the investment analysis.



12. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which (a) incorporate the information submitted as response to this request for review regarding the validation of the input values to the investment analysis and first of its kind claim; (b) provide a detailed description of the changes in the assumptions on the investment analysis between the PDD submitted for the GSC and the PDD submitted for registration, and (c) confirms the first-of-its-kind barrier as a means to support the additionality of the project activity.
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: (a) incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the prior consideration of the CDM and suitability of input values to the investment analysis, and (b) further substantiate the suitability of .rest cost. in the investment analysis under generation costs.
14. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted as response to this request for review.
15. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report that includes the response submitted in request for review with regards to the validation of barrier analysis.
16. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and a corresponding validation report which incorporates the information submitted in the response to the request for review regarding the barrier analysis and monitoring plan.
17. If the Board decides to ultimately register the project activity, the revised PDD and corresponding validation report should incorporate the response submitted in the request for review regarding the CMM gas sale price.
18. If the Board decides to ultimately register the project activity, the revised PDD and corresponding validation report should incorporate the response submitted in the request for review regarding the ex-ante parameters, and monitoring of CMM gas.
19. If the Board decides to ultimately register the project activity, the revised PDD and corresponding validation report should incorporate the response submitted in the request for review regarding the validation of the input values applied in the investment analysis.
20. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the DOE should submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which include the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of benchmark and input values to investment analysis, sensitivity analysis with electricity tariff, existence of the technological and prevailing practice barriers to the project activity, suitability of assumed net calorific value and emission factors, use of waste heat generated by other clinker production lines, identification of the baseline scenario and monitoring plan.
21. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and a corresponding validation report which incorporates the information submitted in the response to the request for review regarding the income tax calculation used in the investment analysis.
22. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and a corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response



to the request for review regarding suitability of input values to the investment analysis.

23. If the Board decides to ultimately register the project activity, the revised PDD and corresponding validation report should incorporate the response submitted in the request for review on the validation of input values.
24. If the Board decides to ultimately register the project activity, the revised PDD and corresponding validation report should incorporate the response submitted in the request for review on the validation of input values.
25. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and a corresponding validation report which incorporates the information submitted in the response to the request for review, regarding the prior CDM consideration and emission factor.
26. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report that includes all information provided in response to the request for review regarding the input values of the IRR calculation, the sensitivity analysis, and the monitoring of the surplus biomass.
27. If the Board ultimately decides to issue CERs for this project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding verification report which corrects the description of the monitoring equipment and actual capacity.
28. If the Board ultimately decides to issue CERs for this project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised monitoring report including revised data spreadsheets, and a corresponding revised verification report that incorporate the clarifications provided in response to the request for review with regard to (i) the clarifications on the DOE's verification on the overall uncertainty factor (UNC); (ii) how conservative values were ensured in case of AMS down times; (iii) clarifications on the inconsistent reporting on the elimination of N<sub>2</sub>O data measured when the plant was operated outside the permitted ranges; (iv) listing each parameter required by the monitoring plan and clearly stating the DOE verification of these values in the monitoring report as per VVM (para.197); and (v) the calculation of the baseline emission factor following the Board's clarification as contained in annex 12 of this report.