

Identification of common issues in implementation of a registered A/R CDM project activity

The Executive Board of the CDM, at its sixty-first meeting, agreed to launch a call for public input for identifying common difficulties in implementation of registered A/R CDM project activities, including type and extent of changes from the project description in the PDD that are typical for forestry practice.

This questionnaire is intended for collecting inputs from the project participants (PPs) who have registered A/R CDM project activities and who have applied or considered application, during implementation of a registered A/R CDM project activity, of changes from the description of the project activity contained in the registered PDD.

While responding to the questions below, PPs should write “Not applicable” when a question does not apply to their project. If PPs have not yet experienced the need for a change but they anticipate the need for such a change in future, they should respond as if the need had existed.

Q.N.	Question	Response
1	Project boundary	
	Have you experienced the need for change in the project boundary as provided in the registered PDD?	YES
	What was the extent of the change in area? (i.e. what percentage of total area was affected by such a change?)	20% reduction in area expected
	Was financial analysis used in demonstration of additionality of your project?	N.A.
	If financial analysis was used in demonstration of additionality of your project, was the range of changes included in the sensitivity analysis broad enough to cover the change actually applied to the project area?	N.A.
	What were the reasons for change in the project boundary?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land Tenure issues 2. Circumspection of communities about continuity CDM practices.
2	Schedule of planting	
	Have you experienced the need for changing the schedule of planting as provided in the registered PDD?	YES
	How much area (in percentage) was not planted on time as provided in the registered PDD?	< 10%
	Was planting delayed or brought forward?	Yes brought forward
	If financial analysis was used in demonstration of additionality of your project, was the range of changes included in the sensitivity analysis	N.A.

	broad enough to cover the change actually applied to the schedule of planting?	
	What were the reasons for not planting areas according to the schedule provided in the registered PDD?	Availability of planting stock .
3	Species composition	
	Have you experienced the need for changing the species composition as provided in the registered PDD?	YES
	How much area (percentage) could not be planted with species composition as provided in the registered PDD?	Percentage cannot be worked out
	If species composition was taken into account while carrying out barrier analysis for demonstration of additionality, was the outcome of the demonstration dependent on the species composition?	N.A.
	If species composition was taken into account while carrying out financial analysis for demonstration of additionality, was the range of changes included in the sensitivity analysis broad enough to cover the actually applied change?	N.A.
	Was planting done with species not provided in the registered PDD?	No
	Was re-planting done with species not provided in the registered PDD?	No
	What were the reasons for change of species composition?	1. At the time of making PDD, it is not possible to exactly worked out site specific requirement of spp..
4	Stocking density	
	Have you experienced the need for changing stocking density (i.e. number of trees per hectare) provided in the registered PDD?	N.A.
	How much area (percentage) could not be planted with the same stocking density as provided in the registered PDD?	N.A.
	If stocking density was taken into account while carrying out financial analysis for demonstration of additionality, was the range of changes included in the sensitivity analysis broad enough to cover the actually applied change?	N.A.
	What were the reasons for change of stocking	N.A.

	density?	
5	Biomass estimation method	
	Have you experienced the need for changing the method of estimation of biomass from the method provided in the registered PDD? For example, the registered PDD provides for use of biomass expansion factor method, but in practice allometric equations were used, or vice versa? Or, the registered PDD provides for permanent sample plots but in practice temporary plots were used?	N.A.
	What changes were made in this respect?	N.A.
	Were any allometric equations deemed more suitable to your project found after registration of the PDD?	N.A.
	Have you experienced, or do you foresee, a need to develop new allometric equations within your project because the equations provided in the registered PDD have been found unsuitable to for your project?	N.A.
6	Use of fire	
	Have you experienced the need for using fire in site preparation even if use of fire was not provided for in the registered PDD?	N.A.
	How much area (in percentage) was affected?	N.A.
	Do you foresee a need to use fire for forest management in future?	N.A.
	What were the reasons for using fire when this was not provided for in the registered PDD?	N.A.
7	Use of fertilizers	
	Have you experienced the need for use of fertilizers even if the registered PDD does not provide for use of fertilizers as a management practice, or vice versa?	N.A.
	How much area (in percentage) was affected?	N.A.
	Did this change significantly affect the cash-flow of your project?	N.A.
	What were the reasons for using fertilizers when the registered PDD does not provide for use of fertilizers?	N.A.
8	Use of mechanized planting operations	
	Have you experienced the need for mechanized	

	planting operations when the registered PDD provided for manual operations only?	N.A.
	How much area (in percentage) was affected?	N.A.
	Did this change significantly affect the cash-flow of your project?	N.A.
	What were the reasons for changing to mechanized planting operations?	N.A.
9	Timing of silvicultural operations	
	Have you experienced the need for a different timing of silvicultural operations (e.g. pruning, cleaning, thinning, resin-tapping, harvesting, replanting) than the timing provided in the registered PDD?	N.A.
	Was harvest delayed or brought forward?	N.A.
	Was re-planting delayed or brought forward?	N.A.
	Was thinning delayed or brought forward?	N.A.
	How much area (in percentage) was affected?	N.A.
	Did this change significantly affect the cash-flow of your project?	N.A.
	If financial analysis was used in demonstration of additionality of your project, was the range of changes included in the sensitivity analysis broad enough to cover the actually applied change?	N.A.
	What were the reasons for not carrying out silvicultural operations according to the timing provided in the registered PDD?	N.A.
10	Propagation methods	
	Have you experienced the need for adopting propagation methods different from the ones provided in the registered PDD? For example, the registered PDD provides for planting of nursery-raised seedlings, but in practice plantations were raised by seed sowing or by assisted natural regeneration techniques?	N.A.
	How much area (in percentage) was affected by this change?	N.A.
	Was the changed propagation technique employed in your project more cost-effective or less cost-effective?	N.A.
	If financial analysis was used in demonstration of additionality of your project, was the range	N.A.

	of changes included in the sensitivity analysis broad enough to cover the actually applied change?	
	What were the reasons for changing the propagation technique?	
11	Area surveying methods	
	Have you experienced the need for using a different method for surveying areas of various land parcels and strata, from the method provided in the registered PDD? For example, the registered PDD provides for use of GPS survey for determination of stratum areas, but in practice areas were determined by carrying out direct field survey?	N.A.
	How much area (in percentage) was affected by this change?	N.A.
	Was the actual survey method used less precise or more precise compared to the method provided in the registered PDD?	N.A.
	Was the actual survey method used less cost-effective or more cost-effective compared to the method provided in the registered PDD?	N.A.
	Was this change applied in <i>ex ante</i> or <i>ex post</i> estimation of area?	N.A.
	What were the reasons for change of survey method?	N.A.
12	Sources of finance	
	Have you experienced the need for adopting a different project financing mechanism than the one provided in the registered PDD? For example, the registered PDD provides that half of the finance will be arranged as loan from commercial banks, but in practice all of the finance was made available by project participants, or vice versa?	N.A.
	To what extent was project finance changed (in percentage - if appropriate) from that provided in the registered PDD?	N.A.
	Did this change affect significantly the cash-flow of your project?	N.A.
	If financial analysis was used in demonstration of additionality of your project, was the range of changes included in the sensitivity analysis broad enough to cover the actually applied change?	N.A.

	What were the reasons for change in project financing mechanism?	N.A.
13	Sources of revenue	
	Have you experienced the need for generating project revenues from any source not provided in the registered PDD? For example, according to the registered PDD fuelwood and fodder from the project area was to be distributed to local people free of cost, but in practice this produce was sold or auctioned? Or, no harvesting was provided for in the registered PDD, but in practice harvest was carried out?	N.A.
	What percentage of the project revenues were generated by using such sources?	N.A.
	Did this change affect significantly the over-all cash-flow of your project?	N.A.
	If financial analysis was used in demonstration of additionality of your project, was the range of changes included in the sensitivity analysis broad enough to cover the actually applied change?	N.A.
	What were the reasons for generating revenue from new revenue sources?	N.A.
14	Unforeseen events	
	Have you experienced unforeseen events, such as wildfire or outbreak of pests/disease?	N.A.
	Were such events anticipated in the registered PDD?	YES
	Were the necessary safeguards against such events, as provided in the registered PDD, put in place?	YES
	If no, what were the reasons for not putting the safeguards in place?	N.A.
	How much area (percentage) was affected by the events?	N.A.

Any other change: If you have experienced need for any other type of change from the description provided in the registered PDD, please use the following question template to provide additional information:

Question template

	The need, experienced or anticipated, for a change from the provisions contained in the registered PDD.
--	---

	<p>Extent / scale of change.</p> <p>More specific details of change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Difference in the minimum DBH specified in the PDD and the minimum DBH for which data are available in volume tables.• Changes in default factors (BEF, root-shoot ratio, etc.) because of the availability of species-specific default factor data after project implementation.• Methodologies call for use of either BEF or allometric equation methods for calculation of carbon stock. As verifications happen after five years of the project start date, there are situations where latest growth data is available from a mix of two methods (i.e., growth data based on BEF method is available for some species and allometric method for other species within a project). No guidance exists on how to deal with these situations.• Difficult geographic circumstances make it expensive to meet the level of accuracy anticipated in the PDD for the projects.• Sample plot lay-out and identification of permanent sample plots (these should be physically invisible to avoid preferential treatment or they shouldn't be treated differently. In practice it is difficult to implement this, so guidance on the acceptable procedure would be helpful).
--	---
