

## 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	<b>Project boundary</b>	
	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?)	18.6%
	Was financial analysis used in demonstration of additionality of your project?	No.
	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?	Some local households did not participate in the project despite of their earlier commitments.
2	<b>Schedule of planting</b>	
	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?	18.6% (57.5 ha)
	Was planting delayed or brought forward?	Yes. A part of area needs to be re-planted due to the weather condition. We tried to follow the schedule of PDD and planted some seedlings under the unfavourable condition and consequently we have to replant because the seedlings were not survived.

	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 schedule of planting?	N.A.
	What were the reasons for not planting areas according to the schedule provided in the registered PDD?	The reasons are delayed preparation for planting, drought, and some local households did not participate in the project despite of their earlier commitments.
3	<b>Species composition</b>	
	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?	9.1% (28.1 ha)
	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?	Species composition was not taken into account in demonstration of additionality.
	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. (It was replaced by other similar spp.)
	Was re-planting done with species not provided in the registered PDD?	No.
	What were the reasons for change of species composition?	Acacia auriculiformis was planted as planned in the PDD but most of the seedlings were died because of the weather condition. Then the farmers wanted to replant Acacia mangium instead of Acacia auriculiformis. The project agreed with them and A. mangium will be replant in this year, one year delay.
4	<b>Stocking density</b>	
	Have you experienced the need for changing stocking density (i.e. number of trees per hectare) provided in the registered PDD?	No.
	How much area (percentage) could not be planted with the same stocking density as	N.A.

	provided in the registered PDD?	
	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 density?	N.A.
5	<b>Biomass estimation method</b>	
	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?	No. But we found it necessary. For the local people, the method of estimation is too difficult to apply it for the monitoring by themselves.
	What changes were made in this respect?	
	Were any allometric equations deemed more suitable to your project found after registration of the PDD?	
	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?	Yes and No We are not very sure if the current allometric equation we mentioned in the PDD is really suitable. However, it was only an equation that we could find in the country. The situation of developing country should be considered, it is quite difficult to find an adequate equation.
6	<b>Use of fire</b>	
	Have you experienced the need for using fire in site preparation even if use of fire was not provided for in the registered PDD?	No.
	How much area (in percentage) was affected?	N.A.
	Do you foresee a need to use fire for forest management in future?	No.
	What were the reasons for using fire when this was not provided for in the registered PDD?	N.A.
7	<b>Use of fertilizers</b>	
	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?	No. PDD indicates use of fertilizer. But we applied the fertilizer different from the one mentioned in the PDD because the price of fertilizer mentioned in

		the PDD became expensive at the planting season. The fertilizer actually used was accepted nationwide for forest plantation.
	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	<b>Use of mechanized planting operations</b>	
	Have you experienced the need for mechanized planting operations when the registered PDD provided for manual operations only?	No.
	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	<b>Timing of silvicultural operations</b>	
	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?	No because the plantation is still very young (2-3 years old). However, the growth of the tree is depends on the environment, the operations schedule could be changed in the future
	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	<b>Propagation methods</b>	
	Have you experienced the need for adopting	No.

	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?	
	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 of changes included in the sensitivity analysis broad enough to cover the actually applied change?	N.A.
	What were the reasons for changing the propagation technique?	N.A.
11	<b>Area surveying methods</b>	
	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?	No. But Potentially yes. We were lucky that there were someone who can use GPS in our team. But for the project base-d project, the ability of project proponent varies. Only proponents with high technology skills would be able to join the A/R CDM.
	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	<b>Sources of finance</b>	
	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	No at the moment. But we found we need more budget necessary to support local communities. However, we can not find any financial sources.

	commercial banks, but in practice all of the finance was made available by project participants, or vice versa?	
	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	<b>Sources of revenue</b>	
	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?	No.
	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	<b>Unforeseen events</b>	
	Have you experienced unforeseen events, such as wildfire or outbreak of pests/disease?	No.
	Were such events anticipated in the registered PDD?	No.
	Were the necessary safeguards against such events, as provided in the registered PDD, put in place?	No.

	If no, what were the reasons for not putting the safeguards in place?	No.
	How much area (percentage) was affected by the events?	No.

**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

	<p>The need, experienced or anticipated, for a change from the provisions contained in the registered PDD.</p> <p>Extent / scale of change.</p> <p>More specific details of change.</p> <p>Whether the change relates to any data/parameter used in barrier/financial analysis for demonstration of additionality of the project.</p> <p>Whether the change relates to any data/parameter used in sensitivity analysis for testing robustness of financial analysis for demonstration of additionality.</p> <p>Reasons for the change.</p>
	<p>Thank you for the effort of the ARWG to collect information of registered projects. The voice from the actual project would be very important but we felt that it was impossible to bring our idea to the UNFCCC as it seems the access is not provided to us. We hope the result of this survey opens to public and be used effectively for the AR CDM reform in the future.</p> <p>In addition to the description above, we'd like to argue that the ARCDM should be reformed fundamentally at the modalities level.</p> <p>For example, temporary credit brings various confusions such as credit pricing. But the effects are there at the project level, for the local communities. The idea of carbon credit is difficult to understand for them who have never thought about the future investment in their lives. Therefore it is impossible for them to understand the temporary credit (it is even difficult for the project developer to understand it). Thus, it was not at all an incentive for them to manage the planted forest. At the same time, the expiration of the credit poses another issue. As the credit expires automatically, the local communities don't have to manage forest for long term. It is a kind of disincentives to protect the forest for long term for the community. We think the Carbon credit should be provided to the local community as a reward for protecting forest and keeping the carbon accumulated. When the time of harvesting, the local community should have options and select: Option 1 Cut trees and sell it; or Option 2 Keep the forest and get carbon credit. The current AR CDM doesn't provide options. Only one to do is cutting trees and getting temporary credit.</p> <p>The land eligibility criteria also make the project development difficult. It is difficult to manage plantation for the community who had not had forests for long time. The land left unplanted because they didn't have ability to manage forest, not only because of the financial barrier. It is challenging to limit the participation only to the community without forest for long term. The community who lost the forest recently should be included. The year 1989 (or 1990) doesn't mean anything as a base year for the CDM. So it should be reviewed.</p> <p>REDD+ will be a measure forest mitigation measure in the post KP but there are countries applicable to the AR CDM. We hope the AR CDM reform discussion becomes more active and ARWG collects more information from the projects for the reform.</p>



\*\*\*