



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

Date: 14 May 2005
Ref: CDM-EB-19

EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE CLEAN DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM

NINETEENTH MEETING

Report

Date of meeting: 11 – 13 May 2005 (the meeting ended on 14 May 2005 at 03:00)

Location: Bonn, Germany

Attendance: The names of members and alternate members present at the meeting are bolded below. Where only the name of an alternate member is bolded, the alternate participated as a member.

Member	Alternate
Mr. John W. Ashe ¹	<i>Ms. Desna M. Solofa¹</i>
Mr. Jean-Jacques Becker²	<i>Ms. Gertraud Wollansky²</i>
Mr. Martin Enderlin¹	<i>Mr. Hans Jürgen Stehr¹</i>
Ms. Sushma Gera²	<i>Mr. Masaharu Fujitomi²</i>
Mr. John Shaibu Kilani²	<i>Mr. Ndiaye Cheikh Sylla²</i>
Mr. Xuedu Lu¹	<i>Mr. Juan Pablo Bonilla¹</i>
Mr. José Domingos Miguez²	<i>Mr. Clifford Anthony Mahlun²</i>
Mr. Richard Muyungi¹	<i>Mr. Hernán Carlino¹</i>
Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sethi²	<i>Ms. Liana Bratasida²</i>
Ms. Marina Shvangiradze¹	<i>Ms. Anastassia Moskalenko¹</i>

¹ Term: Two years (elected at COP 9 in 2003)

² Term: Two years (elected at COP 10 in 2004)

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): **9** (7) members/alternate members acting as members present of which **4** (3) from Annex I Parties and **5** (4) from non-Annex I Parties.

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

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

1. No conflict of interest was identified by any member or alternate member of the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism (CDM) (hereinafter referred to as the Board) present at the meeting.
2. The Board noted that the secretariat was informed that Mr. John W. Ashe, Ms. Desna Solofa and Mr. Juan Pablo Bonilla were unable to attend the meeting due to official duties.
3. The Board agreed to consider, at its twentieth meeting, procedures to select Chairs and Vice Chairs for panels and working groups, bearing in mind the rules of procedure of the Executive Board.

Agenda item 2. Adoption of the agenda

4. The Board adopted the agenda as proposed.

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

5. The Board took note of the sixth progress report on the work of the CDM Accreditation Panel (CDM-AP) presented by Mr. John Kilani, Chair of the CDM-AP. The report summarized information relating to the work of the CDM-AP which was complemented with information on the status of applications and developments with respect to desk reviews and on-site assessments.
6. The Board took note of the progress report and the information provided.
7. The Board took note of the issuance, by the CDM-AP, of three (3) “indicative letters” to:
 - (a) ChouAoyama Sustainability Certification Organization Co. Ltd. (Chou)
 - (b) British Standards Institute (BSI)
 - (c) Korean Foundation for Quality (KFQ).
8. The Board took note of the issuance of an indicative letter for additional sectoral scope(s) to SGS United Kingdom Ltd. for scopes 14 and 15 (afforestation and reforestation, and agriculture).
9. The Board agreed, pursuant to decisions 17/CP.7 and 21/CP.8, to accredit, and provisionally designate, for sector-specific validation the following four applicant entities:
 - (a) Japan Quality Assurance Organization (JQA) (VAL: 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12/ VER: none)¹:
 1. Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources)
 2. Energy distribution
 3. Energy demand
 13. Waste handling and disposal.
 - (b) Japan Consulting Institute (JCI) (VAL: none / VER: none):
 13. Waste handling and disposal.

¹ Numbers in brackets indicate the sectoral scope(s) for which the company is already accredited for validation/registration (VAL) and verification/certification (VER), as applicable.



(c) TÜV Industrie Service GmbH, TÜV Rheinland Group (TÜV Rheinland) (VAL: none / VER: none):

1. Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources)
2. Energy distribution
3. Energy demand.

(d) Spanish Association for Standardisation and Certification (VAL: none / VER: none):

1. Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources)
2. Energy distribution
3. Energy demand.

10. With three new DOEs accredited at this meeting, a total of seven DOEs may provide sector specific validation functions. A list of DOEs indicating the sectoral scope(s) is available on the CDM UNFCCC web site (<<http://cdm.unfccc.int/DOE/list>>). Furthermore, a list indicating approved methodologies by sector scopes lists those DOEs that may provide the validation functions in that sector (<<http://cdm.unfccc.int/DOE/scopes.html>>).

11. The Board considered the recommendations forwarded by the panel with regard to widening the scope of witnessing activities to cover the substantive decision-making on baseline and monitoring methodologies by DOE/AEs. The Board, in order to strengthen the competency of the assessment teams to assess substantive decision making of DOE/AEs at the witnessing stage, agreed to widen the scope of witnessing, as contained in annex 1 to this report. The measure shall be applied to those witnessing activities for which, at the time the first experts for the relevant sectoral scope(s) is included in the new roster, the CDM-PDD was not made public for comments at the stage of validation.

12. The Board considered the recommendation from the panel on post-accreditation assessment at the time of request for registration². It agreed to request Mr. John Kilani to consult on the feasibility and modalities of the recommendation, bearing in mind comments made by members and alternates of the Board.

13. The Board agreed to invite views from the DOE/AE coordination forum on ways to enhance the performance of AEs and DOEs. The Board requested the secretariat to seek views from the AE/DOE coordination forum.

14. The Board agreed on “Guidelines for the preparation of the annual activity report by a DOE to the CDM Executive Board” as contained in annex 2.

15. The Board also agreed to issue a clarification on the number of witnessing activities at the verification stage. The Board agreed that two witnessing activities shall be required at verification stage for those applicant entities that have applied for afforestation and reforestation activities and which have already been accredited for validation in the relevant sectoral scope(s) witnessed for verification. One of those witnessing activity shall be related to afforestation and reforestation activities. If the entity has not applied for the sectoral scope of afforestation and reforestation, only one witnessing activity for verification shall be required. The accreditation for verification covers all sectoral scope(s) applied for by the AE provided that the AE is accredited for validation in the respective sectoral scope(s).

16. The Board requested Mr. John Kilani to consult with Board members and alternates on the feasibility of an entity applying solely for the function of verification/certification, bearing in mind the discussion of the Board, and prepare an input for consideration at EB20.

² See recommendation 2 contained in annex 1 to the annotated agenda of EB19.



17. The Board agreed, with regard to sequencing of validation and verification, to invite views from the AE/DOE coordination forum on the desirability of any revision to the accreditation procedure that would allow an AE to be accredited for verification prior to accreditation for validation in a given sectoral scope. The Board requested the secretariat to forward the request of the Board to the AE/DOE coordination forum in order to seek its views.

18. The Board considered a shortlist of applicants to appoint two panel members. The Board appointed Mr. Satish Rao, India. As no other candidate met all qualification required, the Board invited Mr Raúl Prando to continue as a member of this panel until a replacement was found. Mr. Raúl Prando kindly accepted this invitation. The Board requested the secretariat to make another call for experts with a view to consider new applications at EB21.

19. The Board expressed deep appreciation to the outgoing member of the CDM-AP, Mr. Vijay Mediratta, for his excellent work during his term.

20. The Board took note of the second meeting of the AE/DOE coordination forum held on 10 May, in Bonn, Germany. The Board invited Mr. Einar Telnes, Chair of the forum to provide a brief report of the meeting to the Board on 11 May 2005. The Board took note of the issues and concerns identified by the forum and encouraged it to continue providing input to the Board and its panels, thus enhancing common understanding and approaches.

21. The Board took note of the withdrawal of the applicant entity URS Verification Ltd.

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

22. The Executive Board considered the report of the fifteenth meeting of the Panel on baseline and monitoring methodologies (Meth Panel) and the oral update by Mr. Jean Jacques Becker, Chair of the Panel.

23. The Board considered the draft prepared by Mr. Hans Jürgen Stehr and agreed to “Procedures for the revision of an approved methodology”, as contained in annex 3.

24. The Board continued its work to improve the process of consideration and approval of proposed new methodologies. The Board further agreed that a comprehensive proposal for improving the methodologies process, for consideration of the Board at its twentieth meeting, is to be prepared by Ms. Gertraud Wollansky, in collaboration with the Chairs of the panels on methodologies and accreditation, Mr. Hans Jürgen Stehr, Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sethi, Mr. José Domingos Miguez and Mr. Lu Xuedu.

25. The Board agreed on the following immediate measures aimed at improving the quality of products and easing the workflow:

(a) As stressed in previous reports of the Board, methodology cases that were not approved by the Board are always invited to be resubmitted once they have incorporated recommendations from the Meth Panel and the Board. The Board requested the Meth Panel to prepare recommendations to the Board on detailed criteria for the non-approval of methodologies.

(b) The Board considers its practice of allowing the reconsideration of proposed methodologies without further desk reviews in so-called B cases and interaction with project participants through a feedback-loop to be important measures for ensuring that project participants benefit from expert inputs when further developing a methodology. A methodology, which is in imperfect shape, can thereby be improved for re-appraisal. This practice to facilitate the methodology consideration process leads, however, to delays and has added to the workload of the Meth Panel and the Board. In order to alleviate the bottlenecks, the Board therefore agreed to consider, at its twentieth meeting, limiting the number times that B case can be re-submitted.



- (c) To request the Meth Panel to:
- (i) Recommend revised forms for the submission of new methodologies so that these cases are aligned as much as possible with the format of reformatted methodologies, for the consideration of the Board at its twentieth meeting;
 - (ii) Develop further the guidelines for using the forms in order to reflect that detailed technical information is required when submitting a methodology;
 - (iii) Develop detailed criteria for the pre-assessment of proposed new methodologies by the Meth Panel;
 - (iv) Revise its recommendation forms so that one part provides succinct information for the consideration of the Board (1 page only), and a second part provides detailed technical recommendations to be forwarded to project participants;
- (d) To consider the merit of charging a fee when submitting a proposed new methodology at its twentieth meeting.
- (e) To request the secretariat to make arrangements for a meeting between the Meth Panel and the DOEs, back-to-back with a Meth Panel meeting, for exchanging views with regard to the application of currently approved methodologies. The Board requested the Meth Panel to report on the results of this meeting and to forward proposed procedures for improving communications between the Meth Panel and the DOEs;
- (f) In order to make more efficient use of expertise, to select one lead reviewer from among the two desk reviewers selected to consider each case; the lead reviewer is to be paid 3 days fee and the second reviewer a 2 days fee. The two reviewers should provide inputs independently. The modalities of work between the lead reviewer and the second reviewer shall be further developed at the twentieth meeting of the Board.

26. The Board requested the secretariat to prepare a revised version of the procedures for submission and consideration of proposed new methodologies (version 7) in order to incorporate the measures identified above. The revised version of the procedures will be circulated to the Board for comments and adoption via listserv.

27. The Board considered the treatment of cases of proposed new baseline and monitoring methodologies which are under consideration by the Executive Board where the proponents decide to withdraw support for the proposal. The Board agreed that methodologies once submitted for consideration by the Board, can be retained even if the original proponents have withdrawn. These methodologies will, therefore, be shown with their status (as A, B or C). If cases are under re-consideration (“B cases”), the Board may continue drawing on them. Cases withdrawn will be marked with a footnote indicating the withdrawal. The names of project participants associated to the draft CDM-PDD will be henceforth be hidden.

28. The Board agreed to adopt the reformatted revised versions of methodologies **AM0001** (“Incineration of HFC 23 Waste Streams”), **AM0009** (“Recovery and utilization of gas from oil wells that would otherwise be flared”) and **AM0013** (“Forced methane extraction from organic waste-water treatment plants for grid-connected”) as contained in annexes 4, 5 and 6 to this report. In accordance with the “Procedures for the revision of an approved methodology”, contained in annex 3 to this report, these revised versions will become effective as of 14 May 2005 and replace the previous ones. However, project activities that use the previous versions of the approved methodologies and that have been submitted for registration prior to the date of revisions shall not be affected by the revisions.

29. The Board requested the Meth Panel to develop recommendations regarding the conditions of use of measurement instruments in the monitoring of project activities (i.e. calibration issues).



30. The Board noted that the Meth Panel is in the process of developing a consolidated methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from biomass project activities. It requested the Meth Panel to give priority to this work with a view to recommending a draft consolidated methodology for consideration by the Board at its twentieth meeting.

31. The Board agreed to approve the reformatted consolidated methodology “Emission reductions through partial substitution of fossil fuels with alternative fuels in cement manufacture” as contained in annex 7 of this report. This methodology consolidates the approved baseline and monitoring methodologies **NM0040** (“Replacement of Fossil Fuel by Palm Kernel Shell Biomass in the production of Portland Cement”) and **NM0048-rev** (“Indocement Sustainable Cement Production Project - Alternative Fuel Component”). The Chairs of the Meth Panel and the CDM-AP informed the Board that these methodologies are linked to scope 4 (Manufacturing industries).

32. Taking into consideration recommendations by the Meth Panel and by desk reviewers as well as twelve (12) public inputs, the Board considered fourteen (14) proposals for new baseline and monitoring methodologies and agreed on the following recommendations:

NM0041-rev case: “Khorat Waste to Energy Project, Thailand”

33. The Board agreed to approve the proposed baseline and monitoring methodologies contained in proposal NM0041-rev and the reformatted version of these methodologies as contained in annex 8 to this report.

34. The Chairs of the Meth Panel and the CDM-AP informed the Board that these methodologies are linked to scope 10 (Fugitive emissions from fuels).

35. The Board agreed that the proposed new baseline and monitoring methodologies for the **cases NM0071, NM0076 and NM0079** may be reconsidered subject to:

(a) Required changes being made by the project participants, taking into account issues raised by the Board, recommendations made by the Meth Panel, and re-submission of a duly revised proposal. The secretariat shall make the revised proposal publicly available upon receipt;

(b) Reconsideration of the revised proposal directly by the Meth Panel, without further review by desk reviewers; and

(c) A recommendation by the Meth Panel being made to the Executive Board.

36. If project participants wish to have the revised proposals considered at the sixteenth meeting of the Meth Panel (13-17 June 2005) they shall submit them by 25 May 2005.

37. The Board agreed not to approve the proposed new baseline and monitoring methodologies for **cases NM0020-rev2, NM0068, NM0077, NM0084, NM0086, NM0087 and NM0089**. The Board invites the project participants for these cases to consider the views and suggestions made, in particular with regard to CDM-NMB, CDM-NMB of the submitted draft CDM-PDD, and encourages them to make a further submission.

38. The Board requested that an expert analysis is prepared in the form of a technical paper for consideration by the Meth Panel on weighted average of the operating margin (OM) and the build margin (BM) emission factor to calculate the baseline emission factors for projects generating electricity to the grid.

39. The Board considered the reformatted methodology of **NM0031-rev2** and requested the Meth Panel to further improve the elements relating to the applicability to “captive power plant”. The Board also requested that this methodology is further consolidated with cases **NM0088** and **NM0107** for its consideration at its twentieth meeting.



40. The Board requested the Meth Panel to consolidate methodologies for cases relating to the use and production of blended cement (**NM0045-rev2, NM0047-rev, NM0095**) for its consideration at its twentieth meeting.
41. The Board noted that the Meth Panel has sought additional expertise and shall further consider cases relating to the recovery of coal mine and coal bed methane (**NM0066, NM0075, NM0093 and NM0094**) at its next meeting with a view to finalizing its recommendations on these cases.
42. The Board agreed, for a project activity requesting retroactive credits, on the following:
- (a) Project participants shall, for assessing additionality, consider the information that was available at the time when the decision was made to undertake the project activity;
 - (b) The Meth Panel shall prepare a recommendation on the type of information to be considered in the calculation of baseline emissions.
43. The Board agreed to increase the number of Meth Panel members 10 to 15. It considered a shortlist of applicants to the Meth Panel and selected the following members for a term of 1 year: Ms. Jane Ellis, Mr. Michael Lazarus, Mr. Christophe de Gouvello, Mr. Roberto Schaeffer, Mr. Lambert Richard Schneider, Mr. Christoph Sutter, Mr. Kenichiro Yamaguchi, Mr. Ashok Sarkar, Mr. Braulio Pikman and Mr. Abdel-Aziz. The full membership of the Meth Panel is contained in annex 9 of this report.
44. The Board expressed deep appreciation to the outgoing member of the Meth Panel, Ms. Sujata Gupta, for her excellent work during her term.
45. The Board had an initial consideration of the request of the Meth Panel to obtain guidance on whether local/national/regional policy development and/or implementation can be eligible as CDM project activities. The Panel had recently received baseline and monitoring methodologies proposing a policy measure as a project activity (**e.g. case NM0072**). The Board was unable to agree on a course of action at its nineteenth meeting.
46. Noting that methodologies may be proposed at any time and are treated on a first come first serve basis, the Board agreed to set the deadline for the eleventh round of submissions of proposed new baseline and monitoring methodologies to 1 June 2005.
47. The Board took note of the date for the sixteenth meeting of the Meth Panel (13 to 17 June 2005).

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

48. The Board considered an oral report by Mr. Martin Enderlin, Acting Chair of the afforestation and reforestation working group (AR/WG), on an update of the activities of this group, which were undertaken through two teleconferences.
49. The Board agreed not to approve the proposed new baseline and monitoring methodologies for **cases ARNM0001 and ARNM0002**. The Board noted that case ARNM0001 has been withdrawn. It invites the project participants for these cases to consider the views and suggestions made, in particular with regard to CDM-AR-NMB, CDM-AR-NMB of the submitted draft CDM-PDD, and encourages them to make a further submission.
50. The Board acknowledged the tendency for the work of the AR/WG to increase and that, as a consequence, there might be need for the AR WG to meet more often than expected.
51. The Board nominated Mr. Martin Enderlin as Chair of the AR/WG and agreed to further nominate a Vice-Chair for this group at its twentieth meeting.



52. The Board considered a shortlist of applicants to the A/R WG and selected the following members for a term of one (1) year Ms. Carmenza Robledo Abad, Mr. Paul Victor Desanker, Mr. Wojciech Seweryn Galinski, Mr. Lucio Pedroni, Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh as reflected in annex 10.

53. The Board expressed deep appreciation to the outgoing members of the working group, Mr. Michael Dutschke and Mr. Walter Oyhantcabal, for their excellent work.

54. The Board agreed to set the deadline for the fifth round for submissions of proposed new AR baseline and monitoring methodologies to 2 June 2005.

55. The Board took note of the date for the fourth meeting of the AR/WG (13 to 14 June 2005).

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

56. The Board considered the oral report of the Chair of the working group on proposed methodologies and project categories for small-scale CDM project activities (SSC WG), Ms. Gertraud Wollansky.

57. The Board acknowledged the tendency for the work of the SSC WG to increase as submissions of proposals for new categories/new methodologies and amendments to the Appendix B have augmented and that, as a consequence, there might be need for the SSC WG to meet more often than expected.

58. The Board requested the SSC WG to develop, in collaboration with the Meth Panel, recommendations to the Board on implications for the eligibility of project activities as small-scale project activities in cases where emissions of a proposed project activity are increasing during the crediting period.

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

59. Having considered the report of the review teams, the Board agreed on action to be taken, as contained in annexes 11, 12 and 13, with respect to the following three cases under review:

- (a) La Esperanza Hydroelectric Project (0009)
- (b) Olavarría Landfill Gas Recovery Project (0024)
- (c) Graneros Plant Fuel Switching Project (0029)

60. The Board agreed that clarifications are needed on the circumstances under which a CDM-PDD that has already been made publicly available for comments and needs to change to incorporate corrective measures identified by a DOE, shall once more be made publicly available for comments. The Board agreed to develop clarifications on this issue at its twentieth meeting.

61. The Board, while welcoming requests by DOEs for further clarification and guidance in the context of submitting clarifications to scope of reviews, invites the DOEs to make submissions for clarifications or guidance formally and directly to the Board. It wishes to stress that such requests should not be used to avoid addressing issues highlighted and/or regulated by the Board under the scopes of review and its related requests for clarification.

62. The Board agreed to continue through electronic exchanges its work to streamline the “Clarifications to facilitate the implementation of the procedures for review as referred to in paragraph 41 of the CDM modalities and procedures (EB16, Annex 5)” with the aim to considering and adopting revised procedures at its twentieth meeting.

63. The Board agreed to amend the “Guidelines for completing the project design document (CDM-PDD), the proposed new methodology: baseline (CDM-NMB) and the proposed new methodology: monitoring (CDM-NMM)” as contained in annex 14.

**Agenda sub-item 3 (f): CDM registry**

64. The Board took note of a presentation by the secretariat on (s) the “Technical paper on draft procedures relating to the CDM registry - Version 01”, made available in the extranet of the Board, and (b) areas for which policy-related guidance by the Board is required, as described in annex 6 of the annotated agenda of this meeting.

65. The Board established a small group to look at the issues for which guidance is needed. Due to time constraints, conclusions were not reached on all matters. The Board agreed to task Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sethi and Ms. Anastassia Moskalenko to conduct further consultations and prepare an input for the consideration of the Board at its twentieth meeting. The Board agreed to consider electronic decision-making prior to its twentieth meeting on three high priority issues, identified by the secretariat, if the programming work of version 2 of the CDM Registry would otherwise be substantially delayed.

66. The Board took note of the “Procedures relating to verification and certification report/request for issuance of CERs” as described in annex 7 of the annotated agenda of this meeting. The Board agreed to further consult and consider electronic decision-making on these procedures.

Agenda sub-item 3 (g): Modalities for collaboration with the SBSTA

67. The Board requested Ms. Anastassia Moskalenko and Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sethi to continue to follow negotiations at SBSTA 22 relating to registries and report on the outcome to the Board.

68. The Board further requested Mr. Martin Enderlin and Mr. José Domingos Miguez to follow negotiations at SBSTA 22 relating to “Implications of the implementation of project activities under the clean development mechanism, referred to in decision 12/CP.10, for the achievement of objectives of other environmental conventions and protocols” and report on the outcome to the Board.

Agenda item 4. Resources for the work on the CDM

69. The Board took note of a presentation by the secretariat on the updated budget, resources and expenditure in 2005. Of the total budget of USD 6.8 million for CDM activities in 2005 (core and supplementary), approximately USD 3 million were received to date. This leaves a resource gap of USD 3.8 million for the remainder of the year. While expressing its appreciation to Parties which have recently contributed or pledged, the Board stressed the urgent need for pledges to be converted and for further contributions to be made so that the full scope of required activities could be undertaken in 2005.

70. The secretariat further informed the Board that resources for supporting the operations of the CDM in the biennium 2006-2007, both from core and supplementary resources, were included in proposals that the Executive Secretary has made to the SBI at its twenty-second session (contained in document FCCC/SBI/2005/8 and Add.1 and Add.2). The assumptions regarding activity levels would need to be reviewed as information on the actual case flow is becoming more reliable. The budget provisions for the CDM in 2006-2007 amount to USD 4.69 million (core budget) and USD 12.69 million (supplementary), thus jointly totalling USD 17.4 million.

71. The secretariat reminded the Board of the need to recommend to COP/MOP 1 a percentage for the share of proceeds to cover costs of administration of the CDM.

72. The Board expressed its appreciation to the Executive Secretary and the Chair of the Board for their efforts in raising resources for the work on the CDM, including through a joint letter to Ministers.

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

73. The Board met with registered observers for informal briefings on 13 May 2005 and agreed to continue with such meetings in the afternoon of the last day of its future meetings, unless otherwise indicated. These meetings are available on web cast.
74. The Board took note of CDM-related events attended by Board members and alternates since the last meeting.
75. The Board took note with appreciation of inputs received from Parties, IGOs and NGOs to its work.
76. The Board further agreed to continue to meet with the same type of arrangement as at its nineteenth meeting, with space being made available for 70 observers, and to reconsider the issue when necessary. Observers to the twentieth meeting of the Executive Board shall have registered with the secretariat by 15 June 2005, no later than 17:00 GMT. In order to ensure proper security and logistical arrangements, the Board emphasised that this deadline will be strictly enforced by the secretariat.

Agenda sub-item 5 (c): Other business

77. The Board agreed on the outline for its Management Plan (CDM-MAP), based on inputs by the secretariat on major elements to be covered in such a plan, as contained in annex 15. The Chair of the Board, in consultation with her predecessors, Mr. John Kilani, Mr. Hans Juergen Stehr and Mr. John Ashe, and with the support of the secretariat, will prepare a first draft and circulate it before the twentieth meeting of the Board, with a view to the Board agreeing to the CDM-MAP at that meeting.
78. The Board agreed on the provisional agenda for its twentieth meeting as contained in annex 16 to this report.

Agenda item 6. Conclusion of the meeting

79. The Chair summarized the main conclusions.

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

80. 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

81. The Chair closed the meeting at 2:30 am on 14 May 2005.

Annexes to the report:

Annex 1: Change of the scope of witnessing of applicant entities for accreditation

Annex 2: Guidelines for the preparation of the annual activity report by a DOE to the EB

Annex 3: Procedures for the revision of an approved methodology

Annex 4: Revision of approved methodology AM0001 “Incineration of HFC 23 Waste Streams”

Annex 5: Revision of approved methodology AM0009 “Recovery and utilization of gas from oil wells that would otherwise be flared”

Annex 6: Revision of approved methodology AM0013 “Forced methane extraction from organic waste-water treatment plants for grid-connected”

Annex 7: Approved consolidated methodology ACM0003: “Emission reductions through partial substitution of fossil fuels with alternative fuels in cement manufacture” (NM0040/48)

Annex 8: Approved methodology AM0022: “Avoided Wastewater and On-site Energy Use Emissions in the Industrial Sector” (NM0041-rev)

Annex 9: Members of the Panel on baselines and monitoring methodologies of the clean development mechanism (Meth Panel)

Annex 10: Members of working group on afforestation and reforestation project activities of the clean development mechanism (A/R WG)

Annex 11: Review conclusions: La Esperanza Hydroelectric Project (0009)

Annex 12: Review conclusions: Graneros Plant Fuel Switching Project (0024)

Annex 13: Review conclusions: Olavarría Landfill Gas Recovery Project (0029)

Annex 14: Revised guidelines for completing the CDM-PDD, CDM-NMB and CDM-NMM

Annex 15: CDM Executive Board Management Plan (CDM-MAP)

Annex 16: Provisional agenda for the twentieth meeting of the Executive Board