



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

Date: 26 September 2008
Ref: CDM-EB-42

EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE CLEAN DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM

FORTY-SECOND MEETING

Report

Date of meeting: 24-26 September 2008

Location: Bonn, Germany

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

Member	Alternate
Mr. Samuel Adeoye Adejuwon ¹	<i>Mr. Kamel Djemouai</i> ¹
Mr. Philip M. Gwage ²	<i>Mr. Xuedu Lu</i> ²
Mr. Victor Nicolae ²	<i>Ms. Diana Harutyunyan</i> ²
Mr. Lex de Jonge ²	<i>Mr. Pedro Martins Barata</i> ²
Mr. Akihiro Kuroki ¹	<i>Ms. Jeanne-Marie Huddleston</i> ¹
Mr. Clifford Mahlung ²	<i>Mr. Tuiloma Neroni Slade</i> ²
Mr. Paulo Manso ²	<i>Mr. Hussein Badarin</i> ²
Ms. Ulrika Raab ¹	<i>Mr. Martin Hession</i> ¹
Mr. Hugh Sealy ¹	<i>Mr. José Domingos Miguez</i> ¹
Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sethi ¹	<i>Ms. Liana Bratasida</i> ¹

¹ Term: Two years (term of service ends immediately before the first meeting in 2009)

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

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

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

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

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

1. Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sethi, 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.
2. The Board noted that the secretariat was informed that Mr. Kamel Djemouai and Ms. Jeanne-Marie Huddleston were unable to attend the meeting and had provided proper justification for their absence.

Agenda item 2. Adoption of the agenda

3. The Board adopted the agenda and agreed to the programme of work.

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

4. The Board took note of the twenty-sixth progress report on the work of the CDM Accreditation Panel (CDM-AP), and an oral report by the Chair, Mr. Martin Hession. The report summarized information relating to the work of the panel including the status of applications and developments with respect to desk reviews, on-site assessments, witnessing activities and other accreditation related issues.

Case specific

5. The Board considered a recommendation of the CDM-AP and agreed not to accredit the entity for sectoral scope 4 (Manufacturing Industries) for validation functions. The Board also took note that the entity have requested to withdraw its application for accreditation for sectoral scope 4 (Manufacturing Industries).
6. The Board considered the recommendation of the CDM-AP and agreed to reject the application for an entity taking note that AE had not been able to demonstrate its financial stability as required under the CDM accreditation requirements.
7. The Board considered an appeal submitted by an entity against the recommendation of the CDM-AP on phased accreditation. The CDM-AP, in accordance with the appeals procedures under the CDM accreditation process, established the appeal panel. The Board requested the secretariat to accomplish the work of the appeal panel expeditiously and submit for the consideration of the Board.
8. The Board considered a recommendation from the CDM-AP relating to successful completion of desk-reviews and on-site assessments for four entities under re-accreditation. The Board requested the CDM-AP to review these cases in consideration to the decision of the Board on streamlining the accreditation process as referred in paragraph 11 below and submit a recommendation for the consideration of the Board at its forty-third meeting.

General guidance

9. The Board continued to consider the draft Validation and Verification Manual prepared by the secretariat. The Board held a detailed discussion on the document and considered it up to the paragraph 131 of the document, contained as annex 1 of the annotated agenda of the forty-first meeting of the Board. The Board due to time constraints could not finalize its consideration of the document and agreed to continue its discussion on the remaining open issues of the document at its forty-third meeting.



10. The Board decided to make the draft document on accreditation standard as contained annex 1 of the twenty-sixth progress report of the CDM-AP, available for public comments from 29 September 2008 to 27 October 2008, noting that the Board had not yet considered the draft. The Board requested the secretariat to submit a revised draft document at its forty-fourth meeting taking into consideration the public comments received.
11. The Board, in order to streamline the accreditation process, decided as follows:
- (a) Applicant entities shall be granted accreditation for the sectoral scopes applied for on the basis of successful completion of desk-review and on-site assessment. Their accreditation status shall be subject to assessment of their performance based on projects selected by the CDM-AP on the basis of criteria to be approved by the Board;
 - (b) Designated operational entities shall also be granted re-accreditation for the sectoral scopes applied for on the basis of successful completion of desk review and on-site assessment. The DOEs shall be subject to performance-based monitoring and assessment of projects submitted for registration/issuance by the CDM-AP based on the criteria to be approved by the Board.
12. The Board requested the CDM-AP to review the implications of the decision referred in paragraph 11 above on current accreditation status of entities and make a recommendation to the Board on the effective date of this decision at its next meeting.
13. The Board also requested the CDM-AP to review the system of monitoring and assessment with a view to incentivising improved performance by DOEs. Such review should include rationalisation of the system of witnessings, spot checks, and regular surveillance activities and consideration of other mechanisms for ensuring auditor and technical competences of DOEs.
14. The Board, in order to facilitate the accreditation process agreed on following additional options for performance based monitoring and assessment of entities
- (a) Model projects to be developed by the CDM-AP which could be used for assessing the competence of AEs/DOEs;
 - (b) Public call inviting project participants to submit PDDs.
15. The Board requested the CDM-AP to update the procedure for accrediting the operational entities under the CDM accordingly and submit for its consideration at its next meeting.
16. The Board decided and requested the secretariat to issue an invitation to entities from various sectors to consider applying for accreditation as DOEs to perform validation and verification services.
17. The Board further requested the CDM-AP to analyse the barriers to the entry of new entities and propose measures to facilitate entries for the consideration of the Board at its next meeting.

Further schedule

18. The Board noted that the thirty-seventh meeting of the CDM-AP is scheduled on 8 to 10 October 2008.

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

19. The Board took note of the report of the thirty-fourth meeting of the panel on baseline and monitoring methodologies (Meth Panel), and an oral report by the Chair of the panel, Mr. Akihiro Kuroki, on the work of the panel.

*Case specific*

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

(a) Approve cases:

(i) **AM0070** - "Manufacturing of energy efficient domestic refrigerators", which was proposed as NM0235 (Manufacturing of energy efficient domestic refrigerators (by M/s Godrej & Boyce Mfg. Ltd)) and link it to scope 04 (Manufacturing industries), as contained in the annex 1 of this report;

(ii) **AM0071** - "Manufacturing and servicing of domestic refrigeration appliances using a low GWP refrigerant", which was proposed as NM0247 (Manufacturing and servicing of refrigerators using low GWP refrigerant by M/s Videocon Appliances Ltd.) and link it to scope 11 (Fugitive emissions from production and consumption of halocarbons and sulphur hexafluoride), as contained in the annex 2 of this report;

(iii) **AM0072** - "Fossil Fuel Displacement by Geothermal Resources for Space Heating", which was proposed as NM0261 (Fossil Fuel Displacement by Geothermal Resources for Space Heating) and link it to scope 01 (Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources)), as contained in the annex 3 of this report.

21. **Not to approve cases:** NM0256, NM0263, NM0274 and NM0276 which, if revised taking into account comments, can be resubmitted but will require new expert and public input.

Responses to requests for clarification

22. The Board took note of the responses to the requests for clarification provided by the Meth Panel on the cases AM_CLA_0100 to AM_CLA_0110, AM_CLA_0113 to AM_CLA_0117 and CLA_TOOL_0006 and revised the response to the request for clarification AM_CLA_0114.

Responses to requests for revision

23. The Board agreed to the responses prepared by the Meth Panel to the requests for revision of approved methodologies:

(a) Not to accept request AM_REV_0099 concerning a revision to approved consolidated methodology ACM0006 to revise scenario 15;

(b) Accept request AM_REV_0102 concerning a revision to AM0058 to expand the applicability of the approved methodology. See also paragraph 24 below;

(c) Not to accept request AM_REV_0103 concerning a revision to AM0034 to extend its applicability to cover nitric acid plants that were already approved by the government for construction by the cut-off date of 31 December 2005;

(d) Not to accept request AM_REV_0104 concerning a revision to AM0048 to expand its applicability to include cogeneration project activities that supply steam and electricity to newly introduced customers;

(e) Not to accept request AM_REV_0105 concerning a revision to ACM0008 to include procedures for calculating emission reductions from displaced household cooking fuel.

**Revision to approved methodologies**

24. The Board revised the following approved methodologies:
- (a) **AM0009:** The revision is made in response to the request for clarification AM_CLA_0107. The revision includes the correction of an error in equation 3 and clarification on the calculation of project emissions from associated gas used within the processing facility for power generation. The revised approved methodology is contained in [annex 4](#) to this report;
 - (b) **AM0058:** The revision is made in response to the request for revision AM_REV_0102, allows for backpressure cogeneration plants as a possible project technology, and introduces of a new baseline scenario where an isolated boiler supplies heat to one building. In the latter case historical data on fuel consumption and heat production is required. The revised approved methodology is contained in [annex 5](#) to this report;
 - (c) **AM0064:** The revision is made in response to the submission of a proposed new small-scale methodology SSC-NM001. The Board at its thirty-ninth meeting requested SSC WG to review SSC-NM001 in consultation with the Meth Panel to assess, *inter alia*, its consistency with AM0064. The revision is to expand the applicability of the methodology to include project activities that capture and destruct methane from exploration boreholes. The revised approved methodology is contained in [annex 6](#) to this report;
 - (d) **ACM0008:** The revision is made in response to the requests for clarification AM_CLA_0113 and AM_CLA_0089. The revision expands the applicability of the approved consolidated methodology to include project activities where methane is destructed using flameless oxidation without the use of a catalyst. The revised approved methodology is contained in [annex 7](#) to this report;
 - (e) **ACM0010:** In response to the request by the Board (EB40) to re-assess the requirement for 100 per cent measurement of the animal weight and to consider a sampling method instead, the revision includes sampling procedures for estimating the annual average weight of the livestock at a 95 per cent confidence interval. The revised approved methodology is contained in [annex 8](#) to this report.
25. The revised versions of the methodologies referred to in the paragraphs above will come into effect on 10 October 2008, 17:00 GMT, in accordance with the procedure for the revision of approved methodologies.

General guidance

26. The Board agreed to postpone the consideration of the draft guidance on the barrier “first-of-its-kind” to its forty-third meeting due to time constraints.
27. The Board considered the note prepared by the panel on expansion of industrial gas recovery methodologies to new facilities and requested the panel to provide a draft guidance together with clarifications on the issues raised in the note for consideration of the Board at its forty-fourth meeting.
28. The Board agreed to the revision to the “Procedure for the submission and consideration of queries regarding the application of approved methodologies by Designated Operational Entities to the Meth Panel” as contained in [annex 9](#) to this report. The revision clarifies that requests for clarification submitted with the intention to expand the applicability of an approved methodology to project activities not included (explicitly or otherwise) in the applicability conditions of the approved methodology, shall be requested to be withdrawn. Project participants submitting, through the DOE, such a request for clarification should be advised by the DOE to submit a request for revision to the approved methodology,



complete with a draft PDD and a draft revised methodology.

Further schedule

29. The Board noted that the thirty-fifth meeting of the CDM Meth Panel is scheduled from 3 to 7 November 2008.

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

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

Responses to requests for clarifications

31. The Board noted that the A/R WG agreed to continue consideration of the request AR-AM_CLA_0005 in its twenty-second meeting.

Revision of approved methodologies/tools

32. The Board revised the following approved methodologies and methodological tools:

(a) **AR-AM0005:** The revision is made in response to request for revision AR-AM_REV_0002. The revised methodology applies a methodological approach which makes reference to the approved tool "Estimation of GHG emissions related to displacement of grazing activities in A/R CDM project activity". The revised methodology, which also includes several editorial changes to correct minor errors and add clarity, is contained in [annex 10](#) to this report;

(b) **AR-AM0007:** The revision is made in response to request for revision AR-AM_REV_0003. The revised methodology applies a methodological approach, which makes reference to the approved tool "Estimation of GHG emissions related to displacement of grazing activities in CDM A/R project activity". The revised methodology, which also improves the establishment of the baseline scenario, applies several editorial changes to correct minor errors and adds clarity, is contained in [annex 11](#) to this report.

33. The revised versions of the methodologies referred to in the paragraphs above will come into effect on 10 October 2008, 17:00 GMT, in accordance with the procedure for the revision of approved methodologies.

General guidance

34. The Board revised the "Guidelines for completing the Project Design Document for A/R (CDM-AR-PDD), the proposed new methodology for A/R: baseline and monitoring (CDM-AR-NM)" as contained in [annex 12](#) of this report. The Board further agreed to change the title of the above-mentioned document to: "Guidelines for completing the CDM A/R forms for: the project design document (CDM AR PDD) and the proposed new baseline and monitoring methodology (CDM-AR-NM)".

35. The Board clarified the guidance on accounting GHG emissions in A/R CDM project activities from the following sources: (i) fertilizer application, (ii) removal of herbaceous vegetation, and (iii) transportation; and agreed that emissions from these sources may be considered as insignificant and hence can be neglected in A/R baseline and monitoring methodologies and tools. The Board further requested the secretariat to revise all affected approved A/R CDM baseline and monitoring methodologies and tools, in order to apply the above-mentioned guidance, and make these methodologies available on 17 October 2008, after agreement by the chairs of the A/R WG and the Board.



36. The board took note of the public comments received in response to a call for input on the draft guidance and the issue of flexibility in the application of the definition of project boundary to CDM A/R project activities and considered a draft proposal on “Guidance on the application of the definition of project boundary to A/R project activities” as prepared by the secretariate and contained in annex 2 to the annotations of the forty-second meeting. The Board requested the A/R WG to further consider this guidance, with view to providing clarifications to the options contained therein, for consideration by the Board at its forty-fourth meeting.

Further schedule

37. The Board noted that the twenty-second meeting of the A/R WG is scheduled for 10 - 12 November 2008.

38. The Board reminded project participants that the deadline for consideration of request for revision and request for clarification of A/R methodologies at the twenty-second meeting is 29 September 2008.

39. The Board reminded project participants that the deadline for the twentieth round of submissions of proposed new A/R methodologies is 27 October 2008.

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

40. The Board took note of the report on the work of the seventeenth 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, Ms. Ulrika Raab, on the work of the group.

Case specific

41. The Board approved a new small-scale methodology “AMS III.U Cable Cars for Mass Rapid Transit System” assigned to sectoral scope 07 as contained in [annex 13](#) of this report. The methodology is for public transport projects involving a new cable car line as part of a mass transit system, which displaces fossil fuel based motorized transport modes.

42. The Board approved a new small-scale methodology “AMS III.V Decrease of coke consumption in Blast Furnace by installing dust/sludge recycling system in steel works” assigned to sectoral scope 04 as contained in [annex 14](#) of this report. The methodology is for activities resulting in decrease in coke consumption in a blast furnace of a steel works by feeding direct reduced iron (DRI) pellet into the blast furnace. The DRI pellet is produced by dust/sludge recycling from dust/sludge in the project activity, which in the baseline is not utilized in the steel works but rather sold off and/or land-filled.

43. The Board approved a new small-scale methodology “AMS III.W Methane capture and destruction in non-hydrocarbon mining activities” assigned to sectoral scope 10 as contained in [annex 15](#) of this report. The methodology is for fugitive methane recovery from exploratory boreholes for non-hydrocarbon minerals.

Revisions of approved methodologies:

44. The Board agreed to the revised approved methodologies:

(a) “**AMS I.A Electricity generation by the user**”, which provides guidance on project activities for renewable energy based lighting (e.g. solar-lamps) to displace fossil fuel usage in lighting in rural households that are not grid connected or connected to a grid prone to blackouts/brownouts, as contained in [annex 16](#) of this report;

(b) “**AMS III.H Methane recovery in wastewater treatment**”, which provides additional guidance on baseline determination and project emission calculations, as contained in [annex 17](#) of



this report. The methodology has been restructured for clarity and provisions related to the methane correction factor and related uncertainties have been revised. The Board also requested the SSCWG to recommend guidance on applicable methane correction factor (MCF) for the discharge of wastewater into open lands or groundwater in the baseline;

(c) **“AMS III.I Avoidance of methane production in wastewater treatment through replacement of anaerobic lagoons by aerobic systems”**, to provide additional guidance on the determination of the baseline and the project emission calculations and to make it consistent in structure and with the methods in AMS III.H, as contained in [annex 18](#) of this report;

(d) **“AMS III.Q Waste gas based energy systems”**, which broadens the applicability of the methodology to include an option to use other fuels to supplement the use of waste energy, to meet the balance of energy needed for electricity and/or steam generation, as contained in [annex 19](#) of this report. The revisions also includes a precise definition of waste gas and further guidance on the baseline emission calculations.

45. The revised versions of the methodologies referred to in the paragraphs above will come into effect on 10 October 2008, 17:00 GMT, in accordance with the procedure for the revision of approved methodologies.

General guidance

46. The Board clarified the conditions under which charcoal based biomass energy generation project activities are eligible under the CDM, in applying the approved methodology AMS I.C as;

Only charcoal, produced from renewable biomass sources¹² can be used, provided:

(a) The charcoal is produced in kilns equipped with methane recovery and destruction facility; or

(b) If the charcoal is produced in kilns not equipped with a methane recovery and destruction facility, methane emissions from the production of charcoal shall be considered. These emissions shall be calculated as per the procedures defined in the approved methodology AMS III.K. Alternatively, conservative emission factor values from peer reviewed literature or from a registered CDM project activity can be used, provided that it can be demonstrated that the parameters from these are comparable e.g. source of biomass, characteristics of biomass such as moisture, carbon content, type of kiln, operating conditions such as ambient temperature.

The Board further requested the SSCWG to revise AMS I.C, accordingly.

47. The Board clarified that in applying paragraph 18.C of the approved methodology AMS I.C, it is appropriate to employ survey methods to determine annually the number of systems operating in the absence of other evidence such as on-going rental/lease payments. This being also in accordance with other approved methodologies e.g. AMS II.C, the Board further requested the SSCWG to include this guidance in the revision of AMS I.C.

Further schedule

48. The Board noted that the eighteenth meeting of the SSC WG meeting is scheduled for 10–12 November 2008 .

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

49. Taking into account the public comments received in response to the call for public inputs on issues associated with the development of the Programme of Activities (PoA) and difficulties in the validation and submission for registration of a PoA, the Board took note of the summary of issues raised by stakeholders prepared by the secretariat. The Board also requested the secretariat to develop options that could address the issues raised for consideration by the Board at its forty-third meeting.

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

50. The Board took note that 1168 CDM project activities have been registered by 26 September 2008. 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

51. In accordance with the procedures for review as referred to in paragraph 41 of the CDM modalities and procedures, the Board considered a request for review of sixty-six (66) requests for registration.

52. The Board agreed to register, as corrected, the project activity:

(a) The Board agreed to register, as corrected, the project activity “Fuel Switching Project of the Aqaba Thermal Power Station (ATPS)” (1758) submitted for registration by the DOE (SGS) if the revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report submitted in response to the request for review are displayed on the UNFCCC CDM website;

(b) The Board agreed to register, as corrected, the project activity “Yuexi Dayan Small Hydropower Project” (1814) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV NORD) if the revised PDD submitted and corresponding revised validation report in response to the request for review are displayed on the UNFCCC CDM website.

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

(a) “Inner Mongolia Bayannaer Chuanjingsumu 49.3 MW Wind Power Project” (1621) if the DOE (DNV) submits a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which include the clarifications on the validation of input values and assumption of fixed tariff in the investment analysis submitted in response to the request for review;

(b) “Jiangsu Huaerrun Waste Heat Recovery Project” (1637) if the DOE (TÜV NORD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include:

(i) A revised NPV calculation for the economic comparison of the two baseline alternatives that applies justified rates of increases in the tariffs and O&M costs and shows that the project activity is not the most economically attractive baseline alternative; and

(ii) The information on the suitability of input values submitted in response to the request for review;

(c) “YZICL 4.5MW Waste Heat Generation Project” (1647) if the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include:

(i) Validation of input values to the investment analysis in line with the requirements of EB 38 paragraph 54(c);



- (ii) A revised NPV calculation for the economic comparison of the two baseline alternatives that applies justified rates of increases in the tariffs and O&M costs and shows that the project activity is not the most economically attractive baseline alternative; and
 - (iii) The information on the common practice analysis submitted in response to the request for review;
- (d) “Coke Dry Quenching (CDQ) Waste Heat Recovery for Power Generation Project of Laiwu Iron & Steel Group Corp.” (1656) if the DOE (TÜV SÜD) submits a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which:
- (i) Include the suitability of the input values submitted in the response to the request for review;
 - (ii) Remove the barriers analysis;
 - (iii) Include further description of means of validation of the input values to the NPV and levelized cost, in particular, the maximum annual rate of increases in the tariffs and minimum annual rate of O&M costs; and
 - (iv) Include a revised monitoring plan, which reflects calibration frequency of every year;
- (e) “Landfill Gas Management Project Puerto Vallarta Landfill site, Mexico” (1699) if the DOE (DNV) submits a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which include:
- (i) Information on the prior consideration of the CDM in section B.5;
 - (ii) Common practice analysis in accordance with the requirements of the Tool for the demonstration and assessment of investment analysis; and
 - (iii) Description of the means of validation employed to assess the investment analysis, the common practice analysis and the prior consideration of the CDM;
- (f) “Shanxi Taigang Stainless Steel Co., Ltd. Sinter Machine Waste Heat Recovery and Generation Project ” (1705) if the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include a revised NPV and levelized cost calculation for the economic comparison of the two baseline alternatives that applies justified rates of increases in the tariffs and O&M costs and shows that the project activity is not the most economically attractive baseline alternative;
- (g) “Angang Sinter Machine Waste Heat Recovery and Generation Project” (1709) if the DOE (TÜV SÜD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include:
- (i) Further clarification on the lifetime of the project activity and/or that the salvage value reflects the potential cash flows of the project activity;
 - (ii) The spreadsheet for levelized cost calculation ensuring the formulae are readable;
 - (iii) A revised NPV calculation for the economic comparison of the two baseline alternatives that applies justified rates of increases in the tariffs and O&M costs and shows that the project activity is not the most economically attractive baseline alternative; and



- (iv) The starting date of the project activity as mentioned in the response submitted in response to the request for review;
- (h) “Shanxi Taigang Stainless Steel Co., Ltd. Waste Saturated Steam Recovery and Generation Project” (1711) if the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include:
- (i) Validation of input values to the investment analysis in line with the requirements of EB 38 paragraph 54(c);
 - (ii) A revised NPV and levelized cost calculation for the economic comparison of the two baseline alternatives that applies justified rates of increases in the tariffs and O&M costs and shows that the project activity is not the most economically attractive baseline alternative; and
 - (iii) The information on the standard industrial practice for power generation and reason to apply saturated steam technology to this project activity submitted in response to the request for review;
- (i) “WHR CDM CPP ” (1719) if the DOE (SGS) submits a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which include information on validation of investment comparison analysis and prior consideration of the CDM submitted in response to the request for review;
- (j) “Ma Steel (new plant) CDQ and waste heat utilization project ” (1726) if the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include:
- (i) Validation of input values to the investment analysis in line with the requirements of EB 38 paragraph 54(c);
 - (ii) Further clarification on why the sensitivity analysis has not been carried out with electricity tariff, which could be a significant input in determining the project IRR;
 - (iii) A revised NPV calculation for the economic comparison of the two baseline alternatives that applies justified rates of increases in the tariffs and O&M costs and shows that the project activity is not the most economically attractive baseline alternative; and
 - (iv) The information regarding the maximum and the minimum design production capacities of the coke ovens and of the connected CDQ;
- (k) “Ma Steel (old plant) CDQ and waste heat utilization project” (1729) if the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include:
- (i) Validation of input values to the investment analysis in line with the requirements of EB 38 paragraph 54(c);
 - (ii) Further clarification on the maximum and minimum possible coke production per year and inclusion of variation of the coke production in the sensitivity analysis;
 - (iii) A revised NPV calculation for the economic comparison of the two baseline alternatives that applies justified rates of increases in the tariffs and O&M costs and shows that the project activity is not the most economically attractive baseline alternative; and



- (iv) The clarifications on monitoring of steam consumption in the response submitted in response to the request for review;
- (l) “Methane Recovery for Onsite Utilisation Project at Desa Kim Loong Palm Oil Mill, Sook, Keningau, Sabah, Malaysia” (1737) if the DOE (TÜV SÜD) submits a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which include the information submitted in response to the request for review. The validation report should include a validation opinion confirming that the source of information to support the use of the default methane emission factor reflects either the scientific consensus or best available scientific research, as the Board is concerned that a single source of supporting evidence selected by the project participant may not be a sufficient to demonstrate the suitability of the applied value;
- (m) “Visakhapatnam (India) OSRAM CFL distribution CDM Project ” (1754) if the DOE (TÜV SÜD) submits a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which include:
- (i) The information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the revision of the monitoring plan to include the monitoring frequency of the baseline to be 90 days; and
 - (ii) A requirement to replace only one CFL from the location of maximum usage from each household;
- (n) “GCL biomass gasification based power generation” (1760) if the DOE (TÜV NORD) submits a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which include the information submitted in response to the request for review;
- (o) “China Tuanjie Small Rundle Hydropower Project ” (1772) if the DOE (TÜV NORD) submits a further revision to the PDD and the corresponding validation submitted in response to request for review to include a separate monitoring plan for each of the three components of this bundled project activity;
- (p) “Electricity generation from mustard crop residues: Tonk, India ” (1774) if the DOE (TÜV SÜD) submits a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which include the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the prevailing practice barrier;
- (q) “Energy efficiency and fuel switch project at Welspun India” (1786) if the DOE (TÜV NORD) submits a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which include the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the prior consideration of the CDM, the investment analysis, and baseline determination;
- (r) “Shandong Tuoji Island Windfarm Project” (1789) if the DOE (DNV) submits a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which include the explanations submitted in response to the request for review that the variations projected in the sensitivity analysis that would make the IRR cross the benchmark are unlikely;
- (s) “Energy efficiency measures in "Technopolis"” (1794) if the DOE (SGS) submits a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which include the responses to the request for review and which confirms that the total rental charges per square foot (including service maintenance charges) are not greater in the project activity than the market average;



- (t) “Shanxi Datuhe Coal Mine Methane Utilization Project ” (1801) if the DOE (TÜV SÜD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include:
- (i) A revised NPV calculation for the economic comparison of the two baseline alternatives that applies justified rates of increases in the tariffs and O&M costs and shows that the project activity is not the most economically attractive baseline alternative; and
 - (ii) The information on the elimination of baseline alternatives and which uses the emission factor contained in the PDD published for global stakeholder consultation, submitted in response to the request for review;
- (u) “Danian 14 MW Hydropower Project in Gansu Province ” (1808) if the DOE (DNV) submits a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which include the additional information submitted in response to the request for review on the prior consideration of the CDM;
- (v) “Fujian Wuyishan Wenlin River 2nd and 3rd Level Hydropower Station ” (1831) if the DOE (TÜV NORD) submits a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which include the information provided in response to the request for review regarding the prior consideration of the CDM and a separate monitoring plan for each of the two components of this bundled project activity;
- (w) “Jradzor Small Hydroelectric CDM project” (1835) if the DOE (KPMG) submits a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which include the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of the investment barrier, prior consideration of the CDM and resolution of CARs and CLs.
54. 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.
55. The Board agreed to undertake a review of the project activity:
- (a) “Shri Chamundi Captive Energy Private Limited”, 16 MW biomass fired cogeneration plant for supply of power and steam to an industrial facility in Karnataka.” (1350) submitted for registration by the DOE (BVC) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 20](#) to this report;³
 - (b) “Apaqui run-of-river hydroelectric project ” (1401) 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 21](#) to this report;⁴
 - (c) “Burning of solid biomass for process steam generation for beer manufacture in place of fuel oils at AMBEV’s Branchs Agudos (SP) and Teresina (PI)” (1494) 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 22](#) to this report;
 - (d) “GHG emission reductions through pre-heat train optimization in the CDU and VDU of Digboi Refinery, Indian Oil Corporation Limited (Assam Oil Division)” (1525) 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 23](#) to this report;⁵
 - (e) “Bii Stinu Wind Energy Project” (1581) submitted for registration by the DOE (AENOR) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as



contained in [annex 24](#) to this report;

(f) “Sichuan Chenjiaheba 20 MW Hydropower Project” (1589) 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;

(g) “40 MW Grid Connected Wind Power Project” (1600) 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 26](#) to this report;

(h) “Fujian Jiangle Gaotang Hydropower Project” (1601) submitted for registration by the DOE (JCI) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 27](#) to this report;⁶

(i) “Top Gas Pressure Recovery based Power Generation from ‘G’ Blast Furnace” (1648) 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;⁷

(j) “AARTI CDM CPP” (1649) submitted for registration by the DOE (BVC) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 29](#) to this report;⁸

(k) “AIPL WHRB 1&2” (1654) 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 30](#) to this report;⁹

(l) “Laiwu Iron & Steel Group Laigang Inc. 25MW Waste Gas Power Generation Project” (1657) 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;¹⁰

(m) “Yinshan Profiled Iron Co., Ltd. 25 MW Waste Gas Power Generation Project of Laiwu Iron & Steel Group Corp.” (1658) 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 32](#) to this report;¹¹

(n) “2.5 MW Rice husk based cogeneration plant at Hanuman Agro Industries Limited” (1667) 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 33](#) to this report;¹²

(o) “Baotou Iron & Steel Coke Dry Quenching #3 and Waste Heat Utilization for Electricity Generation Project” (1668) 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 34](#) to this report;¹³

(p) “Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Digang Conch Cement Company Limited” (1672) 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 35](#) to this report;¹⁴

(q) “Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Huaining Conch Cement Company Limited” (1673) 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 36](#) to this report;¹⁵



- (r) “Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Jiande Conch Cement Company Limited” (1674) 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 37](#) to this report;¹⁶
- (s) “Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Tongling Conch Cement Company Limited” (1675) 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 38](#) to this report;¹⁷
- (t) “Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Zongyang Conch Cement Company Limited” (1676) 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 39](#) to this report;¹⁸
- (u) “HITECH CDM CPP” (1693) submitted for registration by the DOE (BVC) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 40](#) to this report;¹⁹
- (v) “SMC WHRB 1&2” (1702) 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 41](#) to this report;²⁰
- (w) “Power generation from coking waste heat utilization project at Taiyuan Gangyuan Coking & Chemicals Co., Ltd in China” (1707) 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 42](#) to this report;²¹
- (x) “SML WHRB CPP” (1708) 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 43](#) to this report;
- (y) “24 MW power generation from coking waste heat generated in the clean-type heat-recovery coke ovens at Shanxi Province Gaoping City Sanjia Coking Co., Ltd. in China” (1710) 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 44](#) to this report;
- (z) “Power generation from coking waste heat utilization project at Taiyuan Yingxian Coking & Chemicals Co., Ltd in Shanxi, China” (1718) 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 45](#) to this report;
- (aa) “Power generation from coking waste heat utilization project at Taiyuan City Wanguang Coal and Coking Co. Ltd in Shanxi, China” (1725) 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 46](#) to this report;
- (ab) “Jingdezhen Kaimenzi Ceramics Chemical Industry Group Limited Company CDQ Technology-Reform Project” (1728) 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 47](#) to this report;²²
- (ac) “PAA Biogas Extraction Project for Heat Generation” (1735) submitted for registration by the DOE (JQA) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation



requirements, as contained in [annex 48](#) to this report;²³

(ad) “Offis Textile Ltd. Fuel Switch, Israel” (1757) 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 49](#) to this report;²⁴

(ae) “Wind Electricity Generation Project” (1762) 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 50](#) to this report;

(af) “China Xieshui Small Rundle Hydropower Project” (1764) 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;²⁵

(ag) “Gansu Luqu Dazhuang Hydropower Station Project” (1768) 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 52](#) to this report;

(ah) “Taebaek Wind Power Project” (1771) 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 53](#) to this report;²⁶

(ai) “China Chuandongxia Small Hydropower Project” (1773) 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;²⁷

(aj) “15 MW Wind Energy Project in Maharashtra” (1778) submitted for registration by the DOE (BVC) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 55](#) to this report;

(ak) “Yunnan Jinping Dapo Hydropower Station” (1779) 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;²⁸

(al) “Methane capture from POME for electricity generation in Batu Pahat” (1783) 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 57](#) to this report;²⁹

(am) “15 MW grid-connected wind power project by MMTC in Karnataka” (1797) 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 58](#) to this report;

(an) “Shanshuping 12 MW Small Hydropower Project in Sichuan Province, China” (1810) 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 59](#) to this report;³⁰

(ao) “Anaerobic Digestion Swine Wastewater Treatment with On-site Power Project (ADSW RP2002)” (1846) 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 60](#) to this report.³¹

56. 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.



57. 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 twenty-three (23) of the project activities which were placed “Under review” at the forty-first meeting of the Board.

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

(a) “Jiangsu Qingshi Cement Plant's Low Temperature Waste Heat Power Generation Project” (1309) if the project participant and DOE (TÜV Rheinland) submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report with a clear validation opinion regarding the input values applied in the investment analysis, in particular it should be clearly stated:

- (i) How the applied electricity tariff has been considered to correctly reflect the decision making context of this project activity if the actual tariff being paid in June 2006 was 0.564 RMB/kWh;
- (ii) How the assumed inflation rate can be considered accurate and reasonable; and
- (iii) How the values derived from the FSR have been assessed to confirm their reliability;

(b) “22.5 MW grid connected wind farm project by RSMML in Jaisalmer, India” (1602) if the project participant and DOE (BVC) submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include information to justify the following:

- (i) Parameters used to calculate the 16.08% benchmark such as the average beta value of 0.86 and appropriateness of the power companies selected as references, the tax rate applied, etc;
- (ii) Input values to the IRR and sensitivity analyses such as the PLF of 16%, the flat tariff assumed for the captive electricity generation (i.e., based on avoided electricity purchase from the grid), the possibilities of tax benefits, etc.; and
- (iii) The prior consideration of the CDM following the guidance from EB 41, Annex 46, paragraphs 5 (b). and 6, including relevant evidence;

(c) “Anshan Iron and Steel Group Corporation (Yingkou) Blast Furnace Gas Combined Cycle Power Plant Project” (1608) if the project participant and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report that:

- (i) Either justifies the use of fixed input values in the NPV/levelized cost calculations, or applies an adequately justified and validated inflation rate to these values; and
- (ii) Includes the information submitted in response to the request for review, in particular the responses on the fuel costs, sensitivity analysis and the common practice analysis;



- (d) “Anshan Iron and Steel Group Corporation (Anshan) Blast Furnace Gas Combined Cycle Power Plant Project” (1609) if the project participant and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report that :
- (i) Either justifies the use of fixed input values in the NPV/levelized cost calculations, or applies an adequately justified and validated inflation rate to these values; and
 - (ii) Includes the information submitted in response to the request for review, in particular the responses on the fuel costs, sensitivity analysis and the common practice analysis;
- (e) “Yuhe Tongli WHR Project” (1619) if the project participant and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report that incorporates:
- (i) Further justification of the assumptions submitted in response to the review regarding inflation rates for the input values; and
 - (ii) A revised NPV calculation for the economic comparison of the two baseline alternatives that applies a justified rates of increases in the tariffs and O&M costs and shows that the project activity is not the most economically attractive baseline alternative;
- (f) “Huanghe Tongli WHR Project” (1622) if the project participant and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which includes:
- (i) The calculation of the NPV of the project activity without CDM and import of electricity from the grid reflecting the rate of electricity tariff increased and rate of O&M cost increased; and
 - (ii) Adequate validation of input values to the NPV, which confirms the sources of the values used and their suitability in the context of this project activity;
- (g) “SSPL 4.5 MW WHRB CPP” (1640) if the project participant and DOE (BVC) submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include:
- (i) The actual electricity demand for the sponge iron plant, including the means of validation of this data; and
 - (ii) The economic comparison of the CDM project activity and a baseline scenario with same level of service, i.e. a 4.5 MW WHRB based power plant with a 4.5 MW coal based power plant at the same PLF;
- (h) “SHYAM DRI WHR CPP” (1642) if the project participant and DOE (BVC) submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include:
- (i) The actual electricity demand for the sponge iron plant, including the means of validation of this data; and
 - (ii) The economic comparison of the CDM project activity and a baseline scenario with same level of service, i.e. a 15 MW WHRB based power plant with a 15 MW coal based power plant at the same PLF;
- (i) “13.5MW WHR Project in Hunan Niuli Cement Co., Ltd.” (1659) if the project participant and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report that incorporates the responses provided regarding the trends of the input values and a



revised NPV calculation for the economic comparison of the two baseline alternatives for each power plant (Changde and Xiangtan) that applies the suggested annual rates of increases in the tariffs and O&M costs and shows that importing electricity from the grid is a more economically attractive alternative than the project activity;

(j) “SEPL CDM CPP” (1666) if the project participant and DOE (BVC) submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which include:

(i) The actual electricity demand for the sponge iron plant, including the means of validation of this data; and

(ii) The economic comparison of the CDM project activity and a baseline scenario with same level of service, i.e. a 17 MW WHRB based power plant with a 17 MW coal based power plant at the same PLF;

(k) “Zhang Jiagang waste heat recovery from sulphuric acid production for electricity generation project” (1685) if the project participant and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report which include information on assessment of the suitability of the benchmark, in particular, whether the project activity produces electricity predominately for supply to the grid or for captive consumption through wheeling;

(l) “Chongqing Iron & Steel Co. Ltd. Waste Gas to Electricity Project” (1689) if the project participant and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which incorporate the responses provided for the assessment of the economic comparison of the alternatives that do not face prohibitive barriers;

(m) “Captive power generation through waste heat recovery system in a steel plant in Jinan City” (1691) if the project participant and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report which establish the baseline and demonstrate additionality based on an investment comparison analysis as required by ACM0004 version2. The DOE is requested to ensure that a detailed description of the means of validation applied for the input values be included in this revised validation report, in particular with regard to the assumptions regarding future trends in the electricity tariff and other input values, including possible variations in the plant load factor;

(n) “Power Generation by Waste Heat Recovery Project of Xinjiang Tianshan Cement Co. Ltd. in Urumqi City, Xinjiang Autonomous Region, P. R. China.” (1696) if the project participant and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding revised validation report that incorporates the responses provided regarding the trends of the input values and submit a revised NPV calculation for the economic comparison of the baseline alternatives for each power plant (Turpan and Urumqi) that applies the suggested annual rates of increases in the tariffs and O&M costs and shows that importing electricity from the grid is a more economically attractive alternative than the project activity. The DOE is requested to confirm the suitability of the input values, including inflation rates, applied in this analysis in the context of the project activity;

(o) “Power generation from coking waste heat utilization project at Shanxi Shouyang County Boda Industries Co., Ltd in Shanxi, China” (1703) if the project participant and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report which include information on assessment of the suitability of the benchmark, in particular, whether the project activity produces electricity predominantly for supply to the grid or for captive consumption through wheeling;



- (p) “Power generation from coking waste heat utilization project at Lan County Fengda Coking and Chemicals Smelting Co., Ltd in Shanxi, China” (1704) if the project participant and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report which include information on assessment of the suitability of the benchmark, in particular, whether the project activity produces electricity predominantly for supply to the grid or for captive consumption through wheeling;
- (q) “Power generation from coking waste heat utilization project at Qinyuan County Mingyuan Coal and Coke Co., Ltd in Shanxi, China” (1720) if the project participant and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report which include information on assessment of the suitability of the benchmark, in particular, whether the project activity produces electricity predominantly for supply to the grid or for captive consumption through wheeling;
- (r) “36 MW Power generation from coking waste heat generated in the clean-type heat-recovery coke ovens at Shanxi Qinxin Coal and Coke Co., Ltd, China” (1724) if the project participant and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report which include information on assessment of the suitability of the benchmark, in particular, whether the project activity produces electricity predominately for supply to the grid or for captive consumption through wheeling.
59. In accordance with paragraphs 17 and 18 (c) of the procedures mentioned in paragraph 58, the Board could not register the following project activities:
- (a) “5 MW Upper Awa small hydroelectric project, Himachal Pradesh, India” (1252) submitted for registration by the DOE (SGS) because the project participant and the DOE failed to substantiate the additionality of the project activity, in particular, the suitability of the benchmark (WACC) and its increase due to the change in debt/equity ratio after the loan has been repaid.
- (b) “USJ Açúcar e Álcool S/A . Usina São Francisco Cogeneration Project” (1479) submitted for registration by the DOE (SGS) because the project participants and the DOE failed to substantiate the baseline determination, in particular how the other baseline candidates were excluded.
- (c) “Waste Heat Recovery and Utilisation for Power Generation Project of Chizhou Conch Cement Company Limited”(1611) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) because the project participant and the DOE failed to substantiate the additionality of the project activity, in particular it had not been substantiated that the internal benchmark (17.86%) had been applied in similar project activities with similar risks.
- (d) “A power generation project using waste heat from the Coke Dry Quenching (CDQ) equipment in China ” (1625) submitted for registration by the DOE (JQA) because the project participant and the DOE failed to substantiate application of the baseline methodology, in particular the validation of the input values used in the economic comparison of baseline alternatives;
- (e) “Tangshan Xinfeng Thermal & Power Co., Ltd. Waste Gas Power Generation Project”(1669) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) because the project participant and DOE failed to substantiate the suitability of the use of iron & steel sector benchmark (13%) benchmark to prove the additionality of the project activity.
60. In accordance with the clarifications to paragraph 18 (b) of the procedures mentioned in the above paragraph, the Board considered one (1) project activity for which corrections had been submitted in



response to the outcome of a previous review.

61. The Board could not register the project activity "Use of FINEX Off Gas for power generation in Pohang Steel Works" (1447) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) as the corrected documentation submitted did not provide any further substantiation of the issues related to the prior consideration of the CDM and investment analysis as requested in the outcome of a review undertaken at EB41. Therefore it could not be concluded that the additionality of the project activity had been demonstrated or assessed in accordance with the requirements of the Executive Board.

62. The Board considered one (1) request for deviation from an approved methodology related to a project activity undergoing validation, agreed to answer it, and requested the secretariat to inform the DOE accordingly.

General guidance

63. The Board took note of a revised proposal from the secretariat regarding the standardization of the format of the modalities of communications between project participants and the Board which takes into account the inputs received from stakeholders in response to a call for public inputs launched by the Board. Due to time constraints the Board could not consider further this proposal and agreed to consider it at its next meeting.

64. The Board noted the applications for membership of the Registration and Issuance Team (RIT) and decided, due to time constraints, to consider these applications at its next meeting.

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

65. The Board took note that 194,680,872 CERs have been issued as of 26 September 2008 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.

Case specific issues

66. 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 thirty (30) requests for issuance.

67. 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) "N₂O Emission Reduction in Onsan, Republic of Korea" (0099), if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which incorporate clarification on the origin of the constant value applied during the failure of the flow meter.

(b) "Energy efficiency through installation of modified CO₂ removal system in Ammonia Plant" (0123), if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report, a corresponding revised verification report and a new request for issuance as appropriate, which include the following corrections:

(i) Calculation of emission reductions after taking into account the highest value of project SSCR, since the operation of the plant as approved in the request for deviation, and not the highest SSCR in a month to those days, when production is out of normal range;



- (ii) Ratio of natural gas and naphtha submitted in response to the request for review; and
 - (iii) Approval date of the request for deviation in the verification report;
- (c) "Abanico Hydroelectric Project" (0141), if the revised monitoring report and the corresponding revised verification report submitted by the DOE (AENOR) in response to the request for review are displayed on the UNFCCC CDM website.

The Board further noted that a revision of monitoring plan should be submitted to correct the description of yearly monitoring of the parameters related to grid emission factor, prior to the next request for issuance;

- (d) "Jalles Machado Bagasse Cogeneration Project (JMBCP)" (0187), if the revised monitoring report and the revised verification report submitted by the DOE (BVC) in response to the request for review are displayed on the UNFCCC CDM website;
- (e) "Alto Alegre Bagasse Cogeneration Project (AABCP)" (0207), if the DOE (SGS) submits a revised verification report which incorporates the clarification on increased bagasse production and storing of bagasse provided in response to the request for review.
- (f) "Serra Bagasse Cogeneration Project (SBCP)" (0213), if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised monitoring report, a corresponding revised verification report, and a new request for issuance as appropriate, which apply the ex-ante grid emission factor as indicated in the registered PDD;

The Board further noted that a request for revision of the monitoring plan should be submitted to correct the inconsistent description on the frequency of updating grid emission factor and the calibration frequency of energy meters, prior to the next request for issuance.

- (g) "18 MW Kempthole Mini Hydel Scheme (KMHS), by International Power Corporation Limited, India" (0312), if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit the revised monitoring report and the corresponding revised verification report provided in response to request for review, and a new request for issuance which corresponds to the corrected certified emission reductions;
- (h) "LDEO Biomass Steam and Power Plant in Malaysia" (0395), if the revised verification report submitted by the DOE (DNV) in response to the request for review is displayed on the UNFCCC CDM website;
- (i) "Puente Gallego Landfill gas recovery project, Gallego, Rosario, Argentina" (0431), if the DOE (SGS) submits a revised verification report which includes a correction to the reference of the electricity generating equipment (biogas fueled generator) in the project description;
- (j) "NorthWind Bangui Bay Project" (0453), if the DOE (AENOR), if the DOE submits a revised verification report which incorporates clarifications on the calculation of electricity supply on 1 to 25 September 2006 provided in the response to request for review;
- (k) "Rudong County Wind Farm Project China" (0491), if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised verification report, the supporting evidence on the second calibration record (No.JL-GK-2007-3008), and the clarification letter provided by the Jiangsu Metering Testing Center (JMTC) confirming that the calibration was conducted on 4 July 2007;

The Board further noted that the a revision of the monitoring plan should be submitted to



correct the description of the calculation of emission factor, prior to next request for issuance.

(l) "Methane recovery and power generation in a distillery plant" (0505), if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised monitoring report, a corresponding revised verification report, and a new request for issuance, which include correction to project emission due to power consumption for the month of May 2007;

(m) "12MW Captive Power Project based on Waste Heat Recovery of Industrial Waste Gases" (0556), if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which incorporate clarification on the DCS continuous measurement system provided in the response to request for review;

The Board further noted that a revision of monitoring plan should be submitted to change the description of the recording frequency for parameters "total electricity generated" and "auxiliary electricity" from "monthly" to "continuously" in line with the applied methodology, prior to next request for issuance .

(n) "India Cements WHR project" (0717), if the revised verification report and the spreadsheet submitted by the DOE (DNV) in response to the request for review are displayed on the UNFCCC CDM website;

(o) "Talia Landfill Gas Recovery Project and Electricity Production" (0839), if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit the revised monitoring report and the corresponding verification report submitted in response to the request for review and a new request for issuance which corresponds to the corrected certified emission reductions;

(p) "0868 No.2 HFC-23 Decomposition Project of Zhejiang Juhua Co." (0868) for the monitoring period 01 November - 31 December 2007, if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding verification report which incorporate:

(i) Calculation of eligible HFC23 provided in response to the request for review and a corresponding revised spreadsheet;

(ii) Clarification on measurement of HFC23 supplied to the incinerator provided in response to the request for review; and

(iii) Analysis of effluent gas during the shutdown of the incinerator provided in response to the request for review;

(q) "RIMA Fuel Switch in Bocaiúva" (0889), if the revised verification report submitted by the DOE (SGS) in response to the request for review is displayed on the UNFCCC CDM website;

(r) "Canabrava Landfill Gas Project" (0893), if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report, a corresponding revised verification report, and a new request for issuance as appropriate, which apply a flare efficiency of 90% for the period from the start of the monitoring period until the measurement of the flare efficiency was conducted;

The Board further noted that the a revision of the monitoring plan should be submitted to reflect the actual monitoring of the total amount of LFG captured and flared, prior to the next request for issuance.



(s) "Fuel switch from fossil fuel to renewable biomass for thermal energy applications in Rajasthan " (0949) if the DOE (SGS) submits a revised verification report which incorporate the clarification on the monitoring of quantity of biomass and energy input in the boiler provided in response to the request for review;

68. In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 10 of the procedures referred in paragraph 66, the Board agreed to undertake a review of the request for issuance of CERs and to appoint members of the review team for:

(a) "Onyx Landfill Gas Recovery Project – Trémembé, Brazil" (0027), submitted by the DOE (SGS), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 61](#) to this report;

(b) "Copiulemu landfill gas project (Center for the Storage and Transfer, Recovery and Control of Waste, Treatment and Disposal of Industrial and Household Waste)" (0096), 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;³²

(c) "Methane Extraction and Fuel Conservation Project at Tamil Nadu Newsprint and Paper Limited (TNPL), Kagithapuram, Karur District, Tamil Nadu" (0124), submitted by the DOE (SGS) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 63](#) to this report;

(d) "Quimobásicos HFC Recovery and Decomposition Project" (0151), 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 64](#) to this report;

(e) "Landfill gas recovery at the Norte III Landfill, Buenos Aires, Argentina" (0260), submitted by the DOE (SGS) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 65](#) to this report;

(f) "Horizonte Wind Power Generation Project " (0486), submitted by the DOE (SGS) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 66](#) to this report;

(g) "MSPSPL Waste Heat Recovery Based Captive Power Project" (0818), submitted by the DOE (SGS) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 67](#) to this report;

(h) "No.2 HFC-23 Decomposition Project of Zhejiang Juhua Co., Ltd, P. R. China" (0868) for the monitoring period 01 January - 05 April 2008, submitted by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 68](#) to this report;³³

(i) "Energy Efficiency Measures At Paper Production Plant" (0932), submitted by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 69](#) to this report;³⁴

(j) "Electricity generation by utilization of waste heat from calcined petroleum coke production process" (1002), 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 70](#) to this report;



- (k) "N₂O decomposition project of Henan Shenma Nylon Chemical Co., Ltd" (1083), submitted by the DOE (SGS) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in annex 71 to this report.
69. 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.
70. In accordance with the procedures for review as referred to in paragraph 66 above, the Board considered the recommendation of the review team for five (5) project activities which was placed "Under review" at the forty-first meeting of the Board.
71. The Board agreed to instruct the CDM registry administrator to issue CERs, subject to satisfactory corrections, for the following project activities:
- (a) "TSIL – Waste Heat Recovery Based Power Project" (0274) for the monitoring period 1 April 2006 - 31 March 2007, if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised monitoring report, a corresponding revised verification report and a new request for issuance, which incorporate the proposed approach provided in response to the review;
- (b) "Switching of fuel from naphtha to natural gas in the captive power plant (CPP) at Dahej complex of Gujarat Alkalies and Chemicals Limited" (0494) for the monitoring period 1 October 2006 - 30 September 2007, if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised monitoring report, a revised verification report, a revised emission reduction spreadsheet and a new request for issuance, which incorporate the clarifications and changes in the certified emission reductions as part of the corrections for issue raised during the request for review;
- (c) "SIDPL Methane extraction and Power generation project" (0498) for the monitoring period 1 January 2006 - 30 September 2007, if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report, a corresponding revised verification report, which incorporates clarifications provided in response to the review, and a new request for issuance which corresponds to the corrections to certified emission reductions as provided in response to the request for review.
72. The Board could not approve the requests for issuance of CERs for the following project activities:
- (a) "Biogas Support Program - Nepal (BSP-Nepal) Activity-1" (0136), for the monitoring period 1 August 2004 - 31 July 2006 because the project participant and the DOE (DNV) could not demonstrate that independent assessment, including survey, random sampling, and statistical analysis, has been conducted to confirm that the claimed emission reductions result solely from the project activity;
- (b) "Biogas Support Program - Nepal (BSP-Nepal) Activity-2" (0139), for the monitoring period 1 August 2005 - 31 July 2006 because the project participant and the DOE (DNV) could not demonstrate that independent assessment, including survey, random sampling, and statistical analysis, has been conducted to confirm that the claimed emission reductions result solely from the project activity.
73. In accordance with the clarifications to paragraph 18 of the procedure referred to in paragraph 66 above, the Board considered one (1) request for issuance of a project activity for which corrections had been submitted in response to the outcome of a previous review.



74. The Board could not approve the request for issuance of the project activity "Onyx Alexandria Landfill Gas Capture and Flaring Project" (0508) for the monitoring period 15 December 2006 - 30 September 2007 submitted by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD), because the project participant and the DOE could not demonstrate how the requirement of the methodology regarding periodical measurement to be done at a 95% confidence level and taking a statistically valid number of samples has been met, in particular, how:

- (a) For the site Borg El Arab for the period 1 April - 31 December 2007, the statistical analysis using nine samples per day taken between 07:00 and 15:00 hours is appropriate to represent variation of methane content in the landfill gas for the entire day;
- (b) For the site El Hamman for the period 15 December 2006 - 31 March 2007, the statistical analysis using one sample per day taken at a random point between 7:00 and 15:00 hours is appropriate to represent variation of methane content in the landfill gas for the entire day, and how a sample taken in 2008 is appropriate to be used as a reference value;
- (c) For the site El Hamman for the period 1 April 2007 - 30 September 2007, the statistical analysis using nine samples per day taken between 7:00 and 15:00 hours and is appropriate to represent variation of methane content in the landfill gas for the entire day, and how a sample taken in 2008 is appropriate to be used as a reference value.

The Board further noted that a request for deviation should be submitted by the DOE to address these issues prior to submitting a request for issuance for this monitoring period.

75. The Board considered eight (8) requests for deviation related to monitoring reports undergoing verification, agreed to answer them and requested the secretariat to inform the DOEs accordingly.

Agenda sub-item 3 (g): Matters related to membership issues

(i) Privileges and immunities

76. The Board took note of the report of the Executive Secretary of the UNFCCC secretariat, Mr. Yvo de Boer, on the current status of privileges and immunities for Board members and alternate members. The Board further discussed potential long and short-term arrangements to address privileges and immunities for Board members and alternate members.

(i) Code of conduct

77. The Board considered a draft code of conduct prepared by the secretariat and agreed to discuss this issue further at subsequent meetings.

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

CDM-MAP

78. The Board agreed to the proposed schedule for preparing the CDM MAP 2009 (version 01) so that changes, if any, could be initiated and implemented early 2009. The Board invited Board members to submit to the secretariat by 7 October needs they believe need to be addressed in through a revision of the MAP in 2009 and the secretariat to prepare an initial revision of activity indicators based on present forecasts. It requested the secretariat to prepare a presentation containing submissions and results of its initial forecast analysis to facilitate the discussion on needs by the Board at its next meeting.

**Resources**

79. The Board took note of information provided by the secretariat on the status of resources received as reflected in [annex 72](#). It was noted that since the thirty-seventh meeting of the Board, the income generated by registration fees, share of proceeds and methodology fees has grown by an additional USD 8,772,496 million as a result of the payment of USD 5,175,464 million in registration fees, USD 3,594,039 million in share of proceeds and USD 2,993 in methodologies fees.

Agenda item 5. Other matters**Agenda sub-item 5 (a): EB report to the CMP**

80. The Board considered a first initial draft report to the fourth session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 4) and requested members to submit further comments by 9 October 2008. It requested the secretariat to prepare a draft report based on the inputs received by members at this meeting and before the deadline and make it available to members for consideration by the Board at its forty-third meeting.

Agenda sub-item 5 (b): Regional distribution

81. The Board considered draft recommendations to CMP.4 on regional distribution, to be reflected in the Board report to the CMP at its fourth session and requested members to provide written comments to the secretariat on the draft by 6 October 2008. The Board further requested the secretariat to revise the draft recommendations on the basis of the inputs received by members for consideration at its next meeting.

Agenda sub-item 5 (c): Relations with Designated National Authorities

82. The Board took note of the briefing of the secretariat on the preparations of the sixth meeting of the CDM DNA Forum to be held on 27 - 28 October 2008 in Santiago de Chile.

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

83. The Chair of the DOE/AE Coordination Forum elaborated the input received from entities for the consideration of the Board, and sought guidance from the Board on the following submitted by the deadline for the meeting:

- (a) Further guidance for the assessment of prior consideration of the CDM;
- (b) Grid emission factors published by DNAs;
- (c) Concerns about increasing number of requests for reviews.

84. The Chair of the Forum further raised some additional issues in his presentation, including, views on the decision of the Board at its forty-first meeting on witnessing activities and timelines for validation and verification activities. The Chair also informed the Board on the schedule of the AE/DOE calibration meetings.

85. The Board with reference to the paragraph 86 of the report of the Board, at its forty-first meeting, relating to the press release by some DOEs on their unilateral action, took note of the clarification provided by the chair of the forum. The Board reiterated its concerns that some DOEs may still not be complying with the rules of the Board. The Board requested the chair of the forum that all DOEs shall comply with the rules of the Board.



86. The Board members responded to some of the questions raised by the Chair of the DOE/AE Forum and also requested the forum to provide options and/or concrete measures to address their concerns on the submission of falsified information by the project participants. The Board also took note of the remaining issues and agreed to further consider these issues.

87. The Chair of the Board thanked Mr. Flavio Gomes and stressed the need for the forum to also identify possible answers to the questions raised by the Board members, during its next interaction.

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

88. The Board met with registered observers for an informal interaction on the last day of the meeting and agreed to continue with such meetings in the afternoon of the last day of its future meetings, unless otherwise indicated. These meetings are available on webcast.

89. The Board further agreed to continue to meet with the same type of arrangement, with space being made available for 70 observers, and to reconsider the issue when necessary. Observers to the forty-third meeting of the Executive Board shall have registered with the secretariat by **1 October 2008, no later than 17:00 GMT**. 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 (f): Other business

90. The Board agreed on the provisional agenda for its forty-third meeting (22-24 October 2008) as contained in [annex 73](#) to this report, with an open session on the 23 - 24 October 2008.

Agenda item 6. Conclusion of the meeting

91. The Chair summarized the main conclusions.

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

92. 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

93. The Chair closed the meeting.



Annexes to the report

Methodologies

Annex 1 - AM0070 "Manufacturing of energy efficient domestic refrigerators" (version 01)

Annex 2 - AM0071 "Manufacturing and servicing of domestic refrigeration appliances using a low GWP refrigerant" (version 01)

Annex 3 - AM0072 "Fossil Fuel Displacement by Geothermal Resources for Space Heating" (version 01)

Annex 4 - Revision to AM0009 "Recovery and utilization of gas from oil wells that would otherwise be flared or vented" (version 03.2)

Annex 5 - Revision to AM0058 "Introduction of a new primary district heating system" (version 02)

Annex 6 - Revision to AM0064 "Methodology for methane capture and utilisation or destruction in underground, hard rock, precious and base metal mines" (version 02)

Annex 7 - Revision to ACM0008 "Consolidated methodology for coal bed methane, coal mine methane and ventilation air methane capture and use for power (electrical or motive) and heat and/or destruction through flaring or flameless oxidation" (version 05)

Annex 8 - Revision to ACM0010 "Consolidated baseline methodology for GHG emission reductions from manure management systems" (version 05)

Annex 9 - Revision to the "Procedure for the submission and consideration of queries regarding the application of approved methodologies and methodological tools by Designated Operational Entities to the Meth Panel" (version 06)

Issues relating afforestation and reforestation CDM project activities

Annex 10 - Revision to AR-AM0005 "Afforestation and reforestation project activities implemented for industrial and/or commercial uses" (version 2)

Annex 11 - Revision to AR-AM0007 "Afforestation and Reforestation of Land Currently Under Agricultural or Pastoral Use" (version 3)

Annex 12 - Revision to "Guidelines for completing the project design document for A/R (CDM-AR-PDD), the proposed new methodology for A/R: baseline and monitoring (CDM-AR-NM)" (version 9)

Issues relating to small-scale CDM project activities

Annex 13- AMS III.U "Cable Cars for Mass Rapid Transit System" (version 01)

Annex 14- AMS III.V "Decrease of coke consumption in Blast Furnace by installing dust/sludge recycling system in steel works" (version 01)

Annex 15- AMS III.W "Methane capture and destruction in non-hydrocarbon mining activities" (version 01)



Annex 16- Revision to AMS-I.A "Electricity generation by the user" (version 13)

Annex 17- Revision to AMS-III.H "Methane recovery in wastewater treatment" (version 10)

Annex 18- Revision to AMS-III.I "Avoidance of methane production in wastewater treatment through replacement of anaerobic lagoons by aerobic systems" (version 07)

Annex 19- Revision to AMS-III.Q "Waste gas based energy systems" (version 02)

Matters relating to the registration of CDM project activities

Annex 20 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1350

Annex 21 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1401

Annex 22 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1494

Annex 23 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1525

Annex 24 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1581

Annex 25 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1589

Annex 26 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1600

Annex 27 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1601

Annex 28 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1648

Annex 29 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1649

Annex 30 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1654

Annex 31 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1657

Annex 32 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1658

Annex 33 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1667

Annex 34 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1668

Annex 35 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1672

Annex 36 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1673

Annex 37 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1674

Annex 38 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1675

Annex 39 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1676

Annex 40 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1693

Annex 41 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1702

Annex 42 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1707

Annex 43 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1708

Annex 44 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1710



- Annex 45 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1718
- Annex 46 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1725
- Annex 47 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1728
- Annex 48 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1735
- Annex 49 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1757
- Annex 50 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1762
- Annex 51 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1764
- Annex 52 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1768
- Annex 53 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1771
- Annex 54 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1773
- Annex 55 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1778
- Annex 56 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1779
- Annex 57 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1783
- Annex 58 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1797
- Annex 59 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1810
- Annex 60 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1846

Matters relating to the issuance of CERs and the CDM registry

- Annex 61 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0027
- Annex 62 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0096
- Annex 63 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0124
- Annex 64 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0151
- Annex 65 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0260
- Annex 66 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0486
- Annex 67 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0818
- Annex 68 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0868
- Annex 69 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 0932
- Annex 70 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 1002
- Annex 71 - Scope of review (issuance) - Project 1083

Resources

- Annex 72 - Status of resources and pledges to support 2007 CDM activities



Other matters

Annex 73 - Provisional agenda for EB43



Endnotes

1. Refer to Annex 18, EB 23 for the definition of renewable biomass
2. s
3. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and a corresponding validation report that include the response submitted to this request for review regarding the investment, technological and prevailing practice barriers and that include (in section B.7.1) a monitoring parameter for each type of biomass to be used.
4. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and a corresponding validation report that include the response submitted to this request for review regarding the investment barrier.
5. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the DOE shall submit a revised validation report, which includes the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the project start date.
6. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the starting date should be revised as per the clarification provided for the request for review.
7. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which includes the information on the validation of suitability of the benchmark.
8. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include the information on validation of economic comparison analysis submitted in response to the request for review.
9. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include the information on validation of investment comparison analysis and prior consideration of the CDM submitted in response to the request for review.
10. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the revised PDD and corresponding validation report should include the clarifications submitted in response to the request for review and use the grid emission factor assumed in the PDD available for global stakeholder process.
11. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the revised PDD and corresponding validation report should include the clarifications submitted in response to the request for review and use the grid emission factor assumed in the PDD available for global stakeholder process.
12. 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 on the start date of the project, prior consideration of CDM and efficiency of the baseline boiler.
13. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the revised PDD and validation report should include the response submitted in response to the request for review, in particular, the clarification on the validation of input values, common practice analysis and the pre-project waste heat system.
14. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include the information on the validation of



input values and common practice analysis submitted in response to the request for review.

15. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include the information on the validation of input values, common practice analysis and credibility of baseline in the context of prevailing practice submitted in response to the request for review.
16. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include the information on the validation of input values, common practice analysis and credibility of baseline in the context of prevailing practice submitted in response to the request for review.
17. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include the information on the validation of input values, common practice analysis and credibility of baseline in the context of prevailing practice submitted in response to the request for review.
18. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include the information on the validation of input values and common practice analysis submitted in response to the request for review.
19. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which includes the information on the validation of economic comparison analysis submitted in response to the request for review.
20. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include the information on validation of investment comparison analysis submitted in response to the request for review.
21. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the starting date should be revised as per the clarification provided for the request for review.
22. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which include the information on comparison of investment costs of CDQ with CWQ, project activity start date and baseline determination.
23. 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 on the prior consideration of CDM.
24. 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 to demonstrate the project to be *first-of-its-kind* and the prior consideration of the CDM.
25. 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 on the start date of the project, prior consideration of CDM and shall also include monitoring of electricity generated, auxiliary consumption, net electricity generations by each of the three cascades and shall crosscheck this with the electricity sales invoices.
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 the response submitted in request for review regarding the prior consideration of the CDM.



27. 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 regarding validation of input values to investment analysis.
28. 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 regarding validation of input values to investment analysis, the start date of the project and the prior consideration of the CDM.
29. 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 regarding validation of input values to investment analysis, the start date, the prior consideration of the CDM, prevailing practice barrier and the grid emission factor.
30. 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 regarding validation of input values to investment analysis and prior consideration of the CDM.
31. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity the PP and DOE will be required to submit a revised PDD which includes reporting of all parameters required by the applied methodology.
32. If the Board ultimately decides to issue CERs for the project activity, the project participant and the DOE should submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which include the correct description of the formulae to calculate daily net emission reductions provided in response to the request for review, and clarification on how a 0.5% factor is applied in the calculation of flare efficiency.
33. If the Board ultimately decides to issue CERs for the project activity, the project participant and the DOE should submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding report which incorporate clarification on measurement of HFC23 supplied to the incinerator provided in response to the request for review.
34. If the Board ultimately decides to issue CERs for the project activity, the project participant and the DOE should submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which include clarifications on the increased specific energy consumption and the inconsistent data to support higher claimed emission reductions.