



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

Date: 12 February 2010  
Ref: CDM-EB-52

**EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE CLEAN DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM  
FIFTY-SECOND MEETING**

**Report**

**Date of meeting:** 8 - 12 February 2010

**Location:** Bonn, Germany

**Attendance:** The names of members and alternate members present at the fifty-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.

<b>Members</b>	<b>Alternates</b>
<b>Mr. Pedro Martins Barata</b> <sup>2</sup>	<b>Mr. Lex de Jonge</b> <sup>2</sup>
<b>Mr. Kamel Djemouai</b> <sup>1</sup>	<b>Mr. Samuel Adeoye Adejuwon</b> <sup>1</sup>
<b>Mr. Philip M. Gwage</b> <sup>2</sup>	<b>Mr. Paulo Manso</b> <sup>2</sup>
<b>Mr. Martin Hession</b> <sup>1</sup>	<b>Mr. Thomas Bernheim</b> <sup>1</sup>
<b>Mr. Shafqat Kakakhel</b> <sup>1</sup>	<b>Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sethi</b> <sup>1</sup>
<b>Mr. Clifford Mahlun</b> <sup>2</sup>	<b>Mr. Asterio Takesy</b> <sup>2</sup>
Vacant	<b>Ms. June Hughes</b> <sup>2</sup>
<b>Ms. Diana Harutyunyan</b> <sup>2</sup>	<b>Ms. Danijela Bozanic</b> <sup>2</sup>
<b>Mr. Hugh Sealy</b> <sup>1</sup>	<b>Mr. José Domingos Miguez</b> <sup>1</sup>
<b>Mr. Peer Stiansen</b> <sup>1</sup>	<b>Mr. Akihiro Kuroki</b> <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Term: Two years (term of service ends immediately before the first meeting in 2011)

<sup>2</sup> Term: Two years (term of service ends immediately before the first meeting in 2012)

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. The Executive Board of the clean development mechanism (CDM) (hereinafter referred to as the Board) elected Mr. Clifford Mahlung and Mr. Pedro Martins Barata as Chair and Vice-Chair, respectively, of the Executive Board until the first meeting of the Board in 2011.
2. The Board expressed deep appreciation to the outgoing Chair, Mr. Lex de Jonge, and Vice-Chair, Mr. Clifford Mahlung, for their excellent leadership during the eighth year of the Board's operations.
3. The Chair of the Board opened the meeting and asserted that the quorum requirement was met. Members and alternate members made declarations as to whether they had a conflict of interest as to any items on the meeting agenda. Specifically, Mr. Pedro Martins Barata, Mr. Martin Hession, Mr. Lex de Jonge, Mr. Hugh Sealy and Mr. Peer Stiansen also requested that their signed statements regarding conflict of interest be attached to this report, as contained in annex 1 to this report.
4. The Board acknowledged the request by the CMP, through its decision 2/CMP.5 paragraph 15, to publish statements on conflict of interest and requested the secretariat to provide information on the consequences of the implementation of this request by CMP, bearing in mind issues related to privileges and immunities of Board members.
5. In accordance with paragraph 15 of decision 2/CMP. 5, the secretariat requested members and alternate members to provide their curricula vitae and details of any past and current professional affiliations in order to make them publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website at <https://cdm.unfccc.int/EB/Members/index.html>.
6. The Board noted that the secretariat was informed that Mr. Thomas Bernheim and Mr. Asterio Takesy were unable to attend the meeting and have provided proper justification for their absence.

***Selection of Chairs and Vice-Chairs of panels/working groups***

7. The Board appointed Mr. Samuel Adeoye Adejuwon and Mr. Martin Hession to serve as the Chair and Vice-Chair of the CDM Accreditation Panel (CDM-AP) respectively. On behalf of the Board, the Chair of the Board expressed deep appreciation to Mr. Martin Hession and Mr. Samuel Adeoye Adejuwon as the outgoing Chair and Vice-Chair of the CDM-AP for their dedication and excellent support to the panel.
8. The Board appointed Mr. Lex de Jonge and Mr. Phillip Gwage, as Chair and Vice-Chair of the Methodologies Panel (Meth Panel) respectively. Furthermore, the Board elected Mr. Kamel Djemouai and Mr. Thomas Bernheim to support the Chair and Vice-Chair in the Meth Panel. On behalf of the Board, the Chair of the Board expressed deep appreciation to Mr. Philip Gwage and Mr. Pedro Martins Barata as the outgoing Chair and Vice-Chair of the Meth Panel for their dedication and excellent support.
9. The Board further appointed Mr. José Domingos Miguez and Ms. Diana Harutyunyan to continue as Chair and Vice-Chair, respectively, of the Afforestation and Reforestation Working Group (A/R WG).
10. The Board appointed Mr. Peer Stiansen and Mr. Hugh Sealy, as the Chair and the Vice-Chair of the Small Scale Working Group (SSC WG). On behalf of the Board, the Chair of the Board expressed deep appreciation to Mr. Hugh Sealy and Mr. Peer Stiansen as the outgoing Chair and Vice-Chair of the SSC WG for their dedication and excellent support to the working group.

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

11. The Board adopted the agenda of the meeting.

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

12. The Board took note of the thirty-sixth progress report on the work of the CDM Accreditation Panel (CDM-AP), and an oral report by the outgoing Chair of the CDM-AP, Mr. Martin Hession. The report summarized the work of the panel including information on the status of applications and assessments, availability and geographical distribution of the assessment resources, developments with respect to revision of the CDM Accreditation Standard and other policy matters.

13. The Board took note of a concern raised by the secretariat and the CDM-AP on the implementation of the CDM Accreditation Procedure with regard to the selection of the verification activities for performance assessment. The Board requested the secretariat to introduce a requirement, in the appropriate procedure, for designated operational entities (DOEs) to publish a monitoring report at least two weeks prior to undertaking a verification site visit. The Board requested the DOEs to comply with this timeline in their on-going work.

***Case specific***

14. The Board took note of the withdrawal of the applicant entity "Tsinghua Coway International Techtrans Co., Ltd" (Tsinghua).

15. The Board, after the consideration of a recommendation of the CDM-AP, decided to reaccredit the entity "Spanish Association for Standardisation and Certification" (AENOR) for the validation and verification/certification functions in the sectoral scopes 1-15. In accordance with the CDM accreditation procedure, the re-accreditation shall be valid for three (3) years from the date of expiry of the previous accreditation.

16. The Board took note of a notification by the CDM-AP on the unsuccessful outcome of a performance assessment activity for the entity "China Quality Certification Centre" (CQC).

17. The Board considered a recommendation of the CDM-AP and decided to confirm the accreditation status of "Det Norske Veritas Certification AS" (DNV) and to close the spot-check follow-up monitoring activities.

18. The Board considered an oral update on progress of the spot-checks agreed by the Board at its last meeting and requested the CDM-AP to report on the outcome of these spot-checks at its next meeting.

19. The Board considered appeals submitted by two (2) DOEs against the recommendations of the CDM-AP. The Board, in accordance with the CDM Accreditation Procedure, decided to establish a three (3) member appeal panel for each appeal. The Board requested the two appeal panels to prepare reports for the consideration of the Board at its next meeting. The Board agreed that the members of the two appeal panels shall be compensated for three (3) days of work in accordance with United Nations rules and regulations.



### *General guidance*

20. The Board took note of the on-going work of the CDM-AP on the revision and clarification of the CDM Accreditation Standard. The Board requested the CDM-AP, supported by the secretariat, to undertake a thorough analysis with regard to competence requirements for different functions within validation and verification, methodologies and projects, including the definition of technical areas and appropriate deployment of technical expertise. The Board further requested the CDM-AP to submit a proposal for a revision or clarification of the standard for adoption by the Board in accordance with the work plan of the CDM-AP for the year 2010.

21. The Board considered a progress update on the implementation of the policy framework to monitor performance of DOEs. The Board decided to use the sub-categories and weights, as proposed, on a provisional basis and to reconsider them as a part of the full review of the framework. The Board requested the secretariat to conduct a thorough analysis of current performance of DOEs using these subcategories and weights, identify appropriate thresholds and to present the analysis of DOE performance, using both weighted and non-weighted data, at its next meeting.

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

23. The Board agreed to the work plan of the CDM-AP for the year 2010, as contained in [annex 2](#) to this report. The Board requested the CDM-AP to report on the progress made against the work plan and to present an updated work plan at its fifty-fifth meeting.

24. The Board took note of the resignation of the member of CDM-AP, Mr. Hubert de Bonafos and agreed to select an expert to replace him at the next meeting of the Board, when considering the applications received from the call for experts launched at the fifty-first meeting. The Board thanked Mr. de Bonafos for his contribution to the work of the CDM-AP.

25. The Board noted that the forty-seventh meeting of the CDM-AP is scheduled for 1 - 3 March 2010.

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

26. The Board took note of the report of the forty-second meeting of the panel on baseline and monitoring methodologies (Meth Panel), and an oral report by the Chair of the panel, Mr. Philip Gwage, on the work of the panel.

### *Case specific*

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

#### *Approve cases:*

- (a) **ACM0018** - "Consolidated methodology for electricity generation from biomass residues in power-only plants", based on ACM0006 and link it to scope 1 (Energy industries), as contained in the [annex 3](#) of this report.

28. **Not to approve cases:** NM0303, NM0305, NM0306, NM0319 and NM0323 which, if revised taking into account comments, can be resubmitted but will require new expert and public input.

***Responses to requests for clarification***

29. The Board took note of the responses provided by the Meth Panel on the following requests for clarification: AM\_CLA\_0169, AM\_CLA\_0170, AM\_CLA\_0171 and AM\_CLA\_0172.

30. The Board took note of the request for guidance from the Meth Panel on the request for clarification AM\_CLA\_0164 on approved methodology AM0001, in view of decision 8 of CMP.1, that under which conditions in the case of swing plants, the applicability condition with regard to the operating history is deemed to be met. The Board agreed to defer the discussions on this issue until its next meeting.

***Responses to requests for revisions***

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

- (a) To accept request AM\_REV\_0147 concerning the revision of the approved methodology AM0028. The revision expands the applicability of the methodology to Caprolactam plants using the HPO® process;
- (b) Not to accept request AM\_REV\_0174 concerning the revision of the approved methodology ACM0014 to expand the applicability of the methodology to cases where solid material in waste water may not be released into open lagoons but have a different aerobic or anaerobic baseline treatment;
- (c) Not to accept request AM\_REV\_0175 concerning the revision of the approved methodology ACM0003 to expand the applicability to new plants;
- (d) Not to accept request AM\_REV\_0176 concerning the revision of the approved methodology ACM0010 to expand the applicability of the methodology to include situations where the most plausible baseline scenario is a counterfactual anaerobic treatment system that generates methane without destruction by flaring or energy production.

***Revision of approved methodologies***

32. The Board revised the following approved methodologies:

- (a) **AM0028:** The revision broadens the applicability of the methodology to cover project activities that use the HPO® process for the production of Caprolactam. The approved revised methodology is contained in [annex 4](#) of this report;
- (b) **AM0034:** The revision provides more precise guidance as to how the monitored data on nitrous oxide concentration (NCSG) and gas volume flow rate (VSG) should be used to calculate N<sub>2</sub>O emission factors in both baseline and project campaigns. Furthermore, the revision removes the provision for exclusion of abnormal campaigns from the historically most recent five campaigns to be selected for the purpose of defining the normal campaign length and identifying the range of operating parameters. The revision makes it necessary for project participants to submit a request for deviation in case an abnormal campaign exists among the five campaigns immediately previous to the baseline campaign. The approved revised methodology is contained in [annex 5](#) of this report;
- (c) **AM0048:** The revision: (i) incorporates the “Tool to calculate project or leakage CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from fossil fuel combustion” in the project emissions section; and (ii) removes inconsistencies in the units for some parameters in equations (22) and (23). The approved revised methodology is contained in [annex 6](#) of this report;



(d) **ACM0002:** The revision waives the projects of capacity addition in wind, solar, wave or tidal power plants from the applicability condition that requires the availability of 5 year historical data for capacity addition, retrofit and rehabilitation projects. The electricity generated by the added capacities is directly measured under these projects. The approved revised methodology is contained in [annex 7](#) of this report;

(e) **ACM0006:** The revision to the approved methodology ACM0006 complements the Meth Panel's recommendation for approval of the new consolidated methodology for electricity generation from biomass residues in power-only plants, which is applicable to project activities that generate electricity in biomass residue (co-) fired power-only plants. Consequently, the revision makes the methodology ACM0006 inapplicable to power-only plants. The approved revised methodology is contained in [annex 8](#) of this report.

33. The revised versions of the methodologies referred to in the paragraphs above will come into effect on 26 February 2010, 24:00 GMT, in accordance with the procedure for the revision of approved methodologies.

#### ***General guidance***

34. The Board agreed to the revised "Procedure for the submission and consideration of a proposed new baseline and monitoring methodology for large scale CDM project activities" and related revised and new forms. The revised procedure also takes into account the CMP's authorization for the Board to set priorities for the work of the Board on methodological issues (as contained in paragraph 23 of the decision 2/CMP.5) and further streamlines the process of consideration of a proposed new methodology by applying, *inter alia*, a thorough quality check at an early stage of the consideration of a proposed new methodology and reducing the number of hand-overs in the entire process. Consequently, the application of the revised procedure will lead to a prompt consideration of the proposed new methodologies that meet priority criteria approved by the Board and delayed consideration of the remaining ones.

35. The effective date for the above mentioned procedures and forms is 12 April 2010 (2400 hours GMT). The Board also confirmed that until the new specific procedures regarding the payment of panel and working group members and experts will enter into effect, the regulations contained in the "Procedures for the submission and consideration of a proposed new methodology" (version 13) regarding remuneration remain valid. The procedure and forms are contained in [annex 9](#), [annex 10](#), [annex 11](#), [annex 12](#) and [annex 13](#) to this report.

36. The Board agreed to the work programmes of the Methodologies Panel, Small Scale Working Group and Afforestation and Reforestation Working Group for the first semester of year 2010, as contained in [annex 14](#), [annex 15](#) and [annex 16](#) to this report.

#### ***Further schedule***

37. The Board noted that the forty-third meeting of the Meth Panel will be held from 22 - 26 February 2010.

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

38. The Board noted the status of registration of a project under programme of activities.

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

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

40. The Board took note that 2,044 CDM project activities have been registered by 12 February 2010. 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*

41. 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 82 requests for registration.

42. The Board agreed to register the project activity:

(a) "Huade Daditaihong 49.5 MW Wind Power Project" (2853), taking note of the initial comments of the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) and the project participant. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark.

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

(a) "Ningxia Federal Solar Cooker Project" (2924) if the revised PDD, corresponding validation report and relevant annexes, submitted in response to the request for review are displayed on the UNFCCC CDM website.

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

(a) "Emission free electricity generation at Harihar, Karnataka" (1632) if the project participant and DOE (BVC) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the equity IRR calculations, the validation of the input values and the monitoring plan;

(b) "Bionersis project on La Duquesa landfill, Dominican Republic" (2595) if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding:

(i) The suitability of the net electricity generation, taxes, plant refurbishment cost and O&M costs;

(ii) The suitability of the baseline assumptions; and

(iii) The technical description of the electricity component of the project activity;

(c) "5.5 MW Bundled Wind Power Project by WMI Cranes Ltd." (2682) if the project participant and DOE (SGS) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of the PLFs, electricity tariffs and escalation in O&M costs used in the investment analysis;

(d) "Sichuan Shimian County Ximagu Hydropower Project" (2737) if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submits a revised validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of start date of project activity and which substantiate the cancellation of previous financial commitments before the stop of construction in March 2005;



- (e) “Gansu Min County Qingshui Hydropower Station Project” (2739) if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the prior consideration of the CDM, in particular, how the benefits of the CDM were decisive factor in the decision to proceed with the project activity;
- (f) “Zafarana KfW IV Wind Farm Project, Arab Republic of Egypt” (2742) if the project participant and the DOE (JACO) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporates the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the start date, total static investment, O&M costs, and tariff. The DOE shall also validate and submit a LoA from the DNA of Egypt with the correct project activity title;
- (g) “Dagachhu Hydropower Project, Bhutan” (2746) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which:
- (i) Incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding how the project activity meets the requirement of ‘trans-national electricity systems’ in line with EB28, para 14 and validation of grid emission factor in line with ‘Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system’, and
  - (ii) Further considers the ex-post monitoring of the combined margin grid emission factor;
- (h) “Fujian Cement 4# and 5# kilns Waste Heat Recovery for Power Generation Project” (2763) if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of input values to the investment analysis and which excludes the barrier analysis as additionality is demonstrated on the investment analysis;
- (i) “Yantai DongyuanLaizhou 48.5 MW Wind Farm Project Phase I” (2764) if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-Nord) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of input values to the investment analysis. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;
- (j) “Gansu Jingtai 45 MW Wind Power Project” (2766) if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-Rhein) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of input values to the investment analysis. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;
- (k) “China Qinghai 42 MW Jiangyuanhydropower project” (2769) if the project participant and the DOE (JACO) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of input values to the investment analysis and sensitivity analysis. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application



of the highest reported tariff in the province since 11 November 2001, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;

(l) “Guangdong Chaonan Chengtian Wind Power Project” (2771) if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-Nord) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of input values to the investment analysis. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;

(m) “Composting of Organic Content of Municipal Solid Waste in Lahore” (2778) if the project participant and DOE (SGS) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding:

(i) The barrier analysis;

(ii) The assessment of the alternatives for the disposal/treatment of the fresh waste in the absence of the project activity; and

(iii) The closure of CL 14 raised by the DOE in the validation report. While the DOE has not adequately addressed the issues raised on the suitability of the 15% interest rate used to calculate the WACC and on the validation of the input values to the investment analysis, the Board has considered that the additionality of the project activity is established based on barrier analysis;

(n) “Hunan Laopokou Hydropower Project” (2786) if the project participant and DOE (TÜV-Rhein) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which:

(i) Incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of the input values; and

(ii) Correct the error in calculation of the plant load factor identified during the request for review;

(o) “China Chalinhe Hydropower Project” (2789) if the DOE (TÜV-Nord) submits a revised validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of start date of project activity and which substantiate the cancellation of previous financial commitments before the stop of construction in August 2004;

(p) “Guangxi Baise Tianlin Baile Hydropower Station” (2791) if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-Nord) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of input values to the investment analysis. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province since 11 November 2001, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;

(q) “Guangdong Zhanjiang Yangqian 49.5 MW Wind Power Project” (2805) if the project participant and DOE (TÜV-Nord) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the estimated operational hours;



- (r) “Hefei Longquanshan Landfill Gas Power Generation Project” (2810) if the project participants and DOE (TÜV-Nord) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to this request for review regarding the suitability of input values to the investment analysis, the choice of the baseline, the *ex-ante* values and the monitoring parameters;
- (s) “Inner Mongolia Chifeng Yihegong Windfarm Project” (2811) if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-Rhein) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report, which incorporate the information submitted in response to the review regarding the validation of the prior consideration of the CDM and the calculation of the grid emission factor. While the concern of the Board on the trend of the tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;
- (t) “Shandong Rushan Luneng Wind Farm” (2814) if the project participant and DOE (TÜV-Nord) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the review regarding the suitability of the income tax calculation and electricity generation. While the concern of the Board on the trend of the tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;
- (u) “Liaoning Changtu Shihu Wind Power Project” (2817) if the project participant and the DOE (CEC) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the review regarding the suitability of the O&M costs and the income tax calculation. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;
- (v) “Dailian Tuoshan Wafangdian Wind Farm project” (2827) if the project participants and DOE (TÜV-Nord) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the power generation. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;
- (w) “Mokpo Landfill Gas Recovery Project for Electricity Generation” (2834) if the DOE (EMC) submit a revised validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of:
- (i) The investment analysis, in particular the suitability of the benchmark and the input parameters; and
  - (ii) The parameters for the application of the "Tool to determine methane emissions avoided from dumping waste at a solid waste disposal site";
- (x) “Weiyuan River 72 MW Hydropower Project in Jinggu County Sima District Yunnan Province, China” (2837) if the project participants and the DOE (TECO) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the continuing and real actions taken to secure the CDM status.



While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province since 11 November 2001, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;

(y) "Shenyang Faku Wanghaisi Wind Power Project" (2854) if the project participants and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the annual power output, and the sensitivity analysis. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 report, paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;

(z) "Xinjiang Dabancheng Sanchang Phase III Wind Power Project" (2855) if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submits a revised validation report which incorporates the information submitted to the response to request for review, regarding the validation on the appropriateness of the annual operational hours;

(aa) "51 MW wind power project of ONGC at Surajbari, Gujarat in India" (2856) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of the input values to the investment analysis and sensitivity analysis;

(ab) "Sichuan Kangding Huashangou 72 MW Hydropower Project" (2858) if the project participant and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the start date, total static investment, and the affect of the residual value on the IRR. The Board notes that the PP has not applied a fair market residual value for the proposed project activity, in accordance with the Guidance on the Assessment of Investment Analysis. The DOE, however, has validated that the application of a fair market residual value does not cause the project IRR to cross the benchmark.

(ac) "Liaoning Kangping Furaoshan Wind Power Project" (2864) if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submits a revised validation report which incorporates the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of the net power supply, the total investment and the O&M costs;

(ad) "Zequ River Gakong 30MW Hydropower Project in Henan County of Qinghai Province, China" (2871) if the PP and the DOE (DNV) submits a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in the response to the request for review, regarding the validation of prior CDM consideration and suitability of input values to the investment analysis;

(ae) "Sidehe 24.8 MW Hydropower Project in Yunnan Province" (2874) if the project participant and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in the response to the request for review, regarding the explanation provided to demonstrate that the project activity has been totally ceased;

(af) "Saiwuduo Hydropower Project in Gansu Province" (2875) if the DOE (DNV) submits a revised validation report which incorporates the information submitted in response to the request for review, regarding the validation on the suitability of the input values;



- (ag) “Yunnan Sinanjiang Hydropower Project” (2877) if the project participant and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the review regarding the additionality of the project activity; in particular, the financial commitments, the input values to the IRR calculation, the investment and O&M costs, and the common practice analysis;
- (ah) “Hunan Sanjiangkou 50 MW Hydropower Expansion Project” (2899) if the project participant and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review, regarding the common practice analysis, surplus water resources and emission factor;
- (ai) “Guangxi Jingxi County Yuexu Hydropower Station” (2904) if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-Nord) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the review regarding the suitability of the electricity tariff and the salvage value of the assets at the end of the period of investment analysis;
- (aj) “Biomass Gasification based Power Generation by Beach Minerals Company Private Limited in India” (2913) if the project participant and DOE (SGS) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of the technological and prevailing practice barriers, the project boundary and the monitoring of leakage;
- (ak) “340 MW Gas based combined cycle power project expansion at Hazira” (2915) if the project participant and the DOE (BVC) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which:
- (i) Incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the start date of the project activity, suitability of input values to the economic comparison analysis, availability of natural gas, baseline emission factor, credibility of the alternatives, and monitoring plan; and
  - (ii) Further substantiate the: (a) suitability of total investment and fuel price considered in the levelized cost of the project activity, and (b) applied emission factor for upstream fugitive methane in accordance with AM0029 version 3;
- (al) “20 MW Biomass Power Project in Tamilnadu” (2920) if the project participant and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of the tariff, biomass prices, electricity generation and the 25% surplus of biomass;
- (am) “KUNAK BIO ENERGY PROJECT” (2921) if the project participants and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to this request for review regarding the validation of the barriers, 12% benchmark, key input values and energy policy programme;
- (an) "Hydro Electric Power Project of Celerity Power Pvt. Ltd " (2927) if the DOE (SGS) submits a revised validation report that incorporates the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of:
- (i) The investment analysis;
  - (ii) The project emissions due to diesel consumption; and
  - (iii) The monitoring plan with respect to diesel consumption;



- (ao) “Decha Bio Green Rice Husk Power Generation 7.5 MW” (2934) if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-Nord) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the additional information submitted in response to the review regarding the validation of the access-to-finance barrier;
- (ap) “24 MW Bhilangana - III Hydro Power Project” (2936) if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which:
- (i) Incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of the start date of the project activity; and
  - (ii) Demonstrate the additionality based on the investment analysis submitted in response to the request for review. While the concern of the Board on barrier analysis has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional based on the investment analysis submitted in response to the request for review;
- (aq) “Power Prospect 9.9 MW Rice Husk Power Plant” (2938) if the project participant and the DOE (JQA) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the review regarding the validation of the investment analysis and the validation of the barriers following the requirements of the “Combined Tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality”;
- (ar) “Wenshan Panlong River Weilong Hydropower Station” (2942) if the DOE (TÜV-Nord) submits a revised validation report which incorporates the additional information submitted in response to the review regarding the reliability of the evidence of continuing and real actions taken to secure CDM status in parallel with the implementation of the project activity;
- (as) “8 MW biomass based power plant at Phagwara” (2998) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review, regarding the exclusion of revenue from steam/heat and demand/capacity charge from the investment analysis;
45. 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.
46. The Board agreed to undertake a review of the project activity:
- (a) “Fujian Shouning Liuchai 20 MW Hydropower Project” (1585) 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 17](#) to this report;<sup>1</sup>
  - (b) “Reforestation as Renewable Source of Wood Supplies for Industrial Use in Brazil” (2569) 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 18](#) to this report;
  - (c) “Huaneng Jilin Tongyu Phase II Wind Farm Project” (2598) 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 19](#) to this report;<sup>2</sup>
  - (d) “Angang Coke Dry Quenching Project” (2703) 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 20](#) to this report;<sup>3</sup>



- (e) "Bagasse based cogeneration project of Nizam Deccan Sugars Limited (NDSL)" (2713) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 21](#) to this report;<sup>4</sup>
- (f) "Wuxi Hydropower Project, Qiyang County, Hunan Province" (2741) submitted for registration by the DOE (TECO) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 22](#) to this report;<sup>5</sup>
- (g) "Conversion of existing open cycle gas turbine to combined cycle at Guaracachi power station, Santa Cruz, Bolivia" (2761) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 23](#) to this report;<sup>6</sup>
- (h) "Heilongjiang Mudanjiang Xiaoguokui Wind Power Project" (2774) 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 24](#) to this report;
- (i) "Heilongjiang Fuyuan Wind Power Project" (2775) 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 25](#) to this report;<sup>7</sup>
- (j) "Heilongjiang Dabaishan Wind Power Project" (2776) 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 26](#) to this report;<sup>8</sup>
- (k) "Jidong Cement Panshi Co., Ltd. 15 MW Cement Waste heat Recovery Project" (2780) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 27](#) to this report;<sup>9</sup>
- (l) "Hunan Yongzhou Hydro Bundled Project" (2796) submitted for registration by the DOE (KEMCO) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 28](#) to this report;<sup>10</sup>
- (m) "Hunan Shatian Hydroelectric Project" (2799) submitted for registration by the DOE (KEMCO) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 29](#) to this report;<sup>11</sup>
- (n) "Yunnan Lincang City Nanlinghe 1st level Small-scale Hydropower Project " (2812) submitted for registration by the DOE (TECO) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 30](#) to this report;<sup>12</sup>
- (o) "Sichuan Tianshengqiao 12 MW Hydropower Project" (2824) submitted for registration by the DOE (TECO) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 31](#) to this report;<sup>13</sup>
- (p) "Yunnan Kunming Dongchuan Xiaoqing River 7th Level Hydropower Station" (2828) 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 32](#) to this report;<sup>14</sup>
- (q) "Liaoning Beipiao Beitazi I Wind Farm Project" (2830) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-Rhein) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 33](#) to this report;<sup>15</sup>



- (r) "Chongqing Pengshui Sanjiangkou Hydropower Station" (2839) 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;
- (s) "Fenglin Hydropower Project" (2846) 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;<sup>16</sup>
- (t) "Chongqing Zhongliang Hydroelectric Project" (2847) 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;<sup>17</sup>
- (u) "Jinping Ladeng River Hydropower Station" (2849) 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;<sup>18</sup>
- (v) "Sichuan Muli River Dashawan Hydropower Station" (2850) 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;<sup>19</sup>
- (w) "Jidong Cement Jilin Co., Ltd 6 MW Cement Waste Heat Recovery Project" (2851) 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;<sup>20</sup>
- (x) "Yunnan Saizhu Hydropower Project" (2852) 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 40](#) to this report;<sup>21</sup>
- (y) "Shuanghekou 16.6 MW Hydropower Project in Chongqing City, P.R. China" (2861) 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 41](#) to this report;
- (z) "Hebei Chengde Yudaokou Windfarm 48 MW project" (2865) 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 42](#) to this report;
- (aa) "Sichuan Lushan Dachuan River Cascade Hydropower Bundle Project" (2868) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-Nord) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 43](#) to this report;<sup>22</sup>
- (ab) "Yunnan Province Luxi City Wanma River 2nd Level Hydropower Station" (2879) submitted for registration by the DOE (TÜV-Rhein) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 44](#) to this report;<sup>23</sup>
- (ac) "Changning Kawan 18.9 MW Hydroelectric Project" (2902) submitted for registration by the DOE (TECO) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 45](#) to this report;
- (ad) "Chibi Huaxin Cement 7.5 MW Waste Heat Recovery as Power Project" (2907) 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 46](#) to this report;<sup>24</sup>
- (ae) "Tarim Oilfield Associated Gas Recovery and Utilization Project" (2908) 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 47](#) to this report;<sup>25</sup>

(af) "Sichuan Heishui Zhawo No.1 Hydropower Project" (2909) 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 48](#) to this report;<sup>26</sup>

(ag) "Shimian Haiyang Hydropower Project" (2926) 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 49](#) to this report;<sup>27</sup>

(ah) "Hunan Tongdao Yaolaitan 5.55 MW Hydro Power Project" (2933) 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;

(ai) "Xincun and Wenzhu Bundled Small Hydropower Project in Zhaoping County, Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region, China" (2986) submitted for registration by the DOE (TECO) and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with validation requirements, as contained in [annex 51](#) to this report.<sup>28</sup>

47. 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.

48. 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 36 of the project activities which were placed "Under review" at the fifty-first meeting of the Board.

49. In accordance with paragraphs 17 and 18 (a) of the procedures mentioned in paragraph 36, the Board agreed to register the project activity "IMAR Debaotu Wind Farm Phase I 49.5 MW Project" (2732) submitted for registration by the DOE (BVC). While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark.

50. In accordance with paragraphs 17 and 18 (b) of the procedures mentioned in paragraph 36, the Board agreed to register, subject to satisfactory corrections, the project activities:

(a) "Enercon Wind Farm (Hindustan) Ltd in Rajasthan" (1168) if the project participant and DOE (SGS) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the review team's questions regarding the suitability of the 18.5% benchmark;

(b) "Heilongjiang Daqing Ruihao Wind Farm Project" (1422) if the project participant and the DOE (BVC) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the earlier response to the request for review and further substantiate the suitability of the tariff as a means of demonstrating the additionality of the project activity. In undertaking these corrections the project participant and the DOE should note the Board's concerns regarding the suitability of the tariff as indicated in EB49 report, paragraph 48;

(c) "CECIC Zhangbei Gaojialiang Wind farm Project" (1895) if the project participant and the DOE (BVC) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the earlier response to the request for review and further substantiate the suitability of the tariff as a means of demonstrating the additionality of the project activity. In undertaking these corrections the project participant and the DOE should note the Board's concerns regarding the suitability of the tariff as indicated in EB49 report, paragraph 48;



- (d) “Liaoning Faku Wanghaisi East Wind Power Project” (1965) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the earlier response to the request for review. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 report, paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;
- (e) “Liaoning Faku 1st phase Wind Power Project” (2223) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the earlier response to the request for review. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 report, paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;
- (f) “Hebei Fengning Luotuogou 1st Phase Wind Power Project” (2462) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the earlier response to the request for review. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 report, paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;
- (g) “Inner Mongolia Wuliji Wind Farm Project” (2483) if the project participant and the DOE (BVC) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the earlier response to the request for review. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 report, paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;
- (h) “Jiangsu Dongling Wind Farm Project” (2532) if the project participant and the DOE (KEMCO) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the earlier response to the request for review. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 report, paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;
- (i) “The Bogeda 40.5 MW Wind-Farm Project in Urumqi, Xinjiang, China” (2537) if the project participant and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the earlier response to the request for review. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 report, paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;
- (j) “Jilin Liaoyuan 50 MW Level Biomass Cogeneration Project” (2563) if the project participant and DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the review’s teams questions, regarding the validation of the baseline and which excludes the baseline emissions claimed from heat displacement;
- (k) “Inner Mongolia Ximeng Zheligentu Wind Farm Phase I Project” (2566) if the project participant and the DOE (BVC) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which



incorporate the earlier response to the request for review. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;

(l) "Yunnan Yunpeng Hydropower Project" (2580) if the project participant and the DOE (TECO) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the earlier response to the request for review. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province since 11 November 2001, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;

(m) "Shandong Dongying 1st phase Wind Power Project" (2584) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and corresponding validation report which incorporate the earlier response to the request for review. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 report, paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;

(n) "Jilin Da'an Dagangzi Wind Power Project Phase II" (2586) if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the earlier response to the request for review. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 report, paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;

(o) "Fujian Zhangpu Liuaao 3rd phase Wind Power Project" (2589) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the earlier response to the request for review. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 report, paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;

(p) "Inner Mongolia Keyouqianqi Wind Farm Project" (2593) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the earlier response to the request for review. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 report, paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;

(q) "Hainan Danzhou Eman Wind Power Project" (2604) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the earlier response to the request for review. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 report, paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;



(r) “Project JBS S/A-Slaughterhouse Wastewater Aerobic Treatment-Barra do Garças Unit” (2609) if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the review team’s question regarding:

(i) The confirmation that the readjustment of the anaerobic lagoons considered ensures a volumetric loading rate of COD above 0.1 kg COD m<sup>3</sup> per day in line with the requirements of the applicable methodology; and

(ii) The change in the operating days during validation, from 24 days/month to 26 days/month, including its impact on the calculation of the emission reductions;

(s) "Inner Mongolia Chifeng Saihanba Tashanzi Wind Power Project" (2615) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the earlier response to the request for review. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 report, paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;

(t) “Inner Mongolia Chifeng Saihanba Qingmachang Wind Power Project” (2617) if the project participant and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the earlier response to the request for review. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 report, paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;

(u) "AGA FANO Liquid CO<sub>2</sub> production using CO<sub>2</sub> from a fermentation plant at Ingenio Providencia" (2630) if the project participant and DOE (ICONTEC) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in the response to the review team's questions regarding the compliance of the project activity with the applicability conditions of the methodology, in particular: (a) that the natural gas burnt in the baseline was used only to produce liquid CO<sub>2</sub>; (b) that all the carbon in the CO<sub>2</sub> produced under the project activity comes from the renewable biomass source; and (c) that CO<sub>2</sub> from fossil or mineral sources that is used for the production of inorganic compounds prior to the project activity will not be emitted to the atmosphere when the project activity is in place;

(v) “BAJ Pakuan Agung Factory tapioca starch wastewater biogas extraction and utilization project, Lampung Province, Republic of Indonesia” (2674) if the project participant and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in the response to the review team's questions regarding the barrier analysis;

(w) “Sichuan Furong Coal Mine Methane Utilization Project” (2677) if the project participant and DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the review team’s questions regarding the additionality of the project activity; in particular, the validation of the weighted average electricity tariff and the compression/delivery and labor O&M costs applied for the project IRR calculation based on the DOE’s sectoral expertise; and the baseline determination. The Board highlights that the validation of the compression/delivery and labor O&M costs is not fully justified; however, if these two O&M costs are not considered the project IRR remains lower than the 13% benchmark;



- (x) "Gansu Yumen Diwopu Wind Power Project" (2680) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the review team's questions regarding the suitability of salvage value of the assets at the end of the period of investment analysis. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;
- (y) "Jilin Shuangliao 2nd Phase Wind Power Project" (2685) if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the earlier response to the request for review. While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 report, paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;
- (z) "Siam Cement (Kaeng Khoi) Waste Heat Power Generation Project, Thailand (KK6 Project)" (2697) if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the review team's question regarding the availability of the waste heat to the project activity;
- (aa) "Sichuan Xiba Small Hydro Power Project" (2725) if the project participant and DOE (TÜV-Nord) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the review team's questions regarding the suitability of coefficient of effective power and further substantiate the suitability of the tariff as a means of demonstrating the additionality of the project activity. In undertaking these corrections the project participant and the DOE should note the Board's concerns regarding the suitability of the tariff as indicated in EB 49 report, paragraph 48;
- (ab) "Shandong Laizhou phase II Wind Power Project" (2730) if the project participant and the DOE (BVC) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the earlier response to the request for review and further substantiate the suitability of the tariff as a means of demonstrating the additionality of the project activity. In undertaking these corrections the project participant and the DOE should note the Board's concerns regarding the suitability of the tariff as indicated in EB 49 report, paragraph 48;
- (ac) "Biomass based Power Plant in Polakpalli Village, Gulbarga District, Karnataka" (2895) if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the review team's question regarding the leakage by use of biomass.



51. In accordance with paragraphs 17 and 18 (c) of the procedures mentioned in paragraph 36, the Board could not register the following project activities:

(a) "Tangshan Jidong Cement Matoushan Matishan 25 MW Cement Waste heat Recovery Project" (2587) as the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) have failed to substantiate the additionality of the project activity as it had not been substantiated that the proposed internal benchmark (WACC, 15.58%) had been applied for similar project activities with similar risks by the project participants, and the DOE has confirmed that the demonstration of additionality is based on investment analysis and not on barriers. The Board also noted with concerns that the DOE has, at the point of having the request placed under review, identified misleading statements in the validation report regarding the status of the previous waste heat recovery project implemented in 2001. Such misleading statements undermines the Board's capacity to undertake a full evaluation of the request for registration.

(b) "Utilization of the heat content of tail gas at PT Cabot Indonesia, Cilegon" (2646) as the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-Nord) have failed to substantiate the additionality of the project activity, in particular, the suitability of:

(i) Input values to the investment analysis such as cash conversion cost, STA cost, cogen operation cost (labor cost, licensing, R/W requirements, chemicals, natural gas and inflation rate), maintenance costs and residual value of zero; and

(ii) The assumption of a 4.5 MW capacity used in the emission reduction calculations and in the investment analysis given the generator capacity as indicated in the PDD (5.5 MW);

(c) "Jiangxi Fengcheng CMM Distribution Project" (2666) as the project participant and the DOE (DNV) have failed to substantiate the project start date as:

(i) The CMM extraction process should be part of the project description as per the applicability criteria of ACM0008 version 4, page 2; and

(ii) If the CMM extraction process is included in the project boundary than the project starting date of 4 March 2006, which refers to the activities implemented to install supply/distribution systems, is not appropriate. The Board took note that the Meth Panel stated that ACM0008 version 4 is not to be applied for using CMM gas for household cooking and heating according to clarification AM\_CLA\_0087 and revision AM\_REV\_0105 decided in June and August 2008 respectively, before this request for registration was submitted (June 2009);

(d) "Tangshan Jidong Cement Guye District 8 MW Cement Waste Heat Recovery Project" (2731) as the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) have failed to substantiate the additionality of the project activity as:

(i) It has not been substantiated that the proposed internal benchmark (WACC, 15.58%) had been applied for similar project activities with similar risks by the project participants; and

(ii) The investment barriers have not been substantiated as per the additionality tool, in particular, it has not been substantiated that other similar activities have been implemented only with grant or other non-commercial finance terms or that no private capital is available due to perceived risks in the country of investment as the information submitted is generic in nature and not specific to the project activity;



- (e) "Tangshan Jidong Cement Fengrun District 12 MW Cement Waste heat Recovery Project" (2733) as the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) have failed to substantiate the additionality of the project activity as:
- (i) It has not been substantiated that the proposed internal benchmark (WACC, 15.58%) had been applied for similar project activities with similar risks by the project participants; and
  - (ii) The investment barriers have not been substantiated as per the additionality tool, in particular, it has not been substantiated that other similar activities have been implemented only with grant or other non-commercial finance terms or that no private capital is available due to perceived risks in the country of investment as the information submitted is generic in nature and not specific to the project activity;
- (f) "31 MW Wind energy project in, India by Grace Infrastructure Pvt Ltd" (2813) as the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-Nord) have failed to validate the common practice analysis in accordance with the "Tool for demonstration and assessment of additionality" and VVM paragraph 118. The Board further notes that the DOE has not sufficiently validated that the input values used in the investment analysis are those which were available at the time of investment decision.
52. In accordance with the clarifications to paragraph 18 (b) of the above-mentioned procedures the Board considered seven project activities for which corrections had been submitted in response to the outcome of a previous review.
53. The Board agreed to register, as corrected, the project activities:
- (a) The Board agreed to register the project activity "CGN Inner Mongolia Zhurihe Phase I Wind Farm Project" (1577) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV). While the concern of the Board on the trend of tariff for similar projects exporting electricity to the same grid, as per EB 49 paragraph 48, has not been fully substantiated, the Board considers the project activity additional as with the application of the highest reported tariff in the province, the project IRR does not cross the benchmark;
54. The Board could not register the project activities:
- (a) "Heilongjiang Yilan Hezuolinchang Phase II Wind Power Project" (2117) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV). The Board considered the corrected project documentation which had been submitted in response to the outcome of a review finalized at EB49. The Board noted that the corrections which had been requested following the review required the DOE to provide information as to whether the tariffs could be considered to be an E- policy and if not to assess in a quantitative manner whether the observed changes in the applicable tariff had resulted in a change in the incentives for investors. The Board considered that the DOE and project participant had failed to either clarify that the tariff could be considered an E- policy or provide a quantitative assessment. The Board could therefore not assess the suitability of the applied tariff and therefore could not register the proposed CDM project activity;
  - (b) "Heilongjiang Huanan Hengdaishan East (II) Wind Power Project" (2124) submitted for registration by the DOE (DNV). The Board considered the corrected project documentation which had been submitted in response to the outcome of a review finalized at EB49. The Board noted that the corrections which had been requested following the review required the DOE to provide information as to whether the tariffs could be considered to be an E- policy and if not to assess in a quantitative manner whether the observed changes in the applicable tariff had resulted in a



change in the incentives for investors. The Board considered that the DOE and project participant had failed to either clarify that the tariff could be considered an E- policy or provide a quantitative assessment. The Board could therefore not assess the suitability of the applied tariff and therefore could not register the proposed CDM project activity;

(c) "Heilongjiang Wuerguli Wind Power Project" (2152) submitted for registration by the DOE (BVC). The Board considered the corrected project documentation which had been submitted in response to the outcome of a review finalized at EB49. The Board noted that the corrections which had been requested following the review required the DOE to provide information as to whether the tariffs could be considered to be an E- policy and if not to assess in a quantitative manner whether the observed changes in the applicable tariff had resulted in a change in the incentives for investors. The Board considered that the DOE and project participant had failed to either clarify that the tariff could be considered an E- policy or provide a quantitative assessment. The Board could therefore not assess the suitability of the applied tariff and therefore could not register the proposed CDM project activity;

(d) "Heilongjiang Yilan Jiguanlazishan Wind Farm Project" (2360) submitted for registration by the DOE (BVC). The Board considered the corrected project documentation which had been submitted in response to the outcome of a review finalized at EB49. The Board noted that the corrections which had been requested following the review required the DOE to provide information as to whether the tariffs could be considered to be an E- policy and if not to assess in a quantitative manner whether the observed changes in the applicable tariff had resulted in a change in the incentives for investors. The Board considered that the DOE and project participant had failed to either clarify that the tariff could be considered an E- policy or provide a quantitative assessment. The Board could therefore not assess the suitability of the applied tariff and therefore could not register the proposed CDM project activity;

(e) "Heilongjiang Dongning Dajiazishan and Xidagang Wind Farm Project" (2361) submitted for registration by the DOE (BVC). The Board considered the corrected project documentation which had been submitted in response to the outcome of a review finalized at EB49. The Board noted that the corrections which had been requested following the review required the DOE to provide information as to whether the tariffs could be considered to be an E- policy and if not to assess in a quantitative manner whether the observed changes in the applicable tariff had resulted in a change in the incentives for investors. The Board considered that the DOE and project participant had failed to either clarify that the tariff could be considered an E- policy or provide a quantitative assessment. The Board could therefore not assess the suitability of the applied tariff and therefore could not register the proposed CDM project activity;

(f) "Inner Mongolia Keshiketeng County Wutaohai South Wind Farm 49.5 MW Project" (2420) submitted for registration by the DOE (JQA). The Board considered the corrected project documentation which had been submitted in response to the outcome of a review finalized at EB49. The Board noted that the corrections which had been requested following the review required the DOE to provide information as to whether the tariffs could be considered to be an E- policy and if not to assess in a quantitative manner whether the observed changes in the applicable tariff had resulted in a change in the incentives for investors. The Board considered that the DOE and project participant had failed to either clarify that the tariff could be considered an E- policy or provide a quantitative assessment. The Board could therefore not assess the suitability of the applied tariff and therefore could not register the proposed CDM project activity.

55. Taking account of the identification of significant concerns with the compliance of a project activity with the requirements of the applied methodology Board agreed to undertake a review of the project activity, "GHG emission reductions through waste gas based power generation at Visa Steel



Limited” (2369) 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 52](#) to this report. While the Board acknowledges that it is unusual practice to reopen a review at this stage of the process the Board considered that proceeding with the registration of the project activity may create potential difficulties for the project participant and DOE during the project lifetime and that the interests of due process would be best served by reviewing this matter prior to registration.

### *General guidance*

56. Due to time constraints the Board did not consider the “Working paper for policy discussion on the application of E+/E- policies in the assessment of additionality” and agreed to consider this at its next meeting.

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

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

59. The Board considered the draft "Procedures for requests for registration of a proposed CDM project activity", the draft “Procedures for review for requests for registration” and requested the secretariat to launch a call for inputs from stakeholders on the proposals which had been discussed by the Board. The Board will consider comments received at its next meeting. Due to the proximity of the next Board meeting, the launch for public comments will be open for three weeks, from 12 February 2010 to 5 March 2010.

60. The Board agreed to adopted the "Guidelines on the Registration Fee Schedule For Proposed Project Activities Under the Clean Development Mechansim (version 01)" as contained in [annex 53](#) to this report, in order to defer the payment of the registration fee for projects hosted in countries with less than 10 registered CDM project activities.

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

61. The Board took note that 375,068,262 CERs have been issued as of 12 February 2010 and that the secretariat, in its capacity as the CDM registry administrator, continues to process requests for opening of holding accounts and for forwarding of CERs. The status of requests for issuance of CERs can be viewed on the UNFCCC CDM website at <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Issuance>.

### *Case specific*

62. 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 19 requests for issuance.

63. In accordance with paragraph 10 of these procedures the Board agreed to instruct the CDM registry administrator to issue 1,680,097 CERs for “Project for GHG emission reduction by thermal oxidation of HFC 23 in Gujarat, India.” (0001), taking note of the initial comments from the DOE (DNV) and project participant in response to the request for review.



64. 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) “AWMS GHG Mitigation Project BR05-B-03, Brazil ” (0336), if the DOE (DNV) submit a revised verification report that incorporates the correct means of verification for electricity consumption by the project activity;
- (b) “AWMS GHG Mitigation Project BR05-B-07, Mato Grosso, Minas Gerais and Goiás, Brazil” (0337), if the DOE (DNV) submits a revised verification report that incorporate the clarifications provided in response to the request for review with regard to the correct means of verification for electricity consumption by the project activity and the correct description of the calibration frequency of the gas analysers;
- (c) “Xiaogushan Hydropower Project in People's Republic of China” (0378), if the project participant and the DOE (JACO) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding verification report which include clarifications on:
  - (i) The difference between EG Aux and EG y was negative until June/2008 and the actions taken to solve this issue;
  - (ii) The role of the parameters ESplant and EGplant, whether values measured were used for ERs calculation and whether the maintenance and calibration of the electricity-meters were performed during the monitoring period;
- (d) “AWMS GHG Mitigation Project BR05-B-05, Minas Gerais and São Paulo, Brazil” (0412), if the DOE (DNV) submits a revised verification report that incorporate the clarifications provided in response to the request for review, with regard to the correct means of verification for electricity consumption by the project activity and the correct description of the calibration frequency of the gas analysers;
- (e) “AWMS GHG Mitigation Project BR05-B-10, Minas Gerais, Goiás, Mato Grosso, and Mato Grosso do Sul - Brazil ” (0417), if the DOE (DNV) submits a revised verification report that incorporates the clarifications provided in response to the request for review, with regard to the correct means of verification for electricity consumption by the project activity and the correct description of the calibration frequency of the gas analysers;
- (f) "AWMS GHG Mitigation Project BR05-B-13, Goiás and Minas Gerais, Brazil” (0419), if the DOE (DNV) submits a revised verification report that incorporate the clarifications provided in response to the request for review, with regard to the correct means of verification for electricity consumption by the project activity and the correct description of the calibration frequency of the gas analysers;
- (g) Aguascalientes EcoMethane Landfill Gas to Energy Project” (0425), if the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submits a revised monitoring report, a corresponding revised verification report and a new request for issuance form which includes the 90% values of flare efficiency for the periods between 27/02/2008 to 13/03/2008 and 27/05/2008 to 31/08/2008;



- (h) "Huaycoloro landfill gas capture and combustion" (0708), if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding verification report which include clarifications regarding:
- (i) The actual situation of the power generation unit provided in the response for the request for review;
  - (ii) No separate monitoring of P and T were necessary as the project used flow-meters which automatically converts the flow to normalized conditions, in line with the methodology and monitoring plan;
- (i) "Huadian Inner Mongolia Huitengxile 100.25MW Wind Farm Project" (0823), if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV-Nord) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report that incorporate:
- (i) The monitored value of electricity import through the main line; and
  - (ii) The clarification on the conservativeness of the defined value by the power purchasing agreement for the electricity import through the main line;
- (j) "N<sub>2</sub>O decomposition project of PetroChina Company Limited Liaoyang Petrochemical Company" (1238), if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding verification report, which incorporate the clarification regarding the capped adipic acid production and operational rate as provided in the response for the request for review;
- (k) "Durango - EcoMethane Landfill Gas to Energy Project" (1307), if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV Rhein) submit a revised monitoring report, a revised spreadsheet, a corresponding revised verification report, and a new request for issuance form which:
- (i) Exclude the emission reductions during the periods when the flow was higher than the flare capacity;
  - (ii) Clarification on how the DOE verified the applicability of the flare tool;
  - (iii) Calibration dates; and
  - (iv) Clarification on how the baseline emissions were monitored and not estimated *ex-ante*, as stated in the verification report;
- (l) "Jinxiang – Golden Elephant Line 1 N<sub>2</sub>O Abatement Project" (1455), if the project participant and the DOE (DNV) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report that incorporate the clarifications provided in response to the request for review regarding:
- (i) Verification of the operation hours in calculating the baseline emission factor;
  - (ii) Reference to CAR1; and
  - (iii) Inconsistent number of the UNC value;



- (m) “Biogas energy plant from palm oil mill effluent” (1509), if the project participant and the DOE (SGS) submit a revised monitoring report, a corresponding revised verification report, and a new request for issuance form which include:
- (i) The monitored values of the total methane recovered, how this parameter was monitored and which QA/QC procedures were applied and a Verification Report which incorporates a FAR to request a revision of the monitoring plan;
  - (ii) Removal of negative values of methane concentration; and
  - (iii) Clarification that the calibration is made through a zero-check and a value check;
- (n) “Amatitlan Geothermal Project” (2022), if the project participant and the DOE (ERM CVS) submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report that incorporate the clarifications regarding:
- (i) Emissions due to diesel consumption by utilitarian trucks;
  - (ii) Verification on the measurement of fossil fuel emission factor, and confirming that the plant specific fuel emission factor is not available; and
  - (iii) Implementation of the new well AMF-8.

65. In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 10 of these procedures, referred in paragraph 46, the Board agreed to undertake a review of the request for issuance of CERs and to appoint members of the review team for:

- (a) “ARAPUtanga Centrais ELétricas S. A. - ARAPUCEL - Small Hydroelectric Power Plants Project” (0530), submitted by the DOE (TÜV Nord), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 54](#) to this report;
- (b) “Demand side energy efficiency programmes for specific technologies at ITC Bhadrachalam pulp and paper making facility in India” (0806), submitted by the DOE (DNV), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 55](#) to this report;
- (c) “Energeticos Jaremar - Biogas recovery from Palm Oil Mill Effluent (POME) ponds, and heat & electricity generation, Honduras” (1483), 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 56](#) to this report;
- (d) “Inner Mongolia Dali Phase V 49.5MW Wind Power Project” (1629), submitted by the DOE (SGS), and that the scope of this review is relating to issues associated with verification requirements, as contained in [annex 57](#) to this report.<sup>29</sup>

66. 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.



67. In accordance with the procedures for review as referred to in paragraph 65 of the CDM modalities and procedures, the Board considered the recommendation of the review team for four project activities which were placed "Under review" at the fifty-first meeting of the Board. The Board agreed to instruct the CDM registry administrator to issue CERs, subject to satisfactory corrections, for the project activities;

(a) "Jilin Tongyu Huaneng 100.05MW Wind Power Project" (0256), if the project participant and the DOE (TÜV- SÜD) submit a new request for issuance form with the corrected number of CERs, a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report which incorporate the corrected values of the grid emission factor;

(b) "Landfill gas recovery and electricity generation at "Mtoni Dumpsite", Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania" (0908) submitted by the DOE (TÜV SÜD), if the project participant and the DOE submit:

A revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised spreadsheet with the data related to the flare efficiency (temperature) with those hours with lower flare efficiency and therefore, the adjusted number of emission reductions; and

A corresponding revised verification report which incorporate the clarification regarding the manufacturer's specification for the enclosed flare operation and the flare efficiency values used in the calculation of emission reductions and a new request for issuance form with the correct number of CERs;

(c) "N<sub>2</sub>O decomposition project of PetroChina Company Limited Liaoyang Petrochemical Company" (1238) submitted by the DOE (SGS), the project participant and the DOE submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding verification report, which incorporate the clarification regarding the capped adipic acid production and operational rate as provided in response to the review;

(d) "Monomeros Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project" (1428) submitted by the DOE (ICONTEC), the project participant and the DOE submit a revised monitoring report, a revised spreadsheet, and a corresponding verification report which include:

(i) Correction of the calculation of CL<sub>normal</sub> by excluding campaign 123, the seventh campaign prior to the baseline campaign, considering that the methodology requires the use of the previous five campaigns or fewer, should there be fewer than five historic campaigns; excluding abnormal campaigns;

(ii) Clarifications provided in response to the request for review in fifty-first meeting of the Executive meeting regarding (i) verification on the overall uncertainty factor (UNC); (ii) how conservative values were ensured in case of AMS down times; (iii) clarifications on the inconsistent reporting on the elimination of N<sub>2</sub>O data measured when the plant was operated outside the permitted ranges; (iv) listing each parameter required by the monitoring plan and clearly stating the DOE verification of these values in the monitoring report as per VVM (para.197); and (v) the calculation of the baseline emission factor following the Board's clarification as contained in annex 12 of this report.

68. In accordance with the Revision to the Clarifications to facilitate the implementation of procedures of review (Annex 22 of thirty-eight meeting of the Executive Board), the Board considered the corrections submitted for "Indocement Blended Cement Project" (0526) by the DOE (TÜV-SÜD). The Board agreed to undertake a review of the request for issuance of CERs and to appoint members of the review team and that the scope of the review is relating to issues associated with verification



requirements, as contained in [annex 58](#) to this report.

### *General guidance*

69. The Board agreed to the revised "Procedures for requesting post-registration changes to the start of the crediting period", as contained in [annex 59](#) to this report. These procedures have been revised to remove the requirement for the Host Country to re-confirm that the delay in the start date of crediting period will not affect project's contribution to sustainable development. These revised procedures also contain provisions for project activities hosted in Least Developed Countries (LDCs).

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

71. The Board considered the draft "Procedures for Requests for Issuance of Certified Emission Reductions", the draft "Procedures for review for requests for issuance" and requested the secretariat to launch a call for inputs from stakeholders on the proposals which had been discussed by the Board. The Board will consider comments received at its next meeting. Due to the proximity of the next Board meeting, the launch for public comments will be open for three weeks, from 12 February 2010 to 5 March 2010.

72. The Board agreed to the "Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements", as contained in [annex 60](#) to this report. The purpose of these guidelines is to provide guidance to DOEs during verification to address the non-compliance with the calibration frequency requirements specified by the methodology, Board guidance, and/or the registered monitoring plan.

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

### *Resources*

73. Upon consideration of the draft CDM-MAP and the useful clarifications provided by the secretariat, the Board decided to defer the approval of the CDM-MAP as presented. It asked the secretariat to revise the proposal, (i) incorporating a more detailed background and justification for the increased resources vis a vis workload projections for 2010; (ii) indicating the resources allocated to each activity; (iii) providing a detailed, clear and consistent status of human resources, including concrete plans on how and when the vacant posts will be filled.

74. The Board noted that such a revised version would take some time, and agreed to consider the revised CDM-MAP at its fifty-fourth meeting. In the meantime, the Board agreed to authorize the secretariat to incur expenditures for 2010 and to start recruitment of new staff up to the level proposed in the draft CDM-MAP in accordance with the secretariat planned re-organization.

75. The Board took note of information provided by the secretariat on the status of resources received as reflected in [annex 61](#). It was noted that the total income generated up to the end of 2009 is USD 56,576,107 (the major sources of income in 2009 were from registration fees of USD 17,073,229, and share of proceeds USD 20,117,799). The Board further noted that figures for fees for January 2010 were also provided, indicating i.a. income of USD 937,065 from registration fees and USD 824,089 from shares of proceeds."

76. The Board considered an assessment of compliance with indicative timelines set by the Board in different processes and request the secretariat to continue to report on all processes.

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

**Agenda sub-item 5 (a): Guidance by CMP**

77. The Board considered the CMP decision 2/CMP.5 “Further guidance relating to the clean development mechanism” and agreed on a tentative workprogramme to deliver the requests mandated by the CMP, which structures the guidance, mandates, activities and timelines. The Board further agreed to consider the progress made in the implementation of this workplan at its next meeting.

78. The Board further requested the secretariat to include in the agenda of future meetings the issues contained in this workplan for which work has not yet been initiated and to prepare the required inputs as reflected in it.

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

79. The Board took note of the update on the informal meeting of the CDM DNA Forum held on 14 December 2009 in Copenhagen, Denmark. The secretariat further informed the Board about the preparations of the regional African DNA Forum, planned to take place on 1-2 March 2010 in Nairobi, Kenya, in conjunction with the African Carbon Forum (3-5 March 2010).

80. The Board also took note of the date of the ninth DNA Forum meeting, planned to take place on 22-23 April 2010 in Bonn, Germany, which will be held in conjunction with the CDM Joint Coordination Workshop, 24-25 April 2010.

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

81. The Board took note of the submissions and an oral report by the Chair of the DOE/AE Coordination Forum, Mr. Jonathan Avis, that elaborated the input received from entities on the following issues:

- (a) Proposal on timelines of completing validations;
- (b) Clarifications requested on: the status of methodology ACM0006, the evidence of the prior CDM consideration, projects that will be implemented in phases and the scale of projects having several components;
- (c) Proposal on possible enabling measures for DOEs;
- (d) Engagement with CDM-AP on the revision of the CDM accreditation standard, CDM accreditation procedure and the Framework to monitor performance of DOEs;
- (e) Rules relating to programme of activities (PoAs);
- (f) Draft procedures for registration;
- (g) Wind power projects.

82. The Board members responded to some of the questions raised and provided feedback on the proposals made by the forum. The Board requested the forum to provide additional input on the following:

- (a) Actions that DOEs can undertake to proactively enhance the quality of their validation and verification activities;
- (b) Proposals for other measures, as an alternative to a suspension;
- (c) Analysis of current timelines of validation activities across different projects and in different host countries, especially LDCs.



83. The Chair of the Board thanked Mr. Jonathan Avis and stressed the need for the forum to identify answers to the questions raised by the Board members for the next interaction. The Chair reminded the Chair of the forum of the need to provide prior written submissions for all issues to be raised in future oral presentations to allow the Board to appropriately consider and then address them.

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

84. 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.

85. The Board further agreed to continue to meet with the same type of arrangement and to reconsider the issue when necessary. Observers to the fifty-third meeting of the Executive Board shall have registered with the secretariat by **1 March 2010**. In order to ensure proper security and logistical arrangements, the Board emphasized that this deadline will be strictly enforced by the secretariat.

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

86. The Board agreed to the revised calendar of meetings for 2010, which is contained in [annex 62](#) to this report. The Board further took note with appreciation of the invitation of Mr. José Domingos Miguez, on behalf of the Government of Brazil, and the invitation of Mr. Pedro Martins Barata, on behalf of the Government of Portugal, to host a meeting of the Board in the second half of 2010 in their respective countries. The meetings are planned to be held in conjunction with other events to raise awareness of the CDM in the region. The Board requested the secretariat to start preparing the formal, legal and logistical arrangements for these meetings.

87. The Board further took note that the annual CDM Joint Coordination workshop is planned to take place on 24- 25 April 2010 in Bonn, Germany. The Board requested the secretariat to prepare all logistical and substantive work for this meeting, which will bring together the Board and its support structure.

88. The Board agreed on the provisional agenda for its fifty-third meeting (22 - 26 March 2010) as contained in [annex 63](#) to this report, with an open session on the 24 - 26 March 2010.

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

89. The Chair summarized the main conclusions.

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

90. 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**

91. The Chair closed the meeting.

-----



## Annexes to the report

### Membership issues

Annex 1 - Documents related to conflict of interest

### Accreditation

Annex 2 - Work programme of the CDM-AP for 2010

### Methodologies

Annex 3 - ACM0018 - Consolidated methodology for electricity generation from biomass residues in power-only plants

Annex 4 - AM0028 - Catalytic N<sub>2</sub>O destruction in the tail gas of nitric acid or caprolactam production plants (version 05)

Annex 5 - AM0034 - Catalytic reduction of N<sub>2</sub>O inside the ammonia burner of nitric acid plants (version 04)

Annex 6 - AM0048 - New cogeneration facilities supplying electricity and/or steam to multiple customers and displacing grid/off-grid steam and electricity generation with more carbon-intensive fuels (version 03)

Annex 7 - ACM0002 - Consolidated methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources (version 11)

Annex 8 - ACM0006 - Consolidated methodology for electricity generation from biomass residues in power and heat plants (version 10)

Annex 9 - Procedure for the submission and consideration of a proposed new baseline and monitoring methodology for large scale CDM project activities

Annex 10 - Proposed new methodology assessment form (F-CDM-NMas) (version 05)

Annex 11 - Proposed new methodology expert form - lead review (CDM Expert, FCDM-NMex\_3d) (version 04)

Annex 12 - Proposed new methodology expert form - second review (CDM Expert, F-CDM-NMex\_2d) (version 04)

Annex 13 - Proposed new methodology expert form - second review (Sectoral/Industry Expert, F-CDM-NMex\_Sect) (version 01)

Annex 14 - Work programme of the Meth Panel for the first semester of 2010

Annex 15 - Work programme of the SSC WG for the first semester of 2010

Annex 16 - Work programme of the AR WG for the first semester of 2010

### Matters relating to the registration of CDM project activities

Annex 17 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 1585

Annex 18 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2569

Annex 19 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2598



Annex 20 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2703  
Annex 21 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2713  
Annex 22 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2741  
Annex 23 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2761  
Annex 24 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2774  
Annex 25 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2775  
Annex 26 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2776  
Annex 27 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2780  
Annex 28 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2796  
Annex 29 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2799  
Annex 30 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2812  
Annex 31 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2824  
Annex 32 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2828  
Annex 33 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2830  
Annex 34 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2839  
Annex 35 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2846  
Annex 36 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2847  
Annex 37 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2849  
Annex 38 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2850  
Annex 39 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2851  
Annex 40 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2852  
Annex 41 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2861  
Annex 42 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2865  
Annex 43 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2868  
Annex 44 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2879  
Annex 45 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2902  
Annex 46 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2907  
Annex 47 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2908  
Annex 48 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2909  
Annex 49 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2926



Annex 50 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2933

Annex 51 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2986

Annex 52 - Scope of review (registration) - Project 2369

Annex 53 - Guidelines on the registration fee schedule for proposed project activities under the Clean Development Mechanism (version 01)

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

Annex 54 - Scope of reviews (issuance) - Project 0530

Annex 55 - Scope of reviews (issuance) - Project 0806

Annex 56 - Scope of reviews (issuance) - Project 1483

Annex 57 - Scope of reviews (issuance) - Project 1629

Annex 58 - Scope of reviews (issuance) - Project 0526

Annex 59 - Procedures for requesting post-registration changes to the start of the crediting period (version 02)

Annex 60 - Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements

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

Annex 61 - Status of resources and pledges to support 2010 CDM activities

### **Other matters**

Annex 62 - Schedule of meetings of the CDM Executive Board and its panels and working groups in 2010 (version 02)

Annex 63 - Provisional agenda for EB53

-----



## Endnotes

1. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in the response to the request for review regarding the suitability of input values to the investment analysis, in particular, the plant load factor of 38.8%.
2. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in the response to the request for review regarding the suitability of input values to the investment analysis, in particular, why the 'Equipment Fix Cost' increases from the 10th and 18th years onwards.
3. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of input values to the investment analysis, starting date, sensitivity analysis, and monitoring plan.
4. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporates the information submitted in the response to the request for review, regarding the prior consideration of CDM, common practice analysis and the selection of reference plant.
5. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in the response to the request for review regarding the suitability of input values to the investment analysis, in particular, total investment, plant load factor, effective utilization of 0.95 and other costs.
6. If the Board decides to ultimately register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in the request for review regarding the availability of the waste heat and lifetime of the existing equipments.
7. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in the response to the request for review regarding the suitability of input values to the investment analysis.
8. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in the response to the request for review regarding the suitability of input values to the investment analysis, in particular, the other/miscellaneous costs.
9. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the response submitted in the request for review regarding the validation of suitability of input values.
10. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE should submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report, which incorporate the additional information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of the project start date, the prior consideration of CDM, input values to the investment analysis and the monitoring plan.
11. If the Board decides to ultimately register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report: (a) which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the: (i) suitability of operating hours, operating costs, electricity tariff and 10% loss rate; and (ii) change in volume of the reservoir; and (b) with the correct grid emission factor of 0.9735 tCO<sub>2</sub>/MWh applied consistently throughout the PDD and Appendices.



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 the response to the request for review, regarding the validation of the transmission loss, internal consumption rate and PLF used in the investment analysis.
13. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE should submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the additional information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of input values to the investment analysis.
14. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE should submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report, which incorporate the additional information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of the suitability of the input values and the common practice analysis.
15. If the Board decides to ultimately register the project activity, the PP/DOE submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report, which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the common practice analysis and the revised monitoring plan
16. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE should submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report, which incorporate the additional information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of the suitability of the input values and the net electricity supply.
17. 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 the response to the request for review, regarding the validation of the investment analysis including the input values and the common practice barrier.
18. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which include the response submitted in the response to the request for review, regarding the validation of common practice analysis and the emission factor.
19. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE should submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report, which incorporate the additional information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of the investment and the O&M costs and the common practice analysis.
20. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of the suitability of input values, common practice analysis and identification of baseline scenario.
21. 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 the response to the request for review, regarding the validation of the inconsistencies in reporting the IRR value and the common practice barrier.
22. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE should submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report, which incorporate the additional information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the validation of the project starting date, prior consideration and real actions, common practice criteria and investment analysis (spreadsheet).



23. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which include the response submitted in the response to the request for review, regarding the validation of coefficient of effective electricity and the common practice analysis.
24. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the DOE (TÜV-SÜD) shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to the request for review regarding the suitability of input values to the investment analysis, in particular, raw material costs, motive power (water), overhead expenses, annual repair charges and the item others.
25. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the DOE (TÜV-Nord) shall submit a revised PDD and the corresponding revised validation report which incorporate the information submitted in response to request for review regarding the sensitivity analysis, common practice analysis, applicability of the methodology, and validation of flaring of gas.
26. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit a revised PDD and a corresponding revised validation report that includes all information provided in response to the request for review regarding the account for the cessation of construction, the project starting date and the power purchase agreement.
27. If the Board ultimately decides to register the project activity, the PP/DOE shall submit the unprotected spreadsheet submitted in the response to the request for review.
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 all information provided in response to the request for review regarding the validation of the O&M costs and the coefficient of effective electricity.
29. If the Board ultimately decides to issue CERs for the project activity, the project participant and the DOE shall submit a revised monitoring report and a corresponding revised verification report including their responses regarding the over deduction of transmission losses in June 2008, accuracy class of the meters and confirmation regarding no back up line, as provided in response to the request for review.