

CDM in CHARTS

Hyperlinked Version

October 2010 Version 11.2

Updated up to the results of the EB57



Ministry of the Environment



Institute for
Global Environmental
Strategies



Edited by **Yuji MIZUNO Ph.D.**
Market Mechanism Group Director
Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES)

With supports from Mr. Kazuhisa Koakutsu, Ms. Nozomi Okubo, Mr. Naoki Torii, Ms. Kaoru Nishimura and Ms. Naoko Ito, IGES

This document aims to give a comprehensive and easy-to-understand description of the clean development mechanism (CDM). It should be noted that this document does not replicate in the exact manner all the texts agreed upon in the international negotiations. Also, there are issues yet to be settled in the international negotiations regarding detailed interpretations and processes. As for the details and exact expressions in the agreed texts, please refer to the respective documents available on the website of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change <<http://unfccc.int/>>.

Whilst information in this document is believed to be true and accurate at the date of going to press, neither the author nor publisher can accept any legal responsibility or liability for any errors or omissions that may be made.

Other CDM-related publications can be downloaded from <<http://www.iges.or.jp/en/cdm/report.html>>.

For any queries relating to this document, please contact <cdm-info@iges.or.jp>.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AAU	Assigned Amount Unit
ACM	Approved Consolidated Methodology
AE	Applicant Entity
AM	Approved Methodology
AMS	Approved small-scales methodologies
A/R CDM	Afforestation and Reforestation Project Activities under the Clean Development Mechanism
AR	Afforestation and Reforestation
AT	(an approved tool referred to in an AM for which a request for revision is submitted)
CCS	Carbon dioxide Capture and Storage
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CDM-AP	CDM Accreditation Panel
CEF	Carbon Emission Factor
CER	Certified Emission Reduction
CME	coordinating or managing entity
CMP (COP/MOP)	the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol
COP	Conference of the Parties (to the UNFCCC)
CPA	CDM programme activity
CPR	Commitment Period Reserve
DNA	Designated National Authority
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
EB	CDM Executive Board
EIT	Economies in Transition
ER	Emission Reduction
ERT	Expert Review Team
ERU	Emission Reduction Unit
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GWP	Global Warming Potential
HFCs	Hydrofluorocarbons
IET	International emissions trading under the Kyoto Protocol
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

ITL	International Transaction Log
JI	Joint Implementation
KP	Kyoto Protocol
LULUCF	Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry
MoC	Modalities of Communication
MP	Methodologies Panel
NM	New Methodology
OE	Operational Entity
Party	Country or regional integration organization which has ratified the KP, unless otherwise specified
PDD	Project Design Document
PFCs	Perfluorocarbons
PMN	a proposed new baseline and monitoring methodology for large scale CDM projects
PoA	Programme of Activities
PP	Project Participant
RIT	Registration and Issuance Team
RMU	Removal Unit
SAR	(the IPCC) 2nd Assessment Report
SBI	Subsidiary Body for Implementation
SBSTA	Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice
SF ₆	Sulfur Hexafluoride
SIDs	Small Island Developing states
SOP	Share of Proceeds
SSC	Small Scale CDM
SSC-WG	Working group for small-scale CDM project activities
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VVM	Validation and Verification Manual

Tree Diagram of Contents

1. The Kyoto Protocol p1

2. The Kyoto Mechanisms

2-1. The Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) p2

2-2. Joint Implementation (JI) p3

2-3. International Emissions Trading (IET) p4

3. CDM project cycle p6

4. CDM-related bodies

4-1. CMP p8

4-2. Designated National Authority (DNA) p8

4-3. CDM Executive Board (EB) p9

4-4. Panels and Working Groups p11

4-5. Designated Operational Entity (DOE) p12

4-6. Project participants (PPs) p14

4-7. Procedures for modalities of communication p15

5. Conditions for CDM projects p17

6. Making PDD p19

7. Baseline

7-1. Concept of the baseline and additionality p21

7-2. Baseline scenario p22

7-3. Baseline methodology p23

7-4. Procedure for the submission and consideration of a proposed new baseline and monitoring methodology for large scale CDM project activities p24

7-5. Procedures for the revision of approved methodologies (AMs) and tools for large scale CDM project activities p26

7-6. Procedures for requests to the EB for deviation from an AM p29

7-7. Procedure for the submission and consideration of queries regarding the application of AMs and tools by DOEs to the MP p30

8. Starting date and crediting period

8-1. Starting date of a CDM project activity p31

8-2. Crediting period p33

9. Monitoring plan p35

10. Approval from each Party involved p36

11. Validation

11-1. Procedures for validation p37

11-2. Validation requirements p38

12. Registration

12-1. Procedures for requests for registration p39

12-2. Procedures for review of requests for registration p40

12-3. Registration fee p41

12-4. Procedures for withdrawal of a request for registration p42

Tree Diagram of Contents

13. Changes after operation of a CDM project

13-1. Procedures for revising monitoring plans p43

13-2. Procedures for requests for deviation prior to submitting request for issuance p44

13-3. Changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD p45

14. Verification and certification p46

15. Issuance of CERs

15-1. Procedures for requests for issuance of CERs p47

15-2. Procedures for review of requests for issuance p48

15-3. Procedures for withdrawal of a request for issuance of CERs p49

16. Distribution of CERs p50

17. Renewal of crediting period p51

18. Small-scale CDM (SSC)

18-1. Definition of small-scale CDM (SSC) p53

18-2. Simplified modalities and procedures p54

18-3. Bundling of SSC p56

19. Afforestation and Reforestation CDM (A/R CDM)

19-1. Overview of A/R CDM p57

19-2. Non-permanence of A/R CDM (tCER and ICER) p58

19-3. Small-scale A/R CDM p61

20. CDM Programme of activities

20-1. Overview of programme of activities p62

20-2. Procedures for programme of activities p64

21. Registry and international transaction log (ITL)

21-1. CDM registry p66

21-2. National registry p67

21-3. International transaction log (ITL) p69

Attachment 1. Project Design Document (CDM-PDD) p70

Attachment 2. Approved methodologies (AMs) and tools p72

Attachment 3. Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality p85

Attachment 4. Guidelines on the assessment of investment analysis p87

Attachment 5. Guidelines for demonstrating additionality for specific SSC project activities p88

Attachment 6. CDM validation and verification manual (CDM-VVM) p89

Attachment 7. Global warming potential (GWP) and carbon emission factor (CEF) p91

Important changes from previous version (Ver. 10/ June 2010) p92

Glossary

Examples of abbreviated titles used in this document and corresponding formal document symbols and titles

<i>Examples of abbreviated titles used in this charts, shown in []</i>	<i>Corresponding formal document symbols and titles</i>
KP Art.2 para1(a)	The Kyoto Protocol, Article2, paragraph1(a)
CP/2001/13/Ad2, p1 para2(a)	FCCC/CP/2001/13/Add.2, page 1 paragraph 2(a)
CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p1 para2(a)	FCCC/KP/CMP/2005/8/Add.1, page 1 paragraph 2(a)
EB01 Rep, para1(a)	Executive Board of the Clean Development Mechanism, 1st Meeting Report, paragraph 1(a)
EB01 Anx1, para1(a)	Executive Board of the Clean Development Mechanism, Annex 1 to the 1st Meeting Report, paragraph 1(a)
PDD GL ver.7, p1	Guidelines for Completing the Project Design Document (CDM-PDD), and the Proposed New Baseline and Monitoring Methodologies (CDM-NM) Version 7, page 1 (ver.7 was published on 2 August 2008)
SSC GL ver5, p1	Guidelines for Completing CDM-SSC-PDD, F-CDM-SSC-Subm and F-CDM-SSC-BUNDLE, Version 05, page 1 (Ver.5 was published on 14 September 2007)
Glos ver.5, p1	Glossary of CDM terms Version 05, page 1 (ver.5 was published on 19 August 2009)
Anx stands for Annex , Apx for Appendix , Att for Attachment , and Ann for Annotation .	
CDM M&P means CDM Modalities and Procedures (Annex to Decision 17/CP.7) (FCCC/CP/2001/13/Add.2, p26-41)	
CDM A/R M&P means Modalities and Procedures for Afforestation and Reforestation project activities under the CDM (Annex to Decision 19/CP.9) (FCCC/CP/2003/6/Add.2, p16-27)	

1. The Kyoto Protocol

- ◆ The Kyoto Protocol was adopted at the 3rd session of the Conference of the Parties (COP3) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) held in Kyoto, Japan, in December 1997.
- ◆ The Protocol defines quantified greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction targets for Annex I Parties. [KP Art.3 para1]

GHGs defined by the Protocol are carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), HFCs, PFCs, and SF₆. [KP AnnexA]

Annex I Parties means those listed in Annex I of the UNFCCC. They are developed countries including Economies in Transitions, e.g. Russia and Eastern Europe.

Annex I Parties have different GHG emission ceilings for the 5-year period of 2008-2012 (1st commitment period).

☞ Emission ceiling which is called 'assigned amounts' for each Party is calculated as follows.

"The base-year emissions" x "emission reduction target" x five [KP Art.3 para7]

☞ The base-year emissions are basically a Party's aggregate GHG emissions in 1990 (whereas, countries may use 1995 as its base year for HFCs, PFCs, and SF₆). [KP Art.3 para1&8]

- ◆ The Protocol introduces 3 market mechanisms, namely the Kyoto Mechanisms. Annex I Parties would be able to achieve their emission reduction targets cost-effectively, by using these mechanisms.

Joint Implementation (JI)
<Article 6 of the Protocol>

Clean Development Mechanism (CDM)
<Article 12 of the Protocol>

International Emissions Trading
<Article 17 of the Protocol>

- ◆ Besides Parties, private firms may use the Kyoto Mechanisms. [CMP/2005/8/Ad2, p7 para29][CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p13 para33][CMP/2005/8/Ad2, p19 para5]
☞ Provided the Parties meet eligibility requirements for using the Kyoto Mechanisms.

BOX: Entry into force of the Kyoto Protocol

The Kyoto Protocol shall enter into force on the 90th day after the date on which not less than 55 Parties to the UNFCCC, incorporating Annex I Parties which accounted in total for at least 55% of the total CO₂ emissions for 1990 of the Annex I Parties, have deposited their instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession. [KP Art.25 para1]

☞ Currently, 190 countries and one regional economic integration organization (the EEC) have deposited instruments of ratifications, accessions, approvals or acceptances.


☞ 63.7% of the total CO₂ emissions for 1990 of the Annex I Parties have ratified the Protocol.

⇒ The Protocol entered into force on 16 February 2005.

2. The Kyoto Mechanisms

2-1. The Clean Development Mechanism (CDM)


- ◆ Annex I Parties which have ceilings for GHG emissions (emission caps), assist non-Annex I Parties which don't have emission caps, to implement project activities to reduce GHG emissions (or remove by sinks), and credits will be issued based on emission reductions (or removals by sinks) achieved by the project activities.
 - ☞ A Party where CDM project is implemented, is called a host Party.
 - ☞ The credit from the CDM is called certified emission reduction (CER). [CMP/2005/8/Ad1.p7 para1(b)]
 - ☞ Reductions in emissions shall be additional to any that would occur in the absence of the certified project activity. [KP Art.12 para5(c)]
- ◆ Annex I Parties can use CERs to contribute to compliance of their quantified GHG emissions reduction targets of the Kyoto Protocol. [KP Art.12 para3(b)]
 - ☞ As a result, the amount of emission cap of Annex I Parties will increase.
- ◆ The CDM will issue CERs before the 1st commitment period.
 - ☞ CERs issued based on activities during the period from the year 2000 up to 2012 can be used in achieving compliance of Annex I Parties in the 1st commitment period. [KP Art.12 para10]



2-2. Joint Implementation (JI)

- ◆ Annex I Parties which have ceilings for GHG emissions (emission caps), assist other Annex I Parties to implement project activities to reduce GHG emissions (or remove by sinks), and credits will be issued based on amount of emission reductions (or removals by sinks) achieved by the project activities.
 - ☞ A Party where JI project is implemented, is called a host Party.
 - ☞ The credit from the JI is called emission reduction unit (ERU). [\[CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p7 para1\(a\)\]](#)
 - ☞ Any such project shall provide a GHG emission reductions, or removals by sinks, that is additional to any that would otherwise occur. [\[KP Art.6 para1\(b\)\]](#)
- ◆ Annex I Parties can use ERUs to contribute to compliance of their quantified GHG emissions reduction targets of the Kyoto Protocol. [\[KP Art.6 para1\]](#)
 - ☞ The total amount of emission cap of Annex I Parties will not change, because JI is credits transfer between the Parties both of which have emission caps.
- ◆ ERUs will be issued only after 2008. [\[CMP/2005/8/Ad2, p2 para5\]](#)


The total amount of emission cap of Annex I Parties is same



2-3. International Emissions Trading (IET)


- ◆ International Emissions Trading is to trade Kyoto Protocol units (KP units) including part of assigned amounts, CERs, ERUs and etc, between Annex I Parties.
 - ☞ The total amount of emission cap of Annex I Parties will not change.
 - ☞ Only Annex B Parties of the Kyoto Protocol can participate International Emissions Trading.
 - ☞ Minimum trading unit is 1t-CO₂ equivalent.
- ◆ Through market mechanism, International Emissions Trading can decrease total cost of Annex I Parties to achieve their collective emission reduction targets.

Without International Emissions Trading



	Party X	Party Y	Total
Before ET: Emission cap	10	8	18
Trading a KP unit	-	-	-
After ET: Emission cap	10	8	18
GHG emissions	12	10	22
Necessary reduction	2	2	4
Unit cost of reduction	\$200	\$100	-
Total cost of reduction	\$400	\$200	\$600
Trading cost	-	-	-
Total compliance cost	\$400	\$200	\$600

With International Emissions Trading



	Party X	Party Y	Total
Before ET: Emission cap	10	8	18
Trading a KP units	1	-1	0
After ET: Emission cap	11	7	18
GHG emissions	12	10	22
Necessary reduction	1	3	4
Unit cost of reduction	\$200	\$100	-
Total cost of reduction	\$200	\$300	\$500
Trading cost	150	-150	0
Total compliance cost	\$350	\$150	\$500

Note: Party Y sold a KP unit to Party X at \$150.

◆ Annex I Parties can trade following types of Kyoto Protocol units.

☞ **Assigned amount unit (AAU)** [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p7 para1(c)]

⇒ Total amount of AAUs of an Annex I Party is calculated from its base year emissions and emission reduction target

☞ **Removal unit (RMU)** [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p7 para1(d)]

⇒ Total amount of RMU of an Annex I Party is calculated from net removal of GHGs by afforestation and reforestation (A/R) activities [CMP/2005/8/Ad3, p5 para1(a)-(d)] and additional activities related to GHG removals by sinks [CMP/2005/8/Ad3, p5 para1(e)-(h)]

☞ **Emission reduction unit (ERU)** from JI


☞ **Certified emission reduction (CER)** from the CDM

☞ **Temporary CER (tCER)** and **long-term CER (ICER)**

⇒ tCER and ICER are issued from afforestation and reforestation (A/R) CDM project activities. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p62 para1(g)-(h)]

BOX: Compliance assessment

GHG emission cap of an Annex I Party at the end of the 1st commitment period is as follows.



Carry-over

If an emission cap of an Annex I Party is more than its GHG emissions during the 1st commitment period, the surplus can be carried over to the subsequent commitment period. [CMP/2005/8/Ad2, p27 para15] [CMP/2005/8/Ad2, p30 para36]

☞ The end of additional period is the 100th day after the date set by the CMP. [CMP/2005/8/Ad3, p101 XIII]

☞ There are several restrictions for carry-over depending on the type of KP units.


Consequence of non compliance


◆ If GHG emissions during the 1st commitment period of an Annex I Party is more than its emission cap, the Annex I Party will be deemed to be non compliance to the Kyoto Protocol.

◆ The Party not in compliance shall be applied the following consequences. [CMP/2005/8/Ad3, p102 para5]

- ☞ Deduction from the Party's assigned amount for the 2nd commitment period of a number of tonnes equal to 1.3 times the amount in tonnes of excess emissions;
- ☞ Development of a compliance action plan; and
- ☞ Suspension of the eligibility to make transfers under Article 17 of the Protocol until the Party is reinstated.

3. CDM project cycle





4. CDM-related bodies

4-1. CMP

- ◆ The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP) is the ultimate decision-making body of the CDM. [\[EB53 Anx38 para3\]](#)
 - ☞ This body has authority over, and provides guidance to, the EB through the adoption of decisions and resolutions, published in reports of the CMP. The decisions of the CMP outline formal expectations with respect to the CDM.
 - ☞ They set direction and establish precedents which serve as reference for future decision making and basis for operating procedures. CMP decisions are treated as directives – mandatory requirements or rules intended to ensure the successful implementation of the KP.
 - ☞ All decisions taken by the EB must be consistent with and not contradict decisions of the CMP.
- ◆ The CMP: [\[CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p7 para2-4\]](#)
 - ☞ Has authority over and provides guidance to the CDM;
 - ☞ Decides on the recommendations made by the EB on its rules of procedure, and in accordance with provisions of decision 17/CP.7 [\[CP/2001/13/Ad2 p20-49\]](#), the present annex and relevant decisions of the CMP;
 - ☞ Decides on the designation of operational entities (OEs) accredited by the EB;
 - ☞ Reviews annual reports of the EB;
 - ☞ Reviews the regional and subregional distribution of designated operational entities (DOEs) and CDM project activities.
 - ☞ etc

4-2. Designated National Authority (DNA)

- ◆ Parties participating in the CDM shall set up a designated national authority (DNA) for the CDM. [\[CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p12 para29\]](#)
- ◆ CDM project participants (PPs) shall receive written approval of voluntary participation from the DNA of each Party involved.
 - ☞ The written approval shall include confirmation by the host Party that the project activity assists it in achieving sustainable development. [\[CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p15 para40\(a\)\]](#)
 - ☞ The details of approval procedure is up to each Party.

Definition of host Party [\[Glos. Ver.5,p19\]](#)

- ☞ Host Party is a non-Annex I Party on whose territory the CDM project activity is physically located.
- ☞ A project activity located in several countries has several host Parties.

4-3. CDM Executive Board (EB)

- ◆ The EB supervises the CDM, under the authority and guidance of the CMP, [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p8 para5]
- ◆ Decisions of the EB must be consistent with and support the formal decisions of the CMP. Decisions of the EB are hierarchical in nature and are published in the meeting reports of the EB and their accompanying annexes.
- ◆ Taking into account both the rule-making and rule-enforcing roles of the EB, decisions of the EB can be divided into three main classes: [EB53 Anx38 para4-5, 7]
 - ☞ **Regulatory** decisions relating to the supervision of the CDM in implementing its modalities and procedures throughout the project activity cycle;
 - ☞ **Rulings** relating to compliance with the CDM modalities and procedures by the PPs, AEs and/or DOEs, such as;
 - ⇒ Accrediting and provisionally designating operational entities;
 - ⇒ Approving methodologies;
 - ⇒ Registering CDM project activities;
 - ⇒ Issuing certified emissions reduction units.
 - ☞ **Operational** decisions relating to the functioning of the regulatory body.
- ◆ There is the code of conduct for member and alternate member of the EB. [EB47 Anx62]

Members of the EB [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p9 para7-12]

- ☞ The EB comprises 10 members from Parties to the KP.
 - ⇒ 1 member from each of the 5 UN regional groups, 2 other members from the Annex I Parties, 2 other members from the non-Annex I Parties, and 1 representative of the small island developing States.
 - ⇒ The 5 regional groups of the UN are: Asia, Africa, Latin America, Eastern Europe, and the Western European and Others Group
 - ⇒ As a result, 4 are from Annex I Parties and 6 are from non-Annex I Parties, unless 1 member from Asia is selected from Japan.
 - ⇒ There is an alternate for each member of the EB.
- ☞ Members, including alternate members, of the EB are nominated by the relevant constituencies referred above, and be elected by the CMP.
 - ⇒ Vacancies shall be filled in the same way.
- ☞ Members are elected for a period of 2 years and be eligible to serve a maximum of 2 consecutive terms.
 - ⇒ Terms as alternate members do not count.
- ☞ 5 members and 5 alternate members are elected initially for a term of 3 years, and other members and alternate members for a term of 2 years. Thereafter, the CMP elects, every year, 5 new members, and 5 new alternate members, for a term of 2 years.
- ☞ The EB elects its own chair and vice-chair, with one being a member from an Annex I Party and the other being from a non-Annex I Party.
 - ⇒ The positions of chair and vice-chair alternate annually between a member from an Annex I Party and a non-Annex I Party.

Meeting and decision of the EB [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p10 para13-16]

- ☞ The EB meets as necessary but no less than 3 times a year.
- ☞ At least 2/3 of the members of the EB, representing a majority of members from Annex I Parties and a majority of members from non-Annex I Parties, must be present to constitute a quorum.
- ☞ Decisions by the EB is taken by consensus, whenever possible. If that is not possible, decisions shall be taken by 3/4 majority of the members present and voting at the meeting. Members abstaining from voting shall be considered as not voting.
- ☞ Meetings of the EB are open to attendance, as observers, except where otherwise decided by the EB.

Regulatory decisions [\[EB53 Anx38 para6\]](#)

◆ Regulatory decisions are intended to ensure the successful implementation of the modalities and procedures for a CDM. Such decisions, when not included in the main body of the meeting report, are published in the following document types:

Standards are designed to achieve a uniform approach to compliance with decisions of the CMP relating to the CDM project activity cycle and include **Approved Methodologies** with their associated **Tools**.

Procedures contains a mandatory series of actions that must be undertaken to satisfy specific requirements of the CDM modalities and procedures. Procedures ensure that PPs and DOEs comply with the applicable decisions or standards issued by the CMP and/or EB. Procedures relate to processes in the project activity cycle, **Rules of Procedures** and **Terms of References** for established advisory bodies.

Guidelines contains supplemental information such as acceptable methods for satisfying requirements described in procedures or standards. Guidelines are designed to achieve a uniform approach to compliance with the applicable standards or procedures issued by the CMP and/or the EB.

Clarifications is issued to alleviate confusion relating to the application of a standard or procedure published within the main body of the meeting report. Clarifications are designed to achieve a uniform approach to compliance with the applicable standards or procedures issued by the CMP and/or the EB. Clarifications are transitory in nature, pending the subsequent revision of the related standard or procedure which takes into account and incorporates the clarification.

Forms do not contain regulatory decisions of the EB. However, they are used to facilitate the submission of data or information required in a recurring, standardized business process within the CDM project cycle. A form contains pre-defined data fields to be filled in by PPs. Completing and submitting forms is part of a mandatory series of actions (how to), required by a procedure.

Operational decisions [\[EB53 Anx38 para9-10\]](#)

◆ Operational (or administrative) decisions ensure the successful running of the EB and cover matters such as: meeting agendas and reports; schedule of meetings; the management of documentation of the EB; finance and administration (management action plan, fee payments, etc); work programmes and priorities; establishment of panels and/or other subsidiary bodies; calls for input; commissioning of technical reports; recommending and reporting to the CMP on the running of the EB and its programmes of work; information notes and other matters of an operational or administrative nature.

◆ Decisions of an operational nature, when not published within the main body of the meeting reports of the EB, are published as annexes to the reports under one of the following document types:

- ☞ **Information Note** is a short message containing facts relating to a particular subject including the schedule of upcoming meetings, budget information, work programmes, and other information of an operational or administrative nature;
- ☞ **Glossary** is an alphabetical list of terms relating to the CDM;
- ☞ **Recommendation** is a document endorsing, approving, supporting, providing options or recommending a course of action.

4-4. Panels and Working Groups

- ◆ The EB may establish committees, panels or working groups to assist it in the performance of its functions. The EB shall draw on the expertise necessary to perform its functions, including from the UNFCCC roster of experts. In this context, it shall take fully into account the consideration of regional balance. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p10 para18]
- ◆ There is “General guidelines for panels/working groups.” [EB37 Anx1]

CDM executive board (EB)

Meth Panel (MP) (Methodologies Panel)

- ☞ The MP is responsible for recommendations to the EB on baseline and monitoring methodologies, revisions to the PDD, etc. [EB46 Anx12, para2-3]
- ☞ 2 members of the EB will act as Chair and vice Chair of the panel, respectively. 2 other members of the EB will be designated to support Chair and vice Chair. In addition to the designated EB members, the panel shall be composed of 16 members. [EB46 Anx12, para5]

SSC WG (Working group for small-scale CDM project activities)

- ☞ The SSC WG is responsible for recommendations to the EB on baseline and monitoring methodologies for small-scale project activity, etc. [EB23 Anx20, para1]
- ☞ 2 members or alternate members of the EB will act as Chair and Vice-Chair of WG, respectively. In addition to the Chair and Vice-Chair, the WG shall be composed of 5 members, 2 of whom are members from the Meth Panel. [EB23 Anx20, para3]

AR WG (Working group on afforestation and reforestation project activities)

- ☞ The AR-WG is responsible for recommendations to the EB on baseline and monitoring methodologies for A/R CDM, revisions to the PDD for A/R CDM, etc. [EB23 Anx14, para2-3]
- ☞ 2 members or alternate members of the EB will act as Chair and Vice-Chair of the WG, respectively. In addition to the Chair and Vice-Chair, the WG shall be composed 8 members. [EB23 Anx14, para5] [EB31 Rep para48]

RIT (Registration and Issuance Team)

- ☞ The RIT serves to prepare appraisals of requests for registration and issuance of CERs assessing whether their requirements are met and/or appropriately dealt with by DOEs for consideration by the EB. [EB46 Anx58, para5]
- ☞ The RIT is composed of not less than 20 members. [EB46 Anx58, para7]

CDM-AP (CDM accreditation panel)

- ☞ The CDM-AP is responsible for recommendations to the EB on the accreditation of an applicant OE, suspension, withdrawal and/or re-accreditation of accreditation of a DOE, etc [EB23 Anx1, para4-5]
- ☞ The CDM-AP also carries out selecting the members of a CDM accreditation assessment team (CDM-AT).
- ☞ In addition to the designated EB members who act as chair and vice chair, the panel shall be composed of 7 members. [EB23 Anx1, para13] [EB33 Rep, para16]

CDM-AT (CDM accreditation assessment team)

- ☞ The CDM-AT shall undertake an assessment of the applicant and/or DOEs and prepare an assessment report for the CDM-AP.
- ☞ A team shall be composed of a team leader and at least 2 team members chosen to serve in a team for an assessment at a time. [EB09 Anx1]

Appeal Panel

- ☞ The CDM-AP, in accordance with the appeals procedures under the CDM accreditation process, established the appeal panel. The EB requested the secretariat to accomplish the work of the appeal panel expeditiously and submit for the consideration of the EB. [EB42 Rep para7]

4-5. Designated Operational Entity (DOE)

- ◆ A DOE under the CDM is either a domestic legal entity or an international organization accredited and designated, on a provisional basis until confirmed by the CMP, by the EB.
 - ☞ It validates and subsequently requests registration of a proposed CDM project activity.
 - ☞ It verifies emission reduction of a registered CDM project activity, certifies as appropriate and requests the EB to issue Certified Emission Reductions (CERs) accordingly.
- ◆ The list of DOEs is shown in <http://cdm.unfccc.int/DOE/list/index.html>.
- ◆ Upon request, the EB may allow a single DOE to perform all these functions within a single CDM project activity. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p12 para27(e)]

The terms used in DOE related official documents are:

- ☞ Applicant entity (AE)= once application has been duly submitted/subject to a procedure;
- ☞ Designated operational entity (DOE)= after designation by CMP. [EB56 Anx2, p3 footnote]

Procedure for accrediting OEs [EB56 Anx2, para3]

- ◆ The CMP designates operational entities (OEs) (or withdraws their designation) based on a recommendation by the EB.
- ◆ The EB takes the decision whether or not to accredit an AE and recommend it to the CMP for designation, and to fully or partially suspend a DOE, or to withdraw accreditation of a DOE. Accreditation by the EB implies provisional designation.
- ◆ CDM-AP serves as the technical panel of the EB in accordance with its terms of reference and makes recommendations to the EB on effective implementation of the CDM accreditation process.
- ◆ CDM-AT, in accordance with the CDM accreditation procedure and under the guidance of the CDM-AP, undertakes the assessment of an AE and/or DOE, to identify the level of conformity to the CDM accreditation requirements and reports to the CDM-AP.
- ◆ The secretariat supports the implementation of the CDM accreditation procedure.

The accreditation (re-accreditation) assessment of an AE consists of following main elements:

- ☞ Desk review by a CDM-AT of the adequacy of the documented system of AE to meet the CDM accreditation requirements and perform CDM validation and verification functions;
- ☞ On-site assessment by a CDM-AT to evaluate the implementation of the system. The on-site assessment shall take place at the office of the AE and/or at any other site where the CDM functions are undertaken, as decided by the CDM-AP.

[EB56 Anx2, para4]

There is “CDM accreditation standard for operational entities”. [EB56 Anx1]

Performance assessment

[EB56 Anx2, para6-9]

- ☞ A DOE shall be subject to performance assessment by the CDM-AT in relation to the scope of its accreditation.
 - ☞ A DOE shall be subject to regular on-site surveillance, which purpose is to ensure that the effectiveness of the DOE's system is maintained. The surveillance shall be undertaken at least once in 3 years of the accredited period of a DOE.
 - ☞ The EB may initiate a spot-check to be conducted at any time with a view to assessing whether a DOE still meets the CDM accreditation requirements.
 - ☞ A DOE may be subject to additional desk review and/or additional on-site assessment at any time of its accreditation period as and when decided by the CDM-AP or the EB. Reasons for such additional assessments shall be conveyed to the DOE.
- ⇒ There is the type of information regarding DOE performance to be made publicly available. [EB57 Anx2]

Suspension or withdrawal of a DOE [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p11 para21]

The EB may recommend to the CMP to suspend or withdraw the designation of a DOE if it has carried out a review and found that the entity no longer meets the accreditation standards or applicable provisions in decisions of the CMP.

- ☞ The EB may recommend the suspension or withdrawal of designation only after the DOE has had the possibility of a hearing.
- ☞ The suspension or withdrawal is with immediate effect, on a provisional basis, once the EB has made a recommendation, and remains in effect pending a final decision by the CMP.
- ☞ The affected entity shall be notified, immediately and in writing, once the EB has recommended its suspension or withdrawal.
- ☞ The recommendation by the EB and the decision by the CMP on such a case shall be made public.
 - ⇒ It is assumed that if the CMP decides the affected DOE meets the accreditation standards, the DOE will recover from its suspension or withdrawal.

Affect to registered CDM project activities by the suspension or withdrawal of designation of a DOE [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p11 para22-24]

- ☞ Registered project activities shall not be affected by the suspension or withdrawal of designation of a DOE unless significant deficiencies are identified in the relevant validation, verification or certification report for which the entity was responsible.
 - ⇒ There is no clear definition of “significant deficiencies.”
- ☞ In this case, the EB shall decide whether a different DOE shall be appointed to review, and where appropriate correct, such deficiencies.
 - ⇒ Any costs related to the review shall be borne by the DOE whose designation has been withdrawn or suspended.
- ☞ If such a review reveals that excess CERs were issued, the DOE whose accreditation has been withdrawn or suspended shall acquire and transfer, within **30 days** of the end of review, the excess CERs issued, as determined by the EB, to a cancellation account in the CDM registry.
- ☞ Any suspension or withdrawal of a DOE that adversely affects registered project activities shall be recommended by the EB only after the affected PPs have had the possibility of a hearing.

BOX: CDM Validation and Verification Manual (CDM-VVM) version 01.2 [EB55 Anx1]

- ☞ There is the Validation and Verification Manual (VVM) (Att.6) and the EB requested AEs/DOEs to implement the VVM with immediate effect and to fully integrate the requirements of VVM into their management system.
- ☞ The EB further noted that it has been and remains essential for all AEs/DOEs to validate and verify the requirements included in the VVM.

BOX: Policy framework to monitor performance and address non-compliance by DOEs

- ☞ The EB agreed on it [EB49 Anx3], and it has following contents.
 - ⇒ Definitions of DOE performance and non-compliance, scope of the policy, principles, elements of the policy, grading of non-compliance, classification of non-compliances, consequences of non-compliance, and proposal on implementation.
- ☞ The EB also agreed the implementation plan of the policy framework [EB51 Anx2], which contains such as the following.
 - ⇒ Issue classification and weighting, indicators, thresholds, usage of the monitoring information and next steps and implementation timeline.

4-6. Project Participants (PPs)

- ◆ Participation in a CDM project activity is voluntary. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p12 para28]
- ◆ A PP is (a) a Party involved, and/or (b) a private and/or public entity authorized by a Party involved to participate in a CDM project activity. [Glos ver.5, p25]

A Party involved

- ☞ A non-Annex I Party may participate in a CDM project activity if it is a Party to the Kyoto Protocol. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p12 para30]
- ☞ “Party involved” is only considered a PP if this is clearly indicated in section A.3 of the PDD or, in case of registered projects, if the secretariat is explicitly informed of this in accordance with MoC. [EB25 Rep, para110]

A private and/or public entity

- ☞ Private and/or public entities may only transfer and acquire CERs if the authorizing Party is eligible to do so at that time. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p13 para33]
- ☞ A written approval constitutes the authorization by a designated national authority (DNA) of specific entity(ies)’ participation as project proponents in the specific CDM project activity. [Glos ver.5, p6]

A change of PPs [Glos ver.5, p27]

- ☞ A change of PPs shall immediately be communicated to the EB through the secretariat in accordance with the modalities of communication (MoC) ([chap.4-7](#)).
- ☞ The indication of change shall be signed by all PPs of the previous communication and by all new and remaining PPs.
- ☞ Each new PP needs authorization, as required.

- ◆ The DOE must have a contractual relationship with the PPs. Upon making the PDD available for global stakeholder consultation ([chap.11-1](#)) the DOE shall indicate with which of the PPs listed in the PDD it has a contractual relationship for the purposes of this validation activity. [EB50 Anx48 para7]
- ◆ When submitting a request for registration ([chap.12-1](#)) all of PPs with a contractual relationship must still be listed in the PDD, unless they have provided a letter of voluntary withdrawal from the project activity. PPs who are listed in the PDD submitted for global stakeholder consultation but who do not have a contractual relationship with the DOE for the purposes of the validation activity may be removed from the PDD which is submitted for registration. [EB50 Anx48 para8]

BOX: Withdrawn of PP before request for registration

- ☞ The EB agreed that where a PP listed in the PDD published at validation is not included in the PDD submitted for registration, the DOE shall provide a letter from the withdrawn PP confirming its voluntary withdrawal from the proposed project activity, and address this issue in its validation report. [EB30 Rep, para41]

BOX: Withdrawn of PP from a registered CDM project activity

- ☞ In cases where PP(s) wish(es) to withdraw their participation from a registered CDM project activity, the secretariat shall ensure that all PPs have communicated their agreement to this withdrawal in writing, in accordance with the MoC ([chap.4-7](#)). [EB38 Rep, para57]

4-7. Procedures for modalities of communication

(Version 1) [EB45 Anx59]

Modalities of communication (MoC) of PPs with the EB [Glos ver.5, p21]

- ◆ The MoC between PPs and the EB are indicated at the time of registration by submitting a statement signed by all PPs.
- ◆ All official communication from and to PPs, after a request for registration is submitted, shall be handled in accordance with these MoC.

Focal point [EB45 Anx59 para2-3, 6-8]

- ◆ Focal point is defined as any entity, or entities, whether or not registered as PP in the corresponding CDM project activity, nominated through the MoC by all PPs to communicate with the EB and the secretariat in relation to some or all of the scopes of focal point authority.
- ☞ Any change to focal point roles shall be agreed by all PPs and will only be effected through the submission of a new FCDM-MOC form.

Sole focal point

☞ A focal point role granted exclusively to one entity on some or all of the scopes of authority, and whose certified signature is sufficient to effect any instruction from this entity.

Shared focal point

☞ A focal point role shared by two or more entities for a given scope of authority where the signature of the corresponding authorised signatories of any one of the focal point entities is sufficient to effect any instruction within the scope of authority.

Joint focal point

☞ More than one entity is nominated as focal point for a given scope of authority and the signatures of all nominated focal point entities shall be required for each communication related to that scope.

- ◆ Scope of focal point authority: A focal point entity can be conferred the authority to:
 - ☞ <Scope a> Communicate in relation to requests for forwarding of CERs to individual accounts of PPs; and/or,
 - ☞ <Scope b> Communicate in relation to requests for addition and/or voluntary withdrawal of PPs; and/or,
 - ☞ <Scope c> Communicate on any other matters related to registration and issuance not covered by <scope a> or <scope b> above.
- ◆ Separate entities can be nominated for each scope of authority either in a sole, shared or joint focal point role.

Authorised signatory [EB45 Anx59 para4-5]

- ◆ Authorised signatory of a PP [a focal point] is the person who represents the PP [the focal point] entity in a CDM project activity and whose name, contact details and specimen signature are to be registered in the MoC statement. PPs [focal point entities] may nominate one primary authorised signatory and one alternate authorised signatory in the MoC statement.

Structure and contents of MoC [EB45 Anx59 para12]

- ◆ A statement of MoC shall incorporate the following provisions:
 - ☞ Title of the CDM project activity (and UNFCCC reference number if available);
 - ☞ Date of submission and list of all PPs;
 - ☞ Clear designation of focal point for each scope of authority;
 - ☞ Contact details and specimen signature of each focal point and signing authority;
 - ☞ Signatures of all PPs confirming their agreement to the terms of the statement of MoC.

Signature [EB45 Anx59 para9-11]

- ◆ Signature is defined as an agreed means of authentication of an MoC statement by a PP, or a given communication from a focal point entity, as the context requires.
- ◆ It may be either an authenticated handwritten signature, accompanied with a company seal or stamp if appropriate, or a cryptographic electronic signature enrolled in the CDM Information System.
 - ☞ Electronic signatures will have the same value. The secretariat shall implement and deploy within the CDM Information System the means to provide PPs and focal point entities with digital certificates for authentication of user identity.
- ◆ Due diligence process is defined as a process whereby personal or corporate identity is established and means of signature are registered for CDM related communications. This process is to be performed by DOEs for all new entities entering as PPs at the point of requesting registration. In the case of registered projects, the secretariat will perform this process on entities requesting registration as PPs in accordance with the existing MoC.

4-7. Procedures for modalities of communication

Changes to the MoC [EB45 Anx59 para15-18]

◆ Modifications to the nomination of focal point in any or all of the scopes of authority are considered to be reasons for changing the MoC. In cases where such modifications are needed, PPs should express their agreement by submitting a new F-CDM-MOC form duly signed by their authorised signatories through the focal point for <scope c>.

☞ Changes in authorised signatories (of PPs and focal point entities): the focal point for <scope b> shall submit an updated version of Annex 2 of the F-CDM-MOC form duly signed and completed.

☞ Change of name of a PP: the focal point for <scope b> shall submit an updated version of Annex 2 of the F-CDM-MOC form duly signed and completed.

☞ Addition or withdrawal of PPs: In cases where the addition or withdrawal is not associated with changes in the nomination of focal points, the focal point for <scope b> shall submit Annex 2 of the F-CDM-MOC form only. If the addition or withdrawal of PPs does encompass changes to the nomination of focal point for any of the scopes of authority, a new F-CDM-MOC form duly signed by the authorised signatories for each PP shall be submitted by the focal point for <scope c>.

Private contractual obligations [EB45 Anx59 para13]

◆ The EB considers that neither itself nor the secretariat has the authority or responsibility to enforce private contractual obligations arising from the sale and buying of CERs. Such instructions shall not be included in an MoC. Honouring such contractual obligations is the sole responsibility of the registered PPs and nominated focal points

Restricted availability of sensitive information in MoC statements on the project page [EB45 Anx59 para14]

◆ Specimen signatures, contact details and other personal information of individuals shall be available only to PPs, focal points, DOEs, members of the EB and secretariat staff.

Implementation of the F-CDM-MOC form [EB45 Anx59 para19-20]

◆ (a) New submissions: the F-CDM-MOC form shall be used for any new submission of an MoC statement at both pre- and post-registration stages. The form will be made available on the UNFCCC CDM website.

◆ (b) For projects requesting registration: PPs shall complete an F-CDM-MOC form which shall be submitted by a nominated DOE with other project related documentation when a request for registration is proposed. The DOE is required to validate the details of each authorised signatory corresponding to each PP before these details are submitted to the secretariat in the MoC form. In particular, the details of each authorised signatory for all PPs shall correspond to the representatives designated to the project in Annex I of the PDD.

☞ Grace period for MoCs already signed (for projects not yet registered): in cases where an MoC statement has already been signed by all PPs in respect of a CDM project before adoption of the F-CDM-MOC form, but the project is not yet registered, the designated focal point may submit the signed statement in its original format providing evidence that it was signed prior to the availability of the F-CDM-MOC form. A grace period of **8 months** will be granted for these exceptional cases to be submitted for registration, after which (b) above shall apply to any new submission.

☞ Grace period for MoCs already signed (for registered projects): in cases where an MoC statement has already been signed by all PPs in respect of a CDM project before adoption of the F-CDM-MOC form, but not yet submitted to the secretariat, the designated focal point may submit the signed statement in its original format providing evidence that it was signed prior to the availability of the F-CDM-MOC form. A grace period of **1 month** will be granted for these exceptional cases, after which (a) above shall apply to any new submission. For any subsequent changes, (a) above shall apply.

◆ The secretariat shall display the effective date of the updated MoC contained in the F-CDM-MOC form on the corresponding project's view page.

BOX: Procedures for public communication with the EB [EB31 Anx37]

☞ Relevant communications received by the EB which are not in response to a call for input (hereinafter referred to as unsolicited communications) may only be taken into consideration at its next meeting if received before the documents submission deadline (**2 weeks** prior to the meeting).

⇒ Any unsolicited communication received after this deadline would be considered, as appropriate, at a subsequent meeting.

5. Conditions for CDM projects

- ◆ When planning a CDM project activity, it is necessary to keep in mind following points:
 - ☞ The purpose of the CDM shall be to assist non-Annex I Parties in achieving sustainable development and in contributing to the ultimate objective of the Convention, and to assist Annex I Parties in achieving compliance with their commitments. [\[KP Art.12 para2\]](#)
 - ⇒ It is the host Party's prerogative to confirm whether a CDM project activity assists it in achieving sustainable development. [\[CP/2001/13/Ad2, p20\]](#)
 - ☞ A CDM project activity is additional if GHG emissions are reduced below those that would have occurred in the absence of the registered CDM project activity; [\[CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p16 para43\]](#)
 - ☞ Annex I Parties are to refrain from using CERs generated from nuclear facilities to meet their quantified GHG emissions reduction targets; [\[CP/2001/13/Ad2, p20\]](#)
 - ☞ The eligibility of land use, land-use change and forestry project activities under the CDM is limited to afforestation and reforestation (A/R); [\[CP/2001/13/Ad2, p22 para7\(a\)\]](#)
- ◆ It is necessary to prepare a project design document (PDD) in order to be registered as a CDM project activity.
 - ☞ The contents of PDD is described in Attachment 1.

Public funding for CDM projects

- ☞ Public funding for CDM projects from Annex I Parties is not to result in the diversion of official development assistance (ODA) and is to be separate from and not counted towards the financial obligations of Annex I Parties. [\[CP/2001/13/Ad2, p20\]](#)
 - ⇒ Annex I Parties shall provide an affirmation that such funding does not result in a diversion of ODA and is separate from and is not counted towards the financial obligations of those Parties. [\[PDD GL ver.7, p9\]](#)
 - ⇒ There is also the document "ODA Eligibility of Expenditures under the Clean Development Mechanism" which was endorsed at the DAC High Level Meeting on 15-16 April 2004. [\[DAC/CHAIR\(2004\)4/FINAL\]](#)

BOX: CDM project activities under a programme of activities [\[CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p97 para20\]](#)

- ☞ Local/regional/national policy or standard cannot be considered as a CDM project activity
- ☞ But that project activities under a programme of activities can be registered as a single CDM project activity provided that approved baseline and monitoring methodologies are used that, inter alia, define the appropriate boundary, avoid double counting and account for leakage, ensuring that the emission reductions are real, measurable and verifiable, and additional to any that would occur in the absence of the project activity. [\(chap.20\)](#)

BOX: Carbon dioxide capture and storage (CCS)

- ☞ The CMP decided to requests the EB to continue to consider proposals for new methodologies, including the PDD for CCS in geological formations as CDM project activities. Approval of such methodologies by the EB can occur only after further guidance from the CMP. [\[CMP/2006/10/Ad1, p6 para19\]](#)
- ☞ The CMP requests the EB to assess the implications of the possible inclusion of CCS in geological formations as CDM project activities, taking into account technical, methodological and legal issues, and report back to the CMP5. [\[CMP/2008/11/Ad1, p9 para41\]](#)

Examples of guidance and clarifications regarding methodological issues

Guidance on transfer of know-how and training [EB23 Rep. para80]

The EB agreed that transfer of know-how and training, as such, cannot be considered as CDM project activities. The eligibility of project activities that are a result of the transfer of know-how and training shall be based only on measurable emission reductions which are directly attributable to these project activities.

Guidance on bunker fuels

[EB25 Rep. para58]

The EB agreed to confirm that the project activities/parts of project activities resulting in emission reductions from reduced consumption of bunker fuels (e.g. fuel saving on account of shortening of the shipping route on international waters) are not eligible under the CDM.

Project activities that result in emission reductions due to the use/consumption of a product in the project activity [EB36 Anx16]

The EB clarified that project activities that result in emission reductions due to the use/consumption of a product produced in the project activity are only eligible as CDM project activity if: (i) the users/consumers of the product are included in the project boundary; and (ii) monitoring takes place of the actual use/consumption and location of the product used/consumed by consumers. In such situations sampling can be used as a monitoring method for actual use/consumption and location of the product.

Eligibility of activities under the CDM [EB33 Rep para30]

The EB agreed that creating infrastructure (e.g. testing labs, creation of an enforcement agency) or capacity to enforce the policy or standard, as such, cannot be considered as CDM project activities. The eligibility of project activities that are a result of the creation of infrastructure or capacity to enforce the policy or standard shall be based only on measurable emission reductions which are directly attributable to these project activities.

Guidance regarding the treatment of "existing" and "newly built" facilities [EB08 Anx1. para10]

If a proposed CDM project activity seeks to retrofit or otherwise modify an existing facility, the baseline may refer to the characteristics (i.e. emissions) of the existing facility only to the extent that the project activity does not increase the output or lifetime of the existing facility. For any increase of output or lifetime of the facility which is due to the project activity, a different baseline shall apply.

6. Making PDD

Identifying a type of CDM project activities

Is it a GHG emission reduction project activity eligible for the CDM? ([chap.5](#))

Yes

Is it eligible for a small-scale CDM project activity? ([chap.18-1](#))

No

Yes

Project Design Document (CDM-PDD) ([Att.1](#))

PDD for small-scale project activities (CDM-SSC-PDD)

Is it a GHG removal by afforestation and reforestation project activity eligible for the CDM? ([chap.19-1](#))

Yes

Is it eligible for a small-scale afforestation and reforestation CDM project activity? ([chap.19-3](#))

No

Yes

PDD for A/R project activities (CDM-AR-PDD)

PDD for small-scale A/R project activities (CDM-SSC-AR-PDD)

Is it a programme of activities eligible for the CDM? ([chap.20](#))

Yes

There are various types of CDM programme of activity

Programme of Activities Design Document (CDM-PoA-DD)
CDM Programme Activity Design Document (CDM-CPA-DD)
etc

Skip the rest (similar to the steps written in the below diagram)

Determining a baseline and monitoring methodology

Is there an approved methodology (AM) applicable to the project activity? ([chap.7-3](#))

Yes

No or not clear

There is "Clarifications to PPs on when to request revision, clarification to an AM or a deviation". ([Version 2](#))[[EB31 Anx12](#)]

Answers

Request for clarifications to an AM ([chap.7-7](#))

Approval

Request for deviation ([chap.7-6](#))

Approval

Request for a revision of an AM ([chap.7-5](#))

Approval

Submission of a proposed new methodology (NM) ([chap.7-4](#))

Writing the CDM-PDD by applying AMs ([Att.2](#))

PDD and methodology related forms


		Normal-scale CDM project activity		Small-scale CDM project activity	
Emission Reduction	PDD	CDM-PDD ver.3 (Att.1)	CDM Project Design Document	CDM-SSC-PDD ver.3	CDM Project Design Document for Small-Scale project activities
		CDM-PoA-DD ver.1	Programme of Activities Design Document	CDM-SSC-Bundle ver.2	Form for submission of bundled Small Scale project activities form
		CDM-CPA-DD ver.1	CDM Programme Activity Design Document	CDM-SSC-PoA-DD ver.1	Small-Scale CDM Programme of Activities Design Document
	Methodology	F-CDM-AM-Subm ver.1	Form for submission of queries from DOEs to the MP regarding the application of approved methodologies	F-CDM-SSC-Subm ver.3	Form for Submissions on Small Scale Methodologies and Procedures
		F-CDM-AM-Rev ver.1	Form for submission of requests for revisions of approved methodologies to the MP		
		CDM-NM ver.3.1	CDM Proposed New Methodology: Baseline and Monitoring	F-CDM-SSC-NM ver.1	Form for proposed New Small-Scale Methodologies
A/R (chap.19)	PDD	CDM-AR-PDD ver.5	CDM Project Design Document for A/R project activities	CDM-SSC-AR-PDD ver.2	Project Design Document Form for Small-Scale A/R project activities
		CDM-PoA-DD-AR ver.1	Programme of Activities Design Document Form for A/R project activities	CDM-PoA-DD-SSC-AR ver.1	Programme of Activities Design Document Form for SSC-AR project activities
		CDM-CPA-DD-AR ver.1	CDM Programme Activity Design Document Form for A/R project activities	CDM-CPA-DD-SSC-AR ver.1	CDM Programme Activity Design Document form for SSC-AR project activities
	Methodology	F-CDM-AR-AM-Subm ver.1	Form for submission of queries from DOEs to the AR WG regarding the application of Approved A/R Methodologies	F-CDM-SSC-AR-Subm ver.2	Form for Submission on Small Scale A/R Methodologies and Procedures
		F-CDM-AR-AM-Rev ver.1	Form for submission of requests for revisions of Approved Methodologies to the AR WG		
		CDM-AR-NM ver.4	CDM Proposed New Methodology: Baseline and Monitoring for A/R		

PDD: http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/PDDs_Forms/PDDs/index.html
 PoA-PDD: http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/PDDs_Forms/PoA/index.html
 Methodology: http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/PDDs_Forms/Methodologies/index.html

7. Baseline

7-1. Concept of the baseline and additionality

- ◆ The baseline (scenario and emissions) for a CDM project activity is the scenario that reasonably represents GHG emissions that would occur in the absence of the proposed project activity. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p16 para44]



- ◆ Difference between the baseline emissions and GHG emissions after implementing the CDM project activity (project emissions) is emission reductions.

- ☞ A baseline (scenario and emissions) shall be established:
 - (a) By PPs in accordance with provisions for the use of approved and new methodologies;
 - (b) In a transparent and conservative manner regarding the choice of approaches, assumptions, methodologies, parameters, data sources, key factors and additionality, and taking into account uncertainty;
 - (c) On a project-specific basis;
 - (d) In the case of small-scale CDM project activities, in accordance with simplified procedures developed for such activities ([chap.18-2](#));
 - (e) Taking into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances, such as sectoral reform initiatives, local fuel availability, power sector expansion plans, and the economic situation in the project sector. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p16 para45]
- ☞ Before calculating baseline emissions, it is necessary to identify baseline scenarios.
- ☞ A baseline (emissions) shall cover emissions from all gases, sectors and source categories within the project boundary. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p16 para44]

- ◆ A CDM project activity is **additional** if GHG emissions are reduced below those that would have occurred in the absence of the registered CDM project activity. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p16 para43]

- ☞ The DOE shall review the PDD to confirm that the project activity is expected to result in a reduction in GHG emissions that are **additional** to any that would occur in the absence of the proposed project activity. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p14 para37(d)]

- ◆ PPs have to write explanation of how and why this project activity is **additional** and therefore not the baseline scenario in accordance with the selected baseline methodology. [PDD GL ver.7, p12]

- ☞ If the starting date of the project activity is before the date of validation, provide evidence that the incentive from the CDM was seriously considered in the decision to proceed with the project activity. This evidence shall be based on (preferably official, legal and/or other corporate) documentation that was available at, or prior to, the start of the project activity ([chap.8-1](#)). [PDD GL ver.7, p12]

- ◆ “The tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality” provides a general framework for demonstrating and assessing additionality. PPs may also propose other tools for the demonstration of additionality. [EB22 Anx8 para1]

BOX: Wording

PPs shall refrain from providing glossaries or using key terminology not used in the COP documents and the CDM glossary (environmental/investment **additionality**).

[EB09 Anx3, para3]

7-2. Baseline scenario

- ◆ The baseline scenario for a CDM project activity is the scenario that reasonably represents GHG emissions that would occur in the absence of the proposed project activity. [Glos ver.5, p10]
- ◆ Different scenarios may be elaborated as potential evolutions of the situation existing before the proposed CDM project activity.
 - ☞ The continuation of a current activity could be one of them;
 - ☞ Implementing the proposed project activity may be another;
 - ☞ And many others could be envisaged.
- ◆ Baseline methodologies shall require a narrative description of all reasonable baseline scenarios.
- ◆ To elaborate the different scenarios, different elements shall be taken into consideration.
 - ☞ For instance, the PPs shall take into account national / sectoral policies and circumstances, ongoing technological improvements, investment barriers, etc.
- ◆ The baseline scenario may include a scenario where future GHG emissions are projected to rise above current levels, due to the specific circumstances of the host Party. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p16 para46]

Clarifications on the treatment of national and/or sectoral policies and regulations in determining a baseline scenario

The EB agreed to differentiate the following 2 types of national and/or sectoral policies that are to be taken into account when establishing baseline scenarios: [EB22 Anx3]

Type E+ That give comparative advantages to more emissions-intensive technologies or fuels.

- ☞ Only national and/or sectoral policies or regulations that have been implemented before adoption of the Kyoto Protocol (11 December 1997) shall be taken into account when developing a baseline scenario.
- ☞ If such national and/or sectoral policies were implemented since the adoption of the Kyoto Protocol, the baseline scenario should refer to a hypothetical situation without the national and/or sectoral policies or regulations being in place.

Type E- That give comparative advantages to less emissions-intensive technologies (e.g. public subsidies to promote the diffusion of renewable energy or to finance energy efficiency programs).

- ☞ National and/or sectoral policies or regulations that have been implemented since the adoption by the COP of the CDM M&P (11 November 2001) need not be taken into account in developing a baseline scenario.
 - ⇒ i.e. the baseline scenario could refer to a hypothetical situation without the national and/or sectoral policies or regulations being in place).

7-3. Baseline methodology

- ◆ Baseline emission under the selected baseline scenarios shall be calculated by PPs in accordance with **approved methodologies (AMs)** or **new methodologies (NMs)**.
- ◆ No methodology is excluded a priori so that PPs have the opportunity to propose any methodology. [Glos ver.5, p8]

A baseline methodology approved by the EB is publicly available along with relevant guidance on the UNFCCC CDM website (<http://unfccc.int/cdm>). [Glos ver.5, p9]

☞ DOEs can submit queries regarding the applicability of **approved methodologies**.

If a DOE determines that a proposed project activity intends to use a **new baseline methodology**, it shall, prior to the submission for registration of this project activity, forward the proposed methodology to the EB for review, i.e. consideration and approval, if appropriate. [EB32 Anx13, para2]

☞ There is “Technical Guidelines for the Development of New Baseline and Monitoring Methodologies Version 1”. [EB24 Anx16]

Baseline approach (para 48 of the CDM M&P) [Glos ver.5, p7][CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p16 para48]

A baseline approach is the basis for a baseline methodology. The EB agreed that the 3 approaches be the only ones applicable to CDM project activities:

(a) Existing actual or historical emissions, as applicable; or

(b) Emissions from a technology that represents an economically attractive course of action, taking into account barriers to investment; or

(c) The average emissions of similar project activities undertaken in the previous 5 years, in similar social, economic, environmental and technological circumstances, and whose performance is among the top 20 per cent of their category. <See [EB08 Anx1 para4-5] for guidance>

BOX: Proposed project activities applying more than one methodology [EB08 Anx1, para6]


☞ If a proposed CDM project activity comprises different “sub-activities” requiring different methodologies, PPs may forward the proposal using one CDM-PDD but shall complete the methodologies sections for each “sub-activity”.

BOX: Temporarily result in “negative emission reductions” [EB21 Rep. para18]

☞ In some cases and for some methodologies, project activities may temporarily result in “negative emission reductions” in a particular year, for example due to poor performance or due to leakage effects outweighing emission reductions.

☞ In these cases, proposed NMs should stipulate that if a project activity temporarily results in “negative emission reductions”, any further CERs will only be issued when the emissions increase has been compensated by subsequent emission reductions by the project activity.

7-4. Procedure for the submission and consideration of a proposed new baseline and monitoring methodology for large scale CDM project activities



7-4. Procedure for the submission and consideration of a proposed new baseline and monitoring methodology for large scale CDM project activities

(14) The MP considers the PPs' submission and the members' initial recommendation and finalizes its recommendation on the PNM over the course of **no more than 4 consecutive meetings** unless an additional guidance from the EB is required.
Depending on the progress of the consideration of the PNM, the secretariat prepares the draft reformatted methodology based on the PNM for the consideration of the MP.

(15) Following each meeting at which the PNM is considered, the MP reports one of the following outcomes:
 ☞ A final recommendation to the EB to approve the PNM (referred to as A);
 ☞ A final recommendation to the EB not to approve the PNM (referred to as C); or
 ☞ A preliminary recommendation to PPs, if they wish, regarding the issues raised in accordance with the step (19) below.
 or the MP continues the consideration of the PNM (referred to as work-in-progress WIP) within the time frame defined in the step (14) above and briefly explains the reason for it in the meeting report.

(16) If the MP does not agree whether to recommend the PNM to the EB **during 3 meetings**, the secretariat presents the unresolved issues to the EB at its next meeting in order to obtain the EB's request to:
 ☞ Continue the consideration of the PNM; or
 ☞ Conclude the consideration of the PNM during the next meeting of the MP.

(17) If the MP agrees to recommend that the EB **approve** or **not approve** the PNM, the secretariat publishes on the CDM website the following as agreed by the MP:
 ☞ The final recommendation using the form CDM-NM;
 ☞ The summary recommendation using the form "F-CDM-NMSUMmp" and
 ☞ (In case of **approving**) The draft reformatted methodology based on the PNM.

(18) If the MP agrees to the preliminary recommendation, the secretariat publishes it on the CDM website using the form CDM-NM and forwards it to the PPs, copying the DOE.

(19) After receiving a preliminary recommendation, the PPs may submit (copying the DOE) through the secretariat, clarifications to the MP concerning the PNM raised in the recommendation.
If PPs provide clarifications related to a preliminary recommendation within **4 weeks** of receiving the preliminary recommendation, then the MP considers the PNM at its next meeting. If these clarifications include changes to the PNM as submitted in the form CDM-NM and/or the PDD then all changes shall be highlighted. The secretariat makes such clarifications available to the EB and on the CDM website.

(20) If PPs provide no response to the preliminary recommendation within **3 months** of the publishing date of the report of the MP meeting at which the PNM received its preliminary recommendation, then the submission is considered withdrawn.

(21) If the MP intends to recommend that the EB approve the PNM, the secretariat sends the draft reformatted methodology to the PPs at least **2 weeks** before the MP meeting which includes the consideration of the PNM on its agenda. The secretariat further requests PPs for comments on the draft reformatted methodology within a defined timeframe.
The PPs may inform the secretariat whether the draft reformatted methodology is applicable to their project, or identify changes that are needed in the draft reformatted methodology in order to make it applicable to their project.
The MP considers the PP's requests and attempts to accommodate them into the draft reformatted methodology. If the MP cannot accommodate the PP's requests, it may recommend the draft reformatted methodology to the EB without accounting for the PP's requests, with an explanation for why the PP's requests could not be accommodated.

(22) The secretariat places the consideration of the recommendation on the PNM on the annotated agenda of a subsequent EB meeting.
At any step in this procedure, the secretariat, on behalf of the MP, may request the PPs to provide additional information regarding the PNM within a defined timeframe, and if such information significantly affects the outcome of the consideration of the PNM by the EB, the secretariat makes this information available to the EB and puts it on the CDM website.

- ◆ The EB clarified that methodologies are approved for application both to CDM project activity and to CDM programme activities (**CPA**) under a Programme of Activities (**PoA**) ([chap.20](#)). The EB also clarified that proposed NMs submitted for consideration by the EB should clearly define the activity to which the proposed methodology is applicable. [[EB35 Rep. para15](#)]
- ◆ There is a "Procedure for the submission and consideration of a proposed new A/R baseline and monitoring methodology for A/R CDM project activities". (Version 1) [[EB53 Anx13](#)]

7-5. Procedures for the revision of approved methodologies (AMs) and tools for large scale CDM project activities

Request for revisions to AM [EB31 Anx12, para5-9]

- ◆ The revision of AM may be carried out in response to requests by a PP, relevant stakeholders, the EB, the MP or WGs in accordance with the latest version of the procedures.
- ◆ A request for revision is suited for situations where:
 - ☞ An AM is not applicable to a project activity but the project activity is broadly similar to the project activities to which the AM is applicable;
 - ⇒ Similarity is based on the nature (technology/measure) of the project activity and sources of the emissions affected by the project activity. For example, the AM may not be applicable as the source of emissions affected by the project activities are the same but the technology/measure used in the project activity is not covered under the applicability conditions.
 - ☞ Or the procedures provided in the methodology for estimating emissions from sources are not applicable because of slight variations in the approach, flow of events or structure chosen in the project activity.
- ◆ Should no AM be appropriate, then a revision to an AM could be requested.
 - ☞ In this case significant changes are required to the AM for it to be applicable to all possible project scenarios, without which *inter alia*:
 - ⇒ The application of the methodology to the proposed project activity would be inappropriate, resulting in an incorrect definition of the project boundary, double counting, an inaccurate account of leakage, emission reductions that are either not real, measurable, verifiable or additional to those that would occur in the absence of the project activity.

if the request for revision to an AM is likely to result in the addition of new procedures or scenarios to more than half of the sections of an AM, it is advisable that project participants propose a NM as per procedures for submission and consideration of proposed NM accordance with the latest version of the procedures ([chap.7-4](#))

The request for revisions shall not include changes to the AM that would result in the exclusion, restriction, narrowing of the applicability conditions of the AMs for other project activities. Should the request result in the above the PP is advised to submit a NM.

There is “Guidance on criteria for consolidations and revision of methodologies”. [EB27 Anx10]

There is “Procedure for the submission and consideration of requests for revision of approved baseline and monitoring methodologies and tools for A/R CDM project activities”. [EB54 Anx3]

BOX: Tools [EB49 Anx31]

☞ A Tool is used to calculate, determine, demonstrate, estimate, identify and/or test information relating to a CDM project activity. A tool is public property once approved and is usually referenced in a standard or a form. When referenced, all or specified components of the tool are required and mandatory.

BOX: In case the revision results in the withdrawal of existing AMs

☞ if the revision results in the withdrawal of one or more AMs, the withdrawal shall not affect

- ⇒ (i) registered CDM project activities during their crediting periods; and
- ⇒ (ii) project activities that have been published for public comments for validation using the previously AM or tool, so long as the project activity is submitted for registration within **8 months** of the effective date of the revision. [EB35 Anx13, para17]

7-5. Procedures for the revision of AMs and tools for large scale CDM project activities

Procedure for the submission and consideration of requests for revision of AMs and tools for large scale CDM project activities (Version 1) [EB54 Anx2]

Request by PPs

- ☞ PPs submit a request for revision of an AM or an AT (an approved tool referred to in an AM for which a request for revision is submitted) by submitting the following documents to a DOE:
 - ⇒ A draft of the proposed revised AM or AT highlighting all proposed changes; and
 - ⇒ A form CDM-PDD with at least section "Application of an AM" (including relevant annexes) completed as a draft, providing an example of the application of the revised AM or AT.
- ☞ The DOE then, checks the completeness of the documents received from PPs, completes a form for submission of requests for revision of AMs to the MP (form F-CDM-AM-Rev), and submits them using the submission interface for requests for revision on the UNFCCC CDM website.

Request by the MP or by the secretariat

- ☞ If the MP agrees to initiate the revision of an AM or an AT, different from the editorial one, it requests either the secretariat or the members of the MP to draft the revised version of the methodology.
- ☞ If the secretariat initiates the revision of an AM or an AT, (e.g. to improve the usability, to improve the accuracy of emission reduction estimation methods or to enable modular application of methodologies):
 - ⇒ It informs the MP about the scope of the initiated revision using the appropriate mailing list; and
 - ⇒ Drafts the revision and forwards it for consideration by the MP.

Request by the EB

- ☞ The EB requests the revision of an AM or an AT by including the request in its meeting report.
- ☞ If the EB considers that the continued application of the AM or the AT should be curtailed, as it has become apparent that there are major shortcomings in the emission reduction estimation methods included, the EB's request shall contain a decision that:
 - ⇒ The AM or the AT be put on hold. In such a case DOEs shall not upload any request for registration of a project activity applying the version of the AM or the AT for which the revision was requested, after the **4th week** (2400 hours GMT) from the date of publication of the EB's report containing the decision;
 - ⇒ The AM or the AT be put on hold with immediate effect. In such a case DOEs shall not upload **from the date** (2400 hours GMT) of publication of the EB's report containing the decision.

(1) Depending on the technical complexity of the request for a revision of an AM or an AT and with the approval of the Chair of the MP, the secretariat either proceeds directly to the step (2) below or selects one or two consultants and proceeds to the step (3).

(2) Each consultant performs an independent assessment of the request for the revision and reports the outcome to the secretariat.

(3) The secretariat:

- ☞ Prepares a draft recommendation on the request for revision taking into account the report(s) of the consultant(s) (if any); and
- ☞ Selects one or two members of the MP to: (i) assess the request for revision, taking into account the secretariat's draft recommendation; (ii) considers whether the improvements applied in the AM or in the AT increase conservativeness over the previous version; and (iii) prepares an initial recommendation for consideration by the MP.

(4) The MP:

- ☞ Considers the request for the revision and the initial recommendation prepared by the member(s), including the statement that the revision leads to an increase in conservativeness over the previous version, if any;
- ☞ Finalizes its recommendation over the course of **no more than 2 meetings** unless additional guidance from the EB or the CMP is required.

(5) If the request for revision was submitted by PPs and the initial recommendation referred to in step (4) above indicates a high probability that the MP will recommend that the EB approves the revision, the secretariat sends the draft revision to the PPs at least **2 weeks** before the MP meeting which includes the consideration of the draft revision on its agenda. The secretariat requests PPs for comments on the draft revised AM or AT within a defined timeframe.

(6) The PPs may:

- ☞ Inform the secretariat that the draft revised AM or AT is applicable to their project; or
- ☞ Identify changes that are needed in the draft revised AM or AT in order to make it applicable to their project and request the MP to consider them.

(7) The MP considers the PPs' requests, if any, and attempts to accommodate them into the draft revised AM or AT. PPs may request the MP to allow them to provide specific information regarding the changes mentioned in the step in (6), in particular by means of a teleconference organized during its meeting. The teleconference shall not last longer than **approximately 30 minutes**. If the MP cannot accommodate PPs' requests, it may recommend the draft revised AM or AT to the EB without accounting for the PPs' requests, explaining why the PPs' requests could not be accommodated.

Next Page

27

7-5. Procedures for the revision of AMs and tools for large scale CDM project activities

[EB54 Anx2]

(8) Depending on the technical complexity of the draft revision as assessed by the secretariat and with the approval of the Chair of the MP, the secretariat:

- ☞ Makes the draft revised AM or AT publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website and invites public comments for a period of **10 calendar days**;
- ☞ Informs the public of the call for public comments through the CDM newsletter;
- ☞ At the end of the period, makes all public comments publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website; and
- ☞ Accommodates relevant public comments into the draft revision.

(8) Following each MP meeting at which the request for the revision is considered, the MP:

- ☞ Reports its final recommendation to the EB to approve the revision, including the statement that the revision leads to an increase in conservativeness over the previous version, if any; or
- ☞ Reports its final recommendation to the EB not to approve the request for the revision; or
- ☞ Continues its consideration of the request for the revision (referred to as work-in-progress (WIP)) within the timeframe defined in step (4) above.

(9) If the MP agrees to recommend the draft revised AM or AT to the EB, the secretariat places the consideration of the recommendation on the request for revision on the annotated agenda of the subsequent EB meeting. If the MP cannot agree upon a final recommendation to the EB either because:

- ☞ Further inputs from an expert and/or the PPs are required; or
- ☞ Public comments provided inputs suggesting further improvement or broadening of the applicability of the revised AM or AT; or
- ☞ Further reformatting and/or quality control of the request for the revision of the revised AM or AT is required, then the reason is briefly explained in the meeting report of the MP and the consideration of the request for the revision is continued (referred to as work-in-progress (WIP))

(10) At any step in this procedure, the secretariat, on behalf of the MP, may request PPs to provide additional information regarding the request for the revision within a defined timeframe. Any information provided by the PPs that might significantly impact the outcome of the consideration of the request for the revision is made available by the secretariat to the EB, and to the public, on the UNFCCC CDM website before the recommendation for request for revision is placed on the annotated agenda of the EB meeting.

(11) If the EB agrees to approve the revised AM or AT, then the approved revised version is published on the UNFCCC CDM website. PPs may resubmit a request for revision not approved by the EB at any time following this procedure. The secretariat shall make available all approved revised AMs and ATs in the approved methodologies section on the UNFCCC CDM website within **5 calendar days** from the publication date of the report of the EB meeting at which they were approved.

Application of the amended/revised version of an AM or an AT [EB54 Anx2 para34-36]

- ☞ PPs may apply the approved amended/revised AM or AT for validation after the date on which the approved revised version is published on the UNFCCC CDM website.
- ☞ The amendment of an AM or an AT has no effect on the global stakeholder consultations of PDDs and registration of project activities applying the previous version of the amended AM or AT.
- ☞ If the recommendation that the EB approve the revision includes the statement that the revision leads to an increase in conservativeness over the previous version and the EB approves the revision, then DOEs may upload for registration the PDDs of project activities in which the previous version of an AM or an AT has been applied not later than the calendar day (2400 hours GMT) **8 months** from the publication date of the report of the EB meeting at which the revised AM or AT was approved.

Editorial amendment of an AM or an AT

[EB54 Anx2 para29-31]

- ☞ To improve clarity of the text or correct editorial errors the secretariat drafts the editorial amendment of an AM or an AT and submits it for approval to the Chair of the MP.
- ☞ Once approved by the Chair of the MP, the draft editorial amendment shall be submitted for consideration of the Chair of the EB. The editorial amendment that is approved by the Chair of the EB is forwarded to all members of the EB. If at least one of the EB members requests **within 20 days** that the editorial amendment shall be considered by the subsequent EB meeting, otherwise it is deemed to be approved by the EB.
- ☞ The secretariat forwards the approved editorial amendment to the MP and makes it publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website.

BOX: Version control [EB54 Anx2 para32-33]

- ☞ During the finalization of a revision the MP assesses if the proposed revision results in improvements that increase the conservativeness of the AM or the AT. If the conservativeness is not increased, the MP classifies the revised version of the AM or the AT as amendment of the previous version.
- ☞ All methodologies will be catalogued with a three number version extension in the format X.Y.Z. X indicates a version number. This will be increased by 1 when the EB approves a revision to the methodology. Y indicates an amendment. This will be increased by 1 when the EB approves an amendment. Z is a document control number. This will be increased by 1 when a new editorial amendment is approved.

7-6. Procedures for requests to the EB for deviation from an AM

(Version 1) [EB49 Anx4]

A DOE shall, prior to requesting registration of a project activity or issuance of CERs, notify the EB of deviations from AMs and/or provisions of registered project documentation and explain how it intends to address such deviations. The DOE shall only proceed with further actions after receipt of guidance from the EB. The Chairs of the panels shall provide an input as to whether the issue should be considered or not by the panels. The EB shall, if needed, address these issues by electronic decision. When providing such guidance, the EB shall consider issuing general clarifications to all DOEs and PPs, as appropriate. [EB21 Rep, para66]

(1) Submission of a request for deviation from methodology

- ☞ If a DOE finds at validation that PPs deviated from an AM and the DOE considers that the deviation was due to a project specific issue implying a revision of the methodology would not be required, it may seek guidance on the acceptability of the deviation from the EB prior to requesting registration of the proposed project activity
- ☞ If guidance is sought, the DOE shall submit the form for submission of a request for deviation (F-CDM-DEV-METH) through the dedicated internet interface. The submission by the DOE shall provide clear and precise assessment of the case including demonstration that the deviation does not imply revision of an AM. It shall also include a description of the impact of the deviation on the emission reductions from the project activity, for the EB to evaluate.
- ☞ Upon submission of the form, the secretariat shall do the completeness check of the documentation within at most **20 working days** of receipt. If further clarification is required the secretariat shall ask DOE to submit the information. Once found complete, the secretariat shall make it publicly available. The date of making the request publicly available is to be considered as the date of receipt of a request for deviation.
- ☞ No request of deviation shall be considered confidential and request as well as decision of the case shall be made publicly available. However, additional information provided as supporting document may be submitted by the DOE as a confidential document.

(2) Consideration of a request for deviation

- ☞ If the secretariat, in consultation with the Chair/Vice Chair of the MP/WGs (thereafter referred as the Chairs), assesses that the request for deviation does not meet the required criteria it shall respond to DOE in one of following ways: (i) to consider submitting the request as a request for revision of an AM; (ii) the request cannot be considered as an eligible request for deviation from a methodology.
- ☞ The secretariat shall prepare the draft response, within **5 working days** after making document publicly available, for the case in consultation with the Chairs. One member of respective Panel/WG can be appointed, if it is deemed necessary by secretariat. The selected Panel/WG member shall each be paid a half-day fee per case.
- ☞ The appointed Panel/WG member shall provide their input on the draft proposal from the secretariat within **5 working days** from the receipt of the case. The secretariat shall seek the endorsement from him/her, it shall forward the draft final response to the EB Chair.
- ☞ If the Chairs assesses that the case requires consideration by the whole Panel/WG, the secretariat shall include the case on the agenda of the next Panel/WG meeting, provided there is sufficient time on the agenda, for recommendation to the EB. The Panel/WG will give its recommendation to the EB.
- ☞ If the recommendation is to accept or reject the deviation, the EB Chair, in consultation with the Chairs, will give his/her final decision within **5 working days** of receipt of the recommendation from the secretariat.
 - ⇒ If the Chair of EB does not provide his/her decision within 5 working days, then the secretariat's recommendation is deemed to be accepted by the Chair.
- ☞ The Chair of the EB in consultation with the Chairs may decide to discuss case(s) in the EB meeting, if the request requires further discussion on some policy issue(s). The Chair of the EB in consultation with the secretariat shall put the case(s) on the agenda of a subsequent EB meeting. The EB meeting will give its decision.
- ☞ The decision of the Chair of the EB above shall be communicated to all the EB members. If in exceptional cases, EB member(s) disagree with the decision of the Chair of the EB, the concerned member(s), within **10 working days** of receiving this communication shall request the Chair, giving reasons in writing, to put the case for further consideration by the EB at its subsequent meeting.
- ☞ This decision will be communicated by the secretariat to PPs. The decision of the Chair and the EB shall be made publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website.

There is "Clarification for PPs on when to request a revision, clarification to an approved methodology or deviation". [EB31 Anx12]

7-7. Procedure for the submission and consideration of queries regarding the application of AMs and tools by DOEs to the Methodologies Panel (MP)

(1) DOEs who wish to submit queries regarding the applicability of AMs or methodological tools shall complete the form “F-CDM-AM-Subm” and submit it to the secretariat.
PPs wishing to seek clarification on the applicability of an AM or a methodological tool, may do so by submitting to the DOE the completed form “F-CDM-AM-Subm”. The DOE shall assess that the PP’s request is not the intention to revise an AM to expand its applicability, and if so forward the request no later than **5 working days**, after the receipt of the request from PP, to the secretariat.

(2) The secretariat shall forward the query to the Methodological Panel (MP) listserv, post the query in a common extranet page for the DOEs and the MP, forward it to the EB and make it publicly available through the UNFCCC CDM web site.

(3) A query regarding the application of an AM shall be available to the MP at least **6 weeks** prior to its next meeting in order to be considered by the meeting. The Chair shall assess when queries are to be considered by the MP depending on the workload of the MP.

(4) The chair shall select one member as a reviewer. For cases that require more detailed consideration, the Chair may select an additional member.

(5a) Should the secretariat, while preparing the draft response, assess, in consultation with the Chair of the MP and the MP member(s) as appropriate, that the request for clarification is submitted with the intention to revise an AM to expand its applicability, it shall contact the DOE advising to withdraw the request for clarification and submit a request for revision following the latest approved version of the “Procedures for the revision of an approved baseline or monitoring methodology by the Executive Board”.

(5b) Should the secretariat, while preparing the draft response, assess that the clarification is simple enough so as to not require the MP’s consideration, it shall forward the proposal to the 2 appointed members for early consideration.

(6b) If both the appointed panel members agree to the draft proposal within **2 days**, the secretariat shall seek the approval of the Chair of the MP within **1 day** and upon endorsement shall forward the final response to the DOE and post it on the UNFCCC CDM web page for methodology clarifications. The response shall be reflected in the report of the meeting of the MP immediately following the publication of the response.

If there is no agreement or endorsement, the request will be considered at the MP meeting.

(5c) Draft recommendations, which shall be considered by the MP, shall be made available for the MP’s consideration at least **1 week** before the next MP meeting. The secretariat shall prepare the draft responses to requests for clarifications for discussion by the MP meetings. The recommendation and answer shall be drafted using form “F-CDM-AM-Subm”.

(6c) Once the MP agrees on a final recommendation, the secretariat shall:

- ☞ forward the final response to the DOE and the EB,
- ☞ and make it publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM web site in the corresponding section and in the history web page of the approved methodology concerned.

All responses to requests for clarification recommended by the MP are considered as agreed upon by the EB, in taking note of the MP’s report, unless otherwise revised by the EB at its subsequent meeting.

There is “Clarification for PPs on when to request a revision, clarification to an approved methodology or deviation”. [EB31 Anx12]

8. Starting date and crediting period

8-1. Starting date of a CDM project activity

The definition and clarification of starting date of a CDM project activity [\[EB41 Rep. para67\]](#)

- ◆ The start date of a CDM project activity is “the earliest date at which either the implementation or construction or real action of a project activity begins”.
 - ☞ The CDM-PDD should contain not only the date, but also a description of how this start date has been determined, and a description of the evidence available to support this start date.
 - ☞ Further, it should be noted that if this starting date is earlier than the date of publication of the CDM-PDD for global stakeholder consultation by a DOE ([chap.11-1](#)), Section B.5 of the CDM-PDD should contain a description of how the benefits of the CDM were seriously considered prior to the starting date. [\[EB41 Anx12, p17\]](#)
- ◆ The EB further clarified that: "In light of the above definition, the start date shall be considered to be the date on which the PP has committed to expenditures related to the implementation or related to the construction of the project activity."
 - ☞ This, for example, can be the date on which contracts have been signed for equipment or construction/operation services required for the project activity.
 - ☞ Minor pre-project expenses, e.g. the contracting of services /payment of fees for feasibility studies or preliminary surveys, should not be considered in the determination of the start date as they do not necessarily indicate the commencement of implementation of the project.
- ◆ For those project activities which do not require construction or significant pre-project implementation (e.g. light bulb replacement) the start date is to be considered the date when real action occurs.
 - ☞ In the context of the above definition, pre-project planning is not considered “real action”.
- ◆ The EB further noted that there may be circumstances in which an investment decision is taken and the project activity implementation is subsequently ceased. If such project activities are restarted due to consideration of the benefits of the CDM the cessation of project implementation must be demonstrated by means of credible evidence such as cancellation of contracts or revocation of government permits.
 - ☞ Any investment analysis used to demonstrate additionality shall comply with the requirements that the investment analysis should reflect the economic decision making context at point of the decision to recommence the project. [\[EB41 Anx45, para7\]](#)

8-1. Starting date of a CDM project activity

Guidelines on the demonstration and assessment of prior consideration of the CDM (Version 3) [EB49 Anx22]

◆ In consideration of requests for registration, the EB takes notes that the issue of prior consideration of the CDM as a major element in assessing that the CDM benefits were considered necessary in the decision to undertake the project as a CDM project activity. As such the EB has introduced a guidance on the means of demonstrating compliance with this requirement.

New project activities

- ☞ The EB decided that for project activities with a starting date **on or after 2 August 2008**, the PP must inform a Host Party DNA and the UNFCCC secretariat in writing of the commencement of the project activity and of their intention to seek CDM status.
 - ⇒ Such notification must be made within **6 months** of the project activity start date.
 - ⇒ Such notification is not necessary if a PDD has been published for global stakeholder consultation or a NM proposed to the EB before the project activity start date.
- ☞ When validating a project activity with a start date on or after 2 August 2008 DOEs shall ensure by means of confirmation from the DNA or UNFCCC secretariat that such a notification has been provided. If such a notification has not been provided the DOE shall determine that the CDM was not seriously considered in the decision to implement the project activity.
- ☞ Additionally for project activities for which a PDD has not been published for global stakeholder consultation or a NM proposed or request for revision of an AM is requested, every subsequent 2 years after the initial notification the PPs shall inform the DNA and/or the UNFCCC secretariat of the progress of the project activity.

Existing project activities

- ☞ Proposed project activities with a start date **before 2 August 2008**, for which the start date is prior to the date of publication of the PDD for global stakeholder consultation, are required to demonstrate that the CDM was seriously considered in the decision to implement the project activity. Such demonstration requires the following elements to be satisfied:
 - ⇒ The PP must indicate awareness of the CDM prior to the project activity start date, and that the benefits of the CDM were a decisive factor in the decision. Evidence to support this would include, *inter alia*, minutes and/or notes related to the consideration of the decision by the Board of Directors, or equivalent, of the PP, to undertake the project as a CDM project activity.
 - ⇒ The PP must indicate, by means of reliable evidence, that continuing and real actions were taken to secure CDM status for the project in parallel with its implementation. Evidence to support this should include, *inter alia*, contracts with consultants for CDM/PDD/methodology services, Emission Reduction Purchase Agreements or other documentation related to the sale of the potential CERs, evidence of agreements or negotiations with a DOE for validation services, submission of a NM to the EB, publication in newspaper, interviews with DNA, earlier correspondence on the project with the DNA or the UNFCCC secretariat;
- ☞ Assessment of real and continuing actions shall be validated by the DOE and the validation should focus on real documented evidence as indicated above, including an assessment by the DOE of the authenticity of the evidence.
- ☞ In validating proposed CDM project activities where:
 - ⇒ there is **less than 2 years** of a gap between the documented evidence the DOE shall conclude that continuing and real actions were taken to secure CDM status;
 - ⇒ the gap is **greater than 2 years and less than 3 years**, the DOE may validate that continuing and real actions were taken to secure CDM status for the project activity and shall justify any positive or negative validation opinion based on the context of the evidence and information assessed;
 - ⇒ the gap is **greater than 3 years**, the DOE shall conclude that continuing and real actions were not taken to secure CDM status for the project activity.
- ☞ If evidence to support the serious prior consideration of the CDM as indicated above is not available the DOE shall determine that the CDM was not considered in the decision to implement the project activity.

8-2. Crediting period

- ◆ CERs shall only be issued for a crediting period starting after the date of registration of a CDM project activity. [CP/2001/13/Ad2, p23 para12]
- ◆ PPs select a crediting period for a proposed project activity from one of the following alternative approaches

[CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p17 para49] :

- ☞ A maximum of 7 years which may be renewed at most 2 times.
 - ⇒ For each renewal, a DOE determines and informs the EB that the original project baseline is still valid or has been updated taking account of new data where applicable.
- ☞ A maximum of 10 years with no option of renewal.

- ◆ GHG emission reductions since 2000 may be eligible to claim CERs.

[CP/2001/13/Ad2, p23 para13]

Regarding the procedures and documentation which need to be used for the renewal of a crediting period, the EB agreed that at the start of the 2nd and 3rd crediting period for a project activity, assessing the continued validity of the baseline and updating the baseline, need to be addressed. [EB20 Anx7, para1] (chap.17)


Indicating the starting date of the crediting period [EB24 Anx31, para4-5]

- ◆ PPs shall state in the PDD the starting date of the crediting period in the format dd/mm/yyyy, no qualifications, e.g. “expected”, can be made to this date. PPs shall specify only one starting date for the crediting period, even in cases of phased implementation.

☞ The starting date of a CDM project activity (chap.8-1) does not need to correspond to the starting date of the crediting period for this project activity. Therefore project activities starting as of 1 January 2000 may be validated and registered. [EB21 Rep, para63]

☞ The crediting period of a project activity cannot commence prior to the date of registration. The date in a PDD is an indicative starting date and it will be updated by the secretariat as the date of registration, if the listed date is prior to the date of registration.

⇒ This update will not affect the specified length of the crediting period nor does this impact the rights of PPs to subsequently request a change of the starting date of the crediting period. [EB41 Anx12, p18]



Requesting post-registration changes to the start of the crediting period [EB52 Anx59, para6-10]

- ◆ PPs in projects for which the starting date of the crediting period is prior to the date of registration (i.e. project claiming retroactive credits) cannot request changes in the starting date of the crediting period.
- ◆ PPs of projects for which the starting date of the crediting period is after the date of registration may:
 - ☞ (a) Inform the secretariat that the starting date of the crediting period be moved to a date up to 1 year earlier than the one indicated in the PDD, provided that this date is not earlier than the date of registration of the project activity;
 - ☞ (b) Inform the secretariat to delay the starting date of the crediting period by up to 1 year;
 - ☞ (c) Make a request to the secretariat, via a DOE, that the start date of the crediting period be delayed by more than 1 year but no more than 2 years, by submitting to the secretariat a confirmation from a DOE that no changes have occurred which would result in a less conservative baseline and that substantive progress has been made by the project participants to start the project activity.
- ◆ With regard to provisions in (b) and (c) above, PPs of projects hosted by a Least Developed Country may:
 - ☞ (d) Inform the secretariat to delay the start date of the crediting period by up to 2 years;
 - ☞ (e) Make a request to the secretariat, via a DOE, that the start date of the crediting period be delayed by more than 2 years but no more than 4 years, by submitting to the secretariat a confirmation from a DOE that no changes have occurred which would result in a less conservative baseline and that substantive progress has been made by the PPs to start the project activity.
- ◆ The secretariat will consider requests made under (c) or (e), in consultation with the Chair of the EB, before making the requested change to the start of the crediting period.
- ◆ PPs may only make use of provisions of (a) to (e) above once for each registered project activity.
- ◆ For the case of a request for a change in the starting date of the crediting period of a project activity for which CERs have already been issued, procedures above apply and that the secretariat can proceed to make the change as requested. [EB25 Rep, para105]

Treatment of the lifetime of plants and equipment in proposed new baseline methodologies [EB22 Anx2, para4-9]

- ☞ Where a project activity involves the replacement or retrofit of existing equipment or facilities, it is reasonable to assume that emission reductions shall only be accounted from the date of replacement until the point in time when the existing equipment would have been replaced in the absence of the project activity or the end of crediting period, whatever is earlier.
- ☞ In order to estimate the point in time when the existing equipment would need to be replaced in the absence of the CDM, a new methodology may consider the following approaches:
 - ⇒ A sector and/or activity specific method or criteria to determine when the equipment would be replaced or retrofitted in the absence of the CDM;
 - ⇒ The typical average technical lifetime of the type equipment may be determined and documented, taking into account common practices in the sector and country, e.g. based on industry surveys, statistics, technical literature, etc.;
 - ⇒ The practices of the responsible entity/PPs regarding replacement schedules may be evaluated and documented, e.g. based on historical replacement records for similar equipment.

9. Monitoring plan

- ◆ **Monitoring** refers to the collection and archiving of all relevant data necessary for determining the baseline, measuring GHG emissions within the project boundary of a CDM project activity and leakage, as applicable. [Glos ver.5, p21]
- ◆ **A monitoring methodology** refers to the method used by PPs for the collection and archiving of all relevant data necessary for the implementation of the monitoring plan. PPs may propose a new monitoring methodology ([chap.7-4](#)). In developing a monitoring methodology, the first step is to identify the most appropriate methodology bearing in mind good monitoring practice in relevant sectors. [Glos ver.5, p22]
- ◆ **A monitoring plan** for a proposed project activity shall be based on a previously approved monitoring methodology or a new methodology. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p17 para54]
- ◆ Revisions, if any, to the monitoring plan to improve its accuracy and/or completeness of information shall be justified by PPs and shall be submitted for validation to a DOE. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p18 para57]
 - ☞ There is the “Procedures for revising monitoring plans” ([chap.7-4](#))

Project Boundary

- ☞ The project boundary shall encompass all anthropogenic GHG emissions by sources under the control of the PPs that are significant and reasonably attributable to the CDM project activity. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p17 para52]

Leakage

- ☞ Leakage is defined as the net change of GHG emissions which occurs outside the project boundary and which is measurable and attributable to the CDM project activity. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p17 para51]
 - ⇒ In an operational context, the terms measurable and attributable should be read as “which can be measured” and “directly attributable”, respectively. [Glos ver.5, p21]
- ☞ Reductions in GHG emissions shall be adjusted for leakage in accordance with the monitoring and verification provisions. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p17 para50]

BOX: Calibration

- ☞ The specific uncertainty levels, methods and associated accuracy level of measurement instruments and calibration procedures to be used for various parameters and variables should be identified in the PDD, along with detailed quality assurance and quality control procedures. In addition standards recommended shall either be national or international standards. The verification of the authenticity of the uncertainty levels and instruments are to be undertaken by the DOE during the verification stage. [EB23 Rep, para24]
- ☞ A zero check cannot be considered as a substitute for calibration of the measurement instrument. [EB24 Rep, para37]
- ☞ There is “Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements”. [EB52 Anx60]

BOX: The standardized format for monitoring report [EB54 Anx34]

- ☞ There is guidelines for completing the monitoring report form (CDM-MR) and the standardized format for monitoring report to improve consistency in reporting of the implementation and monitoring of the project activity by PPs. [EB54 Rep, para71]

10. Approval from each Party involved

Approval by Parties involved [Glos ver.5, p6-7]

- ◆ A written approval constitutes the authorization by a designated national authority (DNA) of specific entity(ies)' participation as project proponents in the specific CDM project activity.
- ◆ The DNA of a Party involved in a proposed CDM project activity shall issue a statement including the following:
 - ☞ The Party has ratified the Kyoto Protocol.
 - ☞ The approval of voluntary participation in the proposed CDM project activity
 - ☞ In the case of Host Party(ies): statement that the proposed CDM project activity contributes to sustainable development of the host Party(ies).
- ◆ The written approval shall be unconditional with respect to the above.
- ◆ A written approval from a Party may cover more than one project provided that all projects are clearly listed in the letter
- ◆ The DOE shall receive documentation of the approval.

☞ Multilateral funds do not necessarily require written approval from each participant's DNA. However those not providing a written approval may be giving up some of their rights and privileges in terms of being a Party involved in the project. [Glos ver.5, p6]

- ☞ The EB agreed that the registration of a CDM project activity can take place without an Annex I Party being involved at the stage of registration.
- ☞ Before an Annex I Party acquires CERs from such a project activity from an account within the CDM Registry, it shall submit a letter of approval to the EB in order for the CDM Registry administrator to be able to forward CERs from the CDM Registry ([chap.21-1](#)) to the national registry ([chap.21-2](#)) of the Annex I Party. [Glos ver.5, p7]
 - ⇒ This is so called “unilateral CDM project.”


BOX: Contents of actual approval letters

- ☞ An approval letter is addressed and sent to PPs.
- ☞ In most cases, an approval letter is the same with an authorization letter. ([chap.4-6](#))
 - ⇒ In some cases, a DNA authorizes an entity in another country.
- ☞ In some cases, a DNA sets conditions on issues other than unconditional issues.
 - ⇒ For example, conditions on amount of CERs to be transferred, validity of the approval, the rejection of an unilateral CDM project, the requirement of reports to a DNA, etc.
- ☞ In some cases, an official approval letter is written in the original language and validated with a seal, while an unofficial English translation is attached.

11. Validation

http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Procedures/valid_proc01_v04.pdf (Version 4 / 8 June 2005)
 Procedures for processing and reporting on validation of CDM project activities (Version 03)[EB50 Anx48]

11-1. Procedures for validation



11-2. Validation requirements

The DOE selected by PPs to validate a project activity, being under a contractual arrangement with them, shall review the PDD and any supporting documentation to confirm that the following requirements have been met. [\[CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p14 para37\]](#)

- ☞ The participation requirements, as follows, are satisfied;
 - ⇒ Participation in a CDM project activity is voluntary. Parties participating in the CDM shall designate a national authority (DNA) for the CDM. A non-Annex I Party may participate in a CDM project activity if it is a Party to the Kyoto Protocol.
- ☞ Comments by local stakeholders have been invited, a summary of the comments received has been provided, and a report to the DOE on how due account was taken of any comments has been received;
- ☞ PPs have submitted to the DOE documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity or an environmental impact assessment in accordance with procedures as required by the host Party;
- ☞ The project activity is expected to result in GHG reductions that are additional to any that would occur in the absence of the proposed project activity;
- ☞ The baseline and monitoring methodologies comply with requirements pertaining to methodologies previously approved by the EB, or modalities and procedures for establishing a new methodology;
- ☞ Provisions for monitoring, verification and reporting are in accordance with the CDM M&P and relevant decisions of the CMP;
- ☞ The project activity conforms to all other requirements for CDM project activities in CDM M&P and relevant decisions by the CMP and the EB.

Validation Report [\[CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p15 para40\]](#)

The DOE shall:

- ☞ Prior to the submission of the validation report to the EB, have received from the PPs written approval of voluntary participation from the DNA of each Party involved, including confirmation by the host Party that the project activity assists it in achieving sustainable development;
- ☞ In accordance with provisions on confidentiality [\[CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p12 para27\(h\)\]](#), make publicly available the PDD;
- ☞ Submit to the EB, if it determines the proposed project activity to be valid, a request for registration in the form of a validation report including the PDD, the written approval of the host Party, and an explanation of how it has taken due account of comments received;
- ☞ Make this validation report publicly available upon transmission to the EB.

BOX: Revisions to AM and validation

[\[EB50 Anx48, para6\]](#)

- ☞ In cases where a PDD of a project activity applying the previous version of the AM was published for global stakeholder consultation, but has not been submitted for registration within the grace period ([chap.7-5](#)), project participants shall revise the PDD using the revised version of the methodology.
- ☞ The revised PDD shall not be republished for global stakeholder consultation prior to the submission of a request for registration, unless otherwise stated by the EB when it approves the revised methodology.
- ☞ Similarly, it is not required to republish the PDD for global stakeholder consultation in cases when PPs are required to use elements of a revised version of a methodology (i.e. in the case of an approved deviation).

12. Registration

12-1. Procedures for requests for registration

(Version 01) [EB54 Anx28]

DOE (and PPs)

UNFCCC secretariat (and the EB)

(1) The DOE submits a request for registration for a proposed CDM project activity for registration only after it determines that a proposed project activity is valid and meeting the requirements of the “CDM-VVM” and other CDM requirements. The DOE submits the required documents listed in latest applicable version of the completeness checklist for requests for registration. The DOE submits the required documents using the electronic, internet-based, submission tool provided to the DOE by the secretariat.

(3) The DOE communicates to the PP(s) the unique reference number; and shall also communicate to the PP(s) the registration fee due.

(4) The PP(s) shall pay any required registration fee by bank transfer identifying the unique reference number. The DOE, using the submission tool, submits proof of payment. If the proposed project activity applies a methodology that has been revised, withdrawn, or suspended by the EB, either proof of payment must be uploaded within **20 calendar days** or payment must be received within **40 calendar days** of the deadlines prescribed in the procedures for the revision of an AM ([chap.7-5](#)).

(2) The secretariat will send to the DOE a unique reference number for the proposed project activity; and shall also send to the DOE a statement of the registration fee due, calculated in accordance with the latest guidelines adopted by the EB, or a confirmation that no registration fee is due.

(5) The secretariat maintains a publicly available list of all submitted requests for registration for which the applicable registration fee has been received. The schedule of requests for registration to be processed, including the expected date of commencement, shall be made publicly available. The commencement of the processing of these requests for registration shall be scheduled in accordance with the secretariat's operational plans, i.e. monthly quotas. The secretariat's operational plans will also incorporate any relevant instructions from the EB.

(6) The secretariat will complete within **7 calendar days** a completeness check to determine whether the request for registration submission is complete, in accordance with the completeness checklist for requests for registration ([ver.01.0 10 June 2010](#)).

(7) Upon completion of the completeness check, the secretariat will notify the PP(s), as identified in the MoC form ([chap.4-7](#)), and the DOE of the result of the completeness check, and make the result publicly available. If the request does not meet the requirements of the completeness check, then upon submission of the revised documentation the request for registration shall be treated as a new submission of a request for registration.

(8) Upon a determination that the request meets the requirements of the completeness checklist, the secretariat will conduct within **23 calendar days** an information and reporting check in accordance with the information and reporting checklist for request for registration ([ver.01.0 10 June 2010](#)), which secretariat shall make publicly available.

(9) Upon conclusion of the information and reporting check, the secretariat will notify the PP(s), as identified in the MoC form, and the DOE of the result of the check, and make the result. If the request does not meet, then upon submission of the revised documentation the request for registration shall be treated as a new submission of a request for registration.

(10) Upon a determination by the secretariat that the request for registration meets the requirements of the information and reporting check, the secretariat will publish the request for registration on the UNFCCC CDM website, and **the request for registration shall be deemed received by the EB for consideration.**

(11) The secretariat will notify the PP(s) (as identified in the MoC form), the DNA(ies) of the Party(ies) involved, and the DOE: that the secretariat has published the request for registration for consideration of registration, and the last date by which members of the EB or a Party involved may request a review of the request for registration, which shall be **28 days** after the date of publication of the request for registration.

(12) The secretariat prepares and sends to the EB a summary note on the request for registration, within **14 days** of date of publication of the request for registration.

Whether a Party involved in a proposed CDM project activity or at least 3 EB members request a review of the request for registration before 17:00 GMT of the last day of the 28 day period following the publication of the request for registration .

Yes ([chap. 12-2](#))

No

(13) The EB shall register the proposed project activity.

12-2. Procedures for review of requests for registration

(Version 1.0)[EB55 Anx40]

(1) Commencement of Review

- ☞ If Party involved in a proposed CDM project activity or at least 3 EB members request a review of the request for registration, the secretariat shall:
 - ⇒ Notify the PPs and the DOE that validated the proposed project activity;
 - ⇒ Make publicly available an anonymous version of each request for review form;
 - ⇒ Assign a team comprising 2 experts from the RIT to participate in the assessment of the request for review and appoint one of the assigned Team members to serve as the lead, who is responsible for all communications with the secretariat.

A request for review by a Party involved shall be sent by the relevant DNA to the EB, through the secretariat, using official means of communication (such as recognized official letterhead and signature or an official dedicated e-mail account). [EB54 Anx28 para20]

- ☞ The PPs and the DOE shall provide responses to the issues identified in the request for review no later than **28 calendar days** after the notification. For each issue raised in the request for review, the PPs and DOE shall either:
 - ⇒ Respond by making any revisions to the PDD and/or validation report (VR); or
 - ⇒ Respond in writing by addressing why no revisions to the PDD and/or VR are necessary.
- ☞ The secretariat shall schedule the commencement of the review of the request for registration, and make these publicly available. Upon scheduling the commencement date, the secretariat shall inform the PPs and DOE of this date. The commencement of the review shall be defined as the date on which the secretariat notifies the PPs and the DOE that the review has commenced.

(2) Assessment

- ☞ The secretariat shall prepare an assessment of the request for registration in the context of the reasons for the request for review, taking into account the responses of the PPs and the DOE. Concurrently and independently, the RIT Team shall prepare an assessment of the request for registration, taking into account the responses of the PPs and the DOE. The secretariat and the RIT Team shall finalize their respective assessments no later than **2 weeks** after the commencement of the review.
- ☞ Each assessment shall include a proposed decision. Each proposed decision shall propose to either: (a) register the proposed project activity; or (b) reject the request for registration. If a proposed decision is to reject the request for registration, then the assessment shall include a proposed ruling, containing an explanation of the reasons and rationale.
- ☞ In addition both the secretariat and the RIT Team shall, in their assessments, highlight any policy issues of significant importance related to the policies and goals of the CDM. The secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the EB, shall bring these issues to the attention of the EB through the agenda of its meetings through the preparation of background notes and policy options.
- ☞ The RIT Team shall communicate its assessment to the EB by submitting it to the secretariat. The secretariat shall inform the EB of the availability of each assessment, and make each assessment available to the EB, together with any responses from the PP and DOE and any revision to the project documentation.

(3) Consideration by the EB

- ☞ If the assessment of the secretariat and the RIT Team contain the same proposed decision, then that shall become the final decision of the EB after **20 days**, unless a member of the EB objects to that. An objection by a member of the EB shall be made by notifying the Chair of the EB, giving reasons in writing, through the secretariat. The secretariat shall make the objection available to the EB.
 - ⇒ If an EB member objects to the proposed decision more than 2 weeks prior to the next EB meeting, the matter shall be placed on the agenda of the next EB meeting (otherwise the subsequent EB meeting).
- ☞ If the assessments of the secretariat and the RIT Team contain different proposed decisions and the EB receives both proposed rulings more than **2 weeks** prior to the next EB meeting, the matter will be placed on the agenda of the next EB (otherwise the subsequent EB meeting).
- ☞ At the EB meeting for which the matter is placed on the agenda, the EB shall decide to either: **register the proposed project activity**; or **reject the request for registration**.

(4) Finalization and implementation of the ruling

- ☞ If a final decision approves the registration of the project activity, the secretariat shall register the proposed project activity on the first working day subsequent to the finalization of the decision. The effective date of registration shall be day on which the latest revisions to the validation report and/or supporting documentation were submitted.
- ☞ If the final decision rejects the request for registration, the secretariat shall update the information on the UNFCCC CDM website on the first working day subsequent to the finalization of the decision. Furthermore, within **3 weeks** of the final decision of the EB, the secretariat will provide the Chair of the EB with an information note, which shall contain a proposed final ruling incorporating the final decision. The proposed final ruling shall contain an explanation of the reasons and rationale for the final decision.
- ☞ Once approved by the Chair of the Board, the secretariat shall make the proposed final ruling available to the EB. The proposed final ruling shall become the final after **10 days**, unless a member of the EB objects to the proposed final ruling.
- ☞ An objection by a member of the EB shall be made by notifying the Chair of the EB, giving reasons in writing, through the secretariat. The secretariat shall make the objection available to the EB.
- ☞ If an EB member objects to the proposed final ruling more than **2 weeks** prior to the next EB meeting, the matter shall be placed on the agenda of the next EB meeting (otherwise the subsequent EB meeting).
- ☞ This formal ruling shall be made publicly available by the secretariat once approved by the EB.

12-3. Registration fee

[EB54 Anx29]

Registration fee of the CDM project activity

- ◆ The registration fee schedule applies to submissions of request for registration of proposed project activities under the CDM.
- ◆ The registration fee shall be the share of proceeds to cover administrative expenses (SOP-Admin) applied to the expected average annual certified emission reductions for the proposed project activity over its crediting period, as identified in the PDD and as validated by the DOE.
- ◆ SOP-Admin is:
 - ☞ **USD 0.10/CER** issued for the first 15,000 t-CO₂ equivalent for which issuance is requested in a given year.
 - ☞ **USD 0.20/CER** issued for any amount in excess of 15,000 t-CO₂ equivalent for which issuance is requested in a given year.
- ◆ The maximum registration fee payable based on this calculation shall be **USD 350,000**.
- ◆ The registration fee shall be deducted from the SOP-Admin due for issuance of the CERs. In effect, the registration fee is an advance payment of the SOP-Admin due for the issuance of CERs likely to be achieved during the first year.
- ◆ For the purpose calculating the registration fee for proposed A/R project activities, CERs mean the net GHG removals by sinks.

No registration fee must be paid:

- ☞ For proposed project activities with expected average annual emission reductions over the crediting period below 15,000 t-CO₂ equivalent;
- ☞ For proposed project activities hosted in least developed countries;
 - ⇒ The application of this exemption is based on the status of the country on the date of the publication of the request for issuance of CERs.
- ☞ Until after the date of the first issuance of CERs in countries with fewer than 10 registered CDM project activities.
 - ⇒ The application of this exemption shall be based on the number of registered CDM projects in the country on the date of the submission of the request for registration.

- ◆ In issuing a validation opinion in the validation report, the DOE shall include a statement of the likelihood of the project activity to achieve the anticipated emission reductions stated in the CDM-PDD. This statement will constitute the basis for the calculation of the registration fee. [EB11 Anx6 para2]

☞ SOP-Admin is a fee that PPs have to pay at issuance of CERs. (chap.16)

BOX: Example of registration fee

Expected average annual emission reduction	Registration fee
10,000 t	-
15,000 t	\$ 1,500
30,000 t	\$ 4,500
100,000 t	\$ 18,500
1,000,000 t	\$ 198,500
1,757,500 t	\$ 350,000
3,000,000 t	\$ 350,000

BOX: Reimbursement of registration fee

- ☞ The registration fee shall be reimbursed in full if the DOE withdraws the request for registration of the proposed project activity prior to date that the secretariat publishes the request for registration on the UNFCCC website.
- ☞ The amount of the paid registration fee greater than **USD 30,000** shall be reimbursed if the DOE withdraws the request for registration of the proposed project activity subsequent to the date that the secretariat publishes the request for registration on the UNFCCC website, or if the EB declines to register the proposed project activity.

12-4. Procedures for withdrawal of a request for registration [EB54 Anx27]

Applicability

- ☞ This procedure shall be applied if a DOE wishes to request the withdrawal of a request for registration after the concerned request for registration has been submitted by the DOE to the EB.
- ☞ This procedure shall be applied in case:
 - ⇒ The PP voluntarily wishes to withdraw the proposed project activity requesting registration;
 - ⇒ The DOE has revised its validation opinion based on new insights and has determined that the project is not yet suitable for registration as a CDM project activity.

- ☞ The DOE shall submit the form for submission of a request for withdrawal “CDM: Request for withdrawal form” (F-CDM-WR) dully completed uploading it through the dedicated internet interface on the UNFCCC CDM website.
- ☞ Upon receipt of the request for withdrawal, the secretariat shall as soon as possible check the documents submitted.
- ☞ The types of request for withdrawal of request for registration, and the procedures applicable to each type of withdrawal are as follows:

Type 1

- ☞ The DOE requests the withdrawal of the request for registration prior to the publication of the request for registration for the period for requesting a review.
 - ⇒ The registration fee will be reimbursed in full to the PP. The project activity will not be marked as withdrawn however the project reference number assigned to the withdrawn project activity will be blocked from further use.

Type 2

- ☞ The DOE requests the withdrawal of the request for registration during the **4/8 week** period for requesting a review.
 - ⇒ Any registration fee paid above 30 000 USD will be reimbursed to the PP and the proposed project activity will be marked as withdrawn on the CDM Information System.

Type 3

- ☞ The DOE requests the withdrawal of the request for registration subsequent to receiving a request for review.
 - ⇒ Any registration fee paid above 30 000 USD will be reimbursed to the PP and the proposed project activity will be marked as withdrawn on the CDM Information System. Type 3 requests must be submitted and considered complete **2 weeks** prior to EB meeting at which the request for review/review/corrections have been scheduled to be considered.

- ☞ Submission of requests for withdrawal will be incorporated into the framework for addressing noncompliance by DOEs.

13. Changes after operation of a CDM project

13-1. Procedures for revising monitoring plans

(Version 2) [EB49 Anx28]

If a DOE during verification finds that the monitoring plan is not in accordance with the monitoring methodology applied to the registered project activity and/or does not reflect the actual monitoring activity based on the registered PDD, the DOE shall request a revision of the monitoring plan.

(1) Submission for revising monitoring plans

- ☞ Prior to requesting issuance of CERs, the DOE shall submit a request for revising monitoring plan, as appropriate, to the secretariat.
- ☞ The submission by the DOE shall contain:
 - ⇒ Request for revision of monitoring plan form;
 - ⇒ A Validation Opinion;
 - ⇒ Revised Monitoring Plan (in clean and track change versions); and
 - ⇒ Supplemental documentation.
- ☞ For the cases where the EB requests the PP/DOE to revise the monitoring plan via deviation, request for issuance and/or request for review, the DOE shall indicate it in the form.
- ☞ The DOE shall prepare a validation opinion including information on how:
 - ⇒ The proposed revision ensures that the level of accuracy and completeness. The DOE shall, using objective evidence, assess the accuracy and completeness of each proposed revision including the frequency of measurements, the quality of monitoring equipment (eg. calibration requirements, and the QA/QC procedures).
 - ⇒ The proposed revision is in accordance with the AM applicable to the project activity. In cases where the proposed revision refers to a later version of the applied methodology, the DOE shall ensure that this application does not compromise the conservativeness in the monitoring and verification process and of the emission reduction calculations.
 - ⇒ The findings of previous verification reports, if any, have been taken into account.

(2) Processing Request for a Revision to the Monitoring Plan

- ☞ Upon receipt of submission by the DOE, the secretariat shall expeditiously carry out a completeness check of the documentation and when deemed complete assign the proposed revision to a member of the Registration and Issuance Team (RIT) to prepare an appraisal. The appraisal shall be submitted to the secretariat within a period of **10 days**. However, for cases where the request for revising monitoring plan is submitted as per the request by the EB, the secretariat shall proceed directly with summary note preparation and forward the assessment together with the request and all documentation to the Chair of the EB and a relevant panel or WG within **10 working days**.
- ☞ Upon receipt of the RIT Members appraisal, the secretariat shall within **10 working days** prepare a summary and assessment of the request and forward them to the Chair of the EB and a relevant panel or WG.
- ☞ If the secretariat during the summary note preparation requires further clarification, it shall request the DOE to submit the clarification. The DOE shall submit the clarification within **2 weeks**. The secretariat upon receiving this clarification shall finalise the summary note with its recommendation and forward it to the Chair of EB and Chair of the relevant panel or WG, within **10 working days**.

(3) Consideration for a request for revision of monitoring plan

- ☞ The Chair in consultation with the Chair of relevant Panel or WGs shall decide on each request within **5 working days** whether:
 - ⇒ To approve the revised monitoring plan;
 - ⇒ To approve the revised monitoring plan with corrections, or
 - ⇒ To reject the revised monitoring plan
- ☞ If the Chair does not provide his/her decision within 5 working days, the secretariat recommendation is deemed to be accepted by the Chair.
- ☞ The Chair of the EB, in consultation with the Chair of the relevant Panel or WG, may decide to discuss case(s) in the EB. The Chair of the EB shall put the case(s) on the agenda of a subsequent EB meeting.
- ☞ The decision of the Chair above shall be communicated to all the EB members. In exceptional cases, EB member(s) may disagree with the decision of the Chair, the concerned member(s) within **10 working days** of receiving this communication shall request the Chair, giving reasons in writing, to put the case for further consideration by the EB at its subsequent meeting.
- ☞ Once a decision has been made, the secretariat shall inform the DOE.
- ☞ For cases where the Chair approves the revised monitoring plan with corrections, if the secretariat considers the corrections as satisfactory, the revised monitoring plan shall be approved, otherwise the request shall be rejected in consultation with the Chair of the EB.
- ☞ The approved revised monitoring plan and validation opinion shall be made publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website. This version of the monitoring plan shall be applied for future requests for issuance.

BOX: Change in the dates of a monitoring period

- ☞ The EB decided to allow DOEs to request a change in the dates of a monitoring period undergoing verification, provided the change is the result of the corrective action request raised by the DOE during the verification process. [EB41 Rep. para78]

13-2. Procedures for requests for deviation prior to submitting request for issuance

A DOE shall, prior to requesting registration of a project activity or issuance of CERs, notify the EB of deviations from AMs and/or provisions of registered project documentation and explain how it intends to address such deviations. The DOE shall only proceed with further actions after receipt of guidance from the EB. [EB21 Rep, para66]

(1) Submission of a request for deviation prior to submitting request for issuance

- ☞ If a DOE determines at verification that PPs deviated from the provisions of the registered monitoring plan it shall not conclude the certification of the emission reductions for the verified period, and inform the EB accordingly, or seek guidance from the EB on the acceptability of the deviation prior to concluding on its verification/certification decision.
- ☞ If guidance is sought, the DOE shall submit the form for submission of a request for deviation (F-CDMDEV-ISS) through the dedicated internet interface. The submission by the DOE shall provide complete, clear, and precise assessment and a description of the impact of the deviation on the emission reductions from the project activity.
- ☞ Upon submission of the form, the secretariat will do the completeness check on 'first come first serve' basis, in no longer than **20 working days** to assess that:
 - The form has been completed by the DOE, including the monitoring period for which the deviation is requested;
 - The proposed request for deviation is not a request for revision of monitoring plan or request from changes in the project design document;
 - Relevant technical information is submitted.
- ☞ If the secretariat considers that the form and documentation are incomplete, it shall ask the DOE to resubmit the request for deviation, addressing the concerns raised.
- ☞ No request for deviation shall be considered confidential and the request as well as the decision on the case shall be made publicly available. However, additional information provided as supporting document may be submitted by the DOE as a confidential document.
- ☞ If the secretariat assesses that the request satisfies the deviation criteria, it shall promptly publish the deviation request on deviation section of the UNFCCC CDM website. The secretariat after publication of the request shall prepare a summary note with its recommendation and forward it to the Chair of the EB and Chair of the relevant panel or WG, within **10 working days**.
- ☞ If the secretariat during the summary note preparation requires further clarification from the DOE, it shall ask the DOE to submit the clarification. The DOE shall submit the clarification within **10 working days** to the secretariat after receiving this request. The secretariat upon receiving this clarification shall finalise the summary note with its recommendation and forward it to the Chair of the EB and Chair of the relevant panel or WG, within **10 working days**.

(2) Consideration of a request for deviation by Panel/WG

- ☞ If secretariat during the summary note preparation identifies that the proposed request requires further consideration by the relevant panel or WG, it shall in consultation with the Chair of the relevant panel or WG put the case on the agenda of a subsequent Panel or WG meeting.
- ☞ The secretariat shall inform the DOE about the request being considered by the Panel or WG. The secretariat shall finalise the summary note with its recommendation including inputs of the panel or WG and forward it to the Chair of the EB and Chair of the relevant panel or WG, within **10 working days**.

(3) Consideration of a request for deviation

- ☞ Upon receiving the secretariat summary note, the Chair of the EB, in consultation with the and Chair of the relevant panel or WG(s), shall decide within **5 working days**:
 - To accept the request for deviation; or
 - To reject the request for deviation.
- ☞ If the Chair does not provide his/her decision within 5 working days, the secretariat recommendation is deemed to be accepted by the Chair.
- ☞ The Chair of the EB, in consultation with the Chair of the relevant Panel or WG, may decide to discuss case(s) in the EB meeting, if it is considered that the request for deviation requires further discussion on some policy issue(s). The Chair of the EB in consultation with the secretariat shall put the case(s) on the agenda of a subsequent EB meeting.
- ☞ The decision of the Chair above shall be communicated to all EB members. In exceptional cases, EB member(s) may disagree with the decision of the Chair, the concerned member(s) within **10 working days** of receiving this communication shall request the Chair, giving reasons in writing, to put the case for further consideration by the EB at its subsequent meeting.
- ☞ Once a decision has been made the secretariat shall promptly inform the DOE about the decision. In case where the Chair decided to discuss the case in the EB meeting, the DOE shall be informed about it.
- ☞ The decision the EB shall be made publicly available on the CDM website. If the EB decides to issue general guidelines it shall be made publicly available in the UNFCCC CDM website and through the CDM news facility.

13-3. Changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD

Guidelines on assessment of different types of changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD

(Version 1) [EB48 Anx67]

- ◆ If there are permanent changes which would impact at least one of the following aspects, the DOE must notify and request approval of changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD.

Changes which may impact the additionality of the project activity

☞ Within this category changes may include:

- Changes in the effective output capacity due to increased installed capacity or number of units, or installation of units with lower capacity or units with a technology which is less advanced than that described in the PDD;
- Addition of component or extension of technology;
- Removal or addition of one (or more) site of a project activity registered with multiple-sites;
- Different values of those actual operational parameters relevant to determination of emission reduction which are within the control of project participant and which result in the IRR passing the benchmark as described in the registered PDD.

☞ The additionality of the project activity reflects specific conditions applicable to the project activity (investment/costs variables, barriers, relevant regulations) at the time when the decision to proceed with CDM took place. Therefore when project has not been implemented as described in the PDD, these conditions may change and the additionality of the project activity should be re-assessed.

☞ The DOE shall assess how the affected data/information in the registered PDD have been derived, and validate if the assumptions underlying this original data/information is correct.

☞ The re-assessment of additionality shall be based on all original input data, thereby – in case of investment analysis – in principle only modifying the changed key parameters in the original spreadsheet calculations.

☞ In the case only barriers have been claimed to demonstrate additionality, it shall be explained why the barriers are still valid under new circumstances.

Changes in the scale of CDM project activity

☞ Within this category are the changes which cause a project activity no longer meeting the criteria for small-scale CDM project activities, therefore, simplified modalities, including the applicability and the application of relevant small-scale baseline methodologies, may no longer be applicable.

☞ The assessment of changes shall refer to the types of SSC project activities as per the CMP decision (Type I, Type II, Type III) ([chap.18-1](#)).

Changes which impact the applicability/ application of baseline methodology

☞ Within this category are the changes in the implementation of project activity which result in:

- The original methodology would no longer be applicable; or
- Another methodology would have been applicable; or
- Another baseline scenario would be more appropriate.

☞ If it is derived using a baseline methodology approved by the EB, the applicability and application of baseline methodology with which the project has been registered shall be reassessed.

Procedures for notifying and requesting approval of changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD

(Version 1) [EB48 Anx66]

- ◆ The procedure shall be applied by the DOE for permanent changes from the registered project activity under situations (a) the project has never been implemented in accordance with description in the registered PDD, or (b) permanent changes occur after the project activity has been implemented in accordance with the description in the PDD and issuance of CERs has taken place.

◆ See [\[EB48 Anx66\]](#) for exact procedures.

14. Verification and certification

- ◆ Verification is the periodic independent review and ex post determination by the DOE of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions that have occurred as a result of a registered CDM project activity during the verification period.
- ◆ Certification is the written assurance by the DOE that, during a specified time period, a project activity achieved the GHG emission reductions as verified. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p18 para61]

- ☞ Unless the EB has agreed grant an exception, a DOE shall not perform verification functions on a CDM project activity for which it has performed the function of validation/registration. [Procedures for making the monitoring report available to the public in accordance with paragraph 62 of the modalities and procedures for the CDM version 01 / 7 April 2005, para1]
- ☞ Timing and frequency of verification and certification are not specified in the official documents.

Procedures for verification and certification

[Procedures for making the monitoring report available to the public in accordance with paragraph 62 of the modalities and procedures for the CDM version 01 / 7 April 2005]

(1) The DOE shall make the monitoring report directly publicly available in PDF format on the UNFCCC CDM web site using a dedicated interface by selecting from a list of registered project activities the particular activity to be verified, specifying the start and ending date of the monitoring period covered by the monitoring report and uploading the report in PDF format.



(2) Immediately upon completion of the entry by the DOE in the dedicated interface, the information shall be made available on the UNFCCC CDM web site and the public shall be informed of the availability of the monitoring report through the CDM news facility. PPs shall be informed in accordance with the MoC (chap.4-7) for the project activity. The announcement to the public shall specify the link in the UNFCCC CDM web page where the monitoring report will be found and the name of the project activity. The secretariat shall promptly inform the DOE when the announcement has been made. The UNFCCC CDM web page where a monitoring report is made available shall contain in list:

- ☞ The name and reference number of the CDM project activity;
- ☞ A link to the monitoring report in PDF format;
- ☞ The name of the DOE contracted by the PPs;
- ☞ The name of the DOE that performed registration and validation for that activity.

(3) The DOE contracted by the PPs to perform the verification shall make the monitoring report publicly available, and shall:

- ☞ Determine whether the project documentation provided is in accordance with the requirements of the registered PDD and relevant provisions of decisions of the COP/MOP;
- ☞ Conduct on-site inspections, as appropriate, that may comprise, inter alia, a review of performance records, interviews with PPs and local stakeholders, collection of measurements, observation of established practices and testing of the accuracy of monitoring equipment;
- ☞ If appropriate, use additional data from other sources;
- ☞ Review monitoring results and verify that the monitoring methodologies for the estimation of GHG emission reductions have been applied correctly and their documentation is complete and transparent;
- ☞ Recommend to the PPs appropriate changes to the monitoring methodology for any future crediting period, if necessary;
- ☞ Determine the GHG emission reductions that would not have occurred in the absence of the CDM project activity, based on the data and information obtained above, as appropriate, using calculation procedures consistent with those contained in the registered PDD and in the monitoring plan;
- ☞ Identify and inform the PPs of any concerns relating to the conformity of the actual project activity and its operation with the registered PDD. PPs shall address the concerns and supply relevant additional information;
- ☞ Provide a verification report to the PPs, the Parties involved and the EB. The report shall be made publicly available. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p18 para62]



(4) The DOE shall, based on its verification report, certify in writing that, during the specified time period, the project activity achieved the verified amount of GHG emission reductions that would not have occurred in the absence of the CDM project activity. It shall inform the PPs, Parties involved and the EB of its certification decision in writing immediately upon completion of the certification process and make the certification report publicly available. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p18 para63]

15. Issuance of CERs

15-1. Procedures for requests for issuance of CERs

(Version 01) [EB54 Anx35]

DOE (and PPs)

UNFCCC secretariat (and the EB)

(1) The DOE submits the request for issuance of CERs only after it verifies the monitoring report and certifies the quantity CERs claimed in the monitoring report, and meeting the requirements of the CDM-VVM and other CDM requirements. The DOE submits the required documents listed in the completeness checklist for requests for issuance. The DOE submits the required documents using the electronic, internet-based, submission tool provided by the secretariat to the DOE.

(2) The secretariat maintains a publicly available list of all submitted requests for issuance. The schedule of requests for issuance to be processed, including the expected date of commencement, shall be made publicly available. The commencement of the processing of these requests for issuance shall be scheduled in accordance with the secretariat's operational plans, i.e. monthly quotas. The secretariat's operational plans will also incorporate any relevant instructions from the EB.

(3) Upon commencement of the processing of the request for issuance the secretariat will conduct within **7 calendar days** a completeness check to determine whether the request for issuance is complete in accordance with the completeness checklist for requests for issuance ([ver.01.0 10 June 2010](#)).

(4) Upon conclusion of the completeness check, the secretariat will notify the PP(s), as identified in the MoC form ([chap.4-7](#)), and the DOE of the result of the completeness check publicly available by publishing it on the UNFCCC website. If the request for issuance does not meet the requirements of the completeness check, then upon submission of the revised documentation the request for issuance shall be treated as a new submission of a request for issuance.

(5) Upon a determination by the secretariat that the request for issuance meets the requirements of the completeness checklist, the secretariat will conduct within **23 calendar days** an information and reporting check in accordance with the latest applicable version of the information and reporting checklist for request for issuance ([ver.01.0 10 June 2010](#)).

(6) Upon conclusion of the information and reporting check, the secretariat will notify the PP(s), as identified in the MoC form, and the DOE of the result of the information and reporting check, and make the result of the information and reporting check publicly available by publishing it on the UNFCCC website. If the request for issuance does not meet the requirements of the information and reporting check, then upon submission of the revised documentation the request for issuance shall be treated as a new submission of a request for issuance.

(7) Upon a determination by the secretariat that the request for issuance meets the requirements of the information and reporting check, the secretariat will publish the request for issuance on the UNFCCC website, and **the request for issuance shall be deemed received by the EB for consideration of issuance.**

(8) The secretariat will notify the PP(s), as identified in the MoC form, the DNA(ies) of the Party(ies) involved, and the DOE: that the secretariat has proposed request for issuance, that the request for issuance has been received by the EB for consideration of issuance, and the last date by which members of the EB or a Party involved may request a review of request for issuance, which shall be **28 days** after the date of publication of the request for registration

(9) The secretariat will prepare and send to the EB a summary note on the request for issuance, within **14 calendar days** of date of publication of the request for issuance

Whether a Party involved in a CDM project activity or at least 3 EB members request a review of the request for issuance before 17:00 GMT of the last day of the 28 day period following the publication of the request for issuance.

Yes ([chap. 15-2](#))

No

(10) The EB shall instruct the CDM registry administrator to issue a specified quantity of CERs into the pending account of the EB of the CDM registry. The EB's instructions to the CDM registry administrator ([chap.21-1](#)) shall be communicated to the PP(s), as identified in the MoC form. The secretariat will make the instructions publicly available.

15-2. Procedures for review of requests for issuance

(Version 1.0)[EB55 Anx41]

(1) Commencement of Review

- ☞ If Party involved in a proposed CDM project activity or at least 3 EB members request a review of the request for issuance, the secretariat shall:
 - Notify the PPs and the DOE that verified and certified the claimed CERs;
 - Make publicly available an anonymous version of each request for review form;
 - Assign a team comprising 2 experts from the RIT to participate in the assessment of the request for review and appoint one of the assigned Team members to serve as the lead, who is responsible for all communications with the secretariat.

A request for review by a Party involved shall be sent by the relevant DNA to the EB, through the secretariat, using official means of communication (such as recognized official letterhead and signature or an official dedicated e-mail account). [EB54 Anx28 para20]
- ☞ The PPs and the DOE shall provide responses to the issues identified in the request for review no later than **28 calendar days** after the notification. For each issue raised in the request for review, the PPs and DOE shall either:
 - Respond by making any revisions to the monitoring report (MR) and attached spreadsheets, verification report (VR), and/or certification; or
 - Respond in writing by addressing why no revisions to the MR, VR, and/or certification are necessary.
- ☞ The secretariat shall schedule the commencement of the review of the request for issuance, and make these publicly available. Upon scheduling the commencement date, the secretariat shall inform the PPs and DOE of this date. The commencement of the review shall be defined as the date on which the secretariat notifies the PPs and the DOE that the review has commenced.



(2) Assessment

- ☞ The secretariat shall prepare an assessment of the request for issuance in the context of the reasons for the request for review, taking into account the responses of the PPs and the DOE. Concurrently and independently, the RIT Team shall prepare an assessment of the request for issuance, taking into account the responses of the PPs and the DOE. The secretariat and the RIT Team shall finalize their respective assessments no later than **2 weeks** after the commencement of the review.
- ☞ Each assessment shall include a proposed decision. Each proposed decision shall propose to either: (a) to approve the request for issuance; or (b) to reject the request for issuance. If a proposed decision is to reject the request for issuance, then the assessment shall include a proposed ruling, containing an explanation of the reasons and rationale.
- ☞ In addition both the secretariat and the RIT Team shall, in their assessments, highlight any policy issues of significant importance related to the policies and goals of the CDM. The secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the EB, shall bring these issues to the attention of the EB through the agenda of its meetings through the preparation of background notes and policy options.
- ☞ The RIT Team shall communicate its assessment to the EB by submitting it to the secretariat. The secretariat shall inform the EB of the availability of each assessment, and make each assessment available to the EB, together with any responses from the PP and DOE and any revision to the project documentation.

(3) Consideration by the EB

- ☞ If the assessment of the secretariat and the RIT Team contain the same proposed decision, then that shall become the final decision of the EB within **10 days**, unless a member of the EB objects to that. An objection by a member of the EB shall be made by notifying the Chair of the EB, giving reasons in writing, through the secretariat. The secretariat shall make the objection available to the EB.
- ☞ If an EB member objects to the proposed decision more than **2 weeks** prior to the next EB meeting, the matter shall be placed on the agenda of the next EB meeting (otherwise the subsequent EB meeting).
- ☞ If the assessments of the secretariat and the RIT Team contain different proposed decisions and the EB receives both proposed rulings more than **2 weeks** prior to the next EB meeting, the matter will be placed on the agenda of the next EB (otherwise the subsequent EB meeting).
- ☞ At the EB meeting for which the matter is placed on the agenda, the EB shall decide to either: **to approved the request for issuance**; or **to reject the request for issuance**.



(4) Finalization and implementation of the ruling

- ☞ If a final decision approves request for issuance, the EB shall instruct the CDM registry administrator to issue a specified quantity of CERs into the pending account of the EB of the CDM registry. The EB's instructions to the CDM registry administrator shall be communicated to the PP(s), as identified in the MoC form. The secretariat will make the instructions publicly available on the UNFCCC website.
- ☞ If the final decision rejects the request for issuance, the secretariat shall update the information on the UNFCCC CDM website accordingly on the first working day subsequent to the finalization of the decision. Furthermore, within **3 weeks** of the final decision of the EB, the secretariat will provide the Chair of the EB with an information note, which shall contain a proposed final ruling incorporating the final decision.
- ☞ Once approved by the Chair of the Board, the secretariat shall make the proposed final ruling available to the EB. The proposed final ruling shall become the final after **10 days**, unless a member of the EB objects to the proposed final ruling.
- ☞ An objection by a member of the EB shall be made by notifying the Chair of the EB, giving reasons in writing, through the secretariat. The secretariat shall make the objection available to the EB.
- ☞ If an EB member objects to the proposed final ruling more than **2 weeks** prior to the next EB meeting, the matter shall be placed on the agenda of the next EB meeting (otherwise the subsequent EB meeting).
- ☞ This formal ruling shall be made publicly available by the secretariat once approved by the EB.

15-3. Procedures for withdrawal of a request for issuance of CERs [EB54 Anx33]

Applicability

- ☞ The procedure shall be applied if a DOE wishes to request the withdrawal of a request for issuance submitted to the EB in cases where:
 - ⇒ The PPs voluntarily wish to withdraw the request for issuance for the specified monitoring period;
 - ⇒ The DOE has revised its verification report and/or certification decision based on new insights.

- ☞ The DOE shall submit to the secretariat the form for submission of a request for withdrawal of a request for issuance CDM: Request for withdrawal form”(F-CDM-WI) dully completed by uploading it through the dedicated internet interface on the UNFCCC CDM website.
- ☞ Upon receipt of the request for withdrawal, the secretariat shall as soon as possible check the documents submitted.
- ☞ The types of request for withdrawal of request for issuance, and the procedures applicable to each type of withdrawal are as follows:

Type 1

- ☞ The DOE requests the withdrawal of the request for issuance prior to the publication of the request for issuance.
 - ⇒ The request for issuance for the specified monitoring period will not be marked “withdrawn”. If the DOE re-submits the request for issuance for the same monitoring period after such a withdrawal, the resubmission shall be treated as a new submission.

Type 2


- ☞ The DOE requests the withdrawal of the request for issuance during the 15 day period for requesting a review.
 - ⇒ The request for issuance for the specified monitoring period will be marked “withdrawn”. If the DOE intends to re-submit the request for issuance for the same monitoring period after such a withdrawal, the DOE may re-submit the request without requesting permission from the EB.

Type 3

- ☞ The DOE requests the withdrawal of the request for issuance subsequent to receiving a request for review.
 - ⇒ The request for issuance for the specified monitoring period will be marked “withdrawn.” Type 3 requests must be submitted and considered complete **2 weeks** prior to EB meeting at which the request for review/review/corrections have been scheduled to be considered. If the DOE intends to re-submit the request for issuance for the same monitoring period after such a withdrawal, the DOE shall request a permission to the EB to re-submit such a request.

- ☞ Submission of requests for withdrawal will be incorporated into the framework for addressing noncompliance by DOEs.

16. Distribution of CERs



- ◆ Upon being instructed by the EB to issue CERs for a CDM project activity, the CDM registry administrator shall, promptly, issue the specified quantity of CERs into the pending account of the EB in the CDM registry. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p19 para66]
- ◆ The issuance of CERs, in accordance with the distribution agreement, shall be effected only when the share of proceeds to cover administrative expenses (SOP-Admin) of the CDM has been received. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p98 para37]
 - ☞ The **SOP-Admin** shall be:
 - ⇒ **USD 0.10** per CER issued for the 1st 15,000 t-CO₂ equivalent for which issuance is requested in a given calendar year;
 - ⇒ **USD 0.20** per CER issued for any amount in excess of 15,000 t-CO₂ equivalent for which issuance is requested in a given calendar year. [EB23 Anx35, para1]
 - ☞ The registration fee shall be deducted from the SOP-Admin. (chap.12-3)
 - ☞ No registration fee and share of proceeds at issuance have to be paid for CDM project activities hosted in least developed countries. [EB37 Anx20, para5]

Among issued CERs, 2% of those will be deducted for share of proceeds to assist developing Parties that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change to meet the costs of adaptation (SOP-Adaptation). [CP/2001/13/Ad2, p23 para15(a)]

- ☞ CDM project activities in least developed country Parties shall be exempt from the SOP to assist with the costs of adaptation. [CP/2001/13/Ad2, p23 para15(b)]

- ◆ CERs are forwarded to the registry accounts of PPs, in accordance with their request. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p20 para66(b)]
- ◆ The decision on the distribution of CERs shall exclusively be taken by PPs. [Glos ver5, p25]
 - ☞ PPs shall communicate with the EB, through the secretariat, in writing in accordance with the “modalities of communication” as indicated at the time of registration or as subsequently altered.
 - ☞ If a PP does not wish to be involved in taking decisions on the distribution of CERs, this shall be communicated to the EB through the secretariat at the latest when the request regarding the distribution is made.
 - ☞ The request regarding the distribution of CERs can only be changed if all signatories have agreed to the change and signed the appropriate document. [Glos ver5, p26]
- ◆ Requests for the partial distribution of CERs issued in a single transaction shall be allowed. [EB21 Rep, para70]

BOX: Transferring CERs from the CDM registry

The CDM registry is to enable non-Annex I Parties, and entities from non-Annex I Parties, to transfer CERs from their holding accounts in the CDM registry to accounts in national registries. [CP/2004/2/, p15 para58]

17. Renewal of crediting period

The renewal of a crediting period of a registered CDM project activity shall only be granted if a DOE determines and informs the EB that the original project baseline is still valid or has been updated taking account of new data where applicable.

(1) Preparation of a revised PDD

PPs shall update those sections of the PDD relating to the baseline, estimated emission reductions and the monitoring plan using an AM as follows:

- ☞ a) The latest AM, applied in the original PDD of the registered CDM project activity, shall be used whenever applicable;
- ☞ b) If a baseline and monitoring methodology, applied in the original PDD, was withdrawn after the registration of the CDM project activity and replaced by a consolidated methodology, the latest approved version of the respective consolidated methodology shall be used;
- ☞ c) If the registered CDM project activity does not meet applicability criteria of the options provided for by a) or b), due to their revision or due to the update of the baseline, the PPs shall either select another applicable AM or request a deviation from an AM for the purpose of renewal.

The demonstration of the validity of the original baseline or its update does not require a reassessment of the baseline scenario, but rather an assessment of the emissions which would have resulted from that scenario.

(2) Application for renewal of a crediting period

PPs shall notify the secretariat of their intention to request a renewal of a crediting period of the registered CDM project activity by submitting an updated PDD and informing of their selection of a DOE, within **9 to 6 months** prior to the date of expiration of the current crediting period.

- ☞ For the purpose of renewal of the crediting period it is not necessary to obtain a new letter of approval from Parties involved.
- ☞ No fee is due for the application for the renewal of the crediting period.

The DOE's validation opinion shall assess the validity of the original baseline or its update through an assessment of the following issues:

- ☞ a) an impact of new relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances on the baseline taking into account relevant EB guidance; and
- ☞ b) the correctness of the application of an AM for the determination of the continued validity of the baseline or its update, and the estimation of emission reductions for the applicable crediting period.

A DOE shall submit a request for renewal of a crediting period of a registered CDM project activity using the form "Renewal of the crediting period of a registered CDM project activity" (F-CDM-REN) along with the updated PDD and validation report.

If the notification of the intention to request a renewal of a crediting period is not received by the secretariat **6 months** prior to the date of expiration of the current crediting period, the PP shall not be entitled to the issuance of CERs for the period from the expiration date of the current crediting period until the date on which the crediting period is deemed renewed.

(3) Processing of an application

Upon receipt of a request for renewal of a crediting period of the registered CDM project activity the secretariat will determine whether all information and documentation requested in the F-CDM-REN form has been provided by the DOE.

Once the secretariat has determined that the request is complete it shall be made publicly available through the UNFCCC CDM web site for a period of **4 weeks**. The secretariat shall announce a request for renewal of a crediting period of the registered CDM project activity on the UNFCCC CDM web site and notify the requesting DOE, the PPs and the DNA.

Unless there is a request for review within **4 weeks** after the publication of the request for renewal, the crediting period of the registered CDM project activity shall be deemed renewed.

- ☞ The procedures to be applied for review of a request for renewal of a crediting period are the same as the procedures for review of registration. ([chap.12-2](#))
- ☞ The start date of the renewed crediting period is the first day after the ending date of the previous crediting period.

Step 1: Assess the validity of the current baseline for the next crediting period

Step 1.1: Assess compliance of the current baseline with relevant mandatory national and/or sectoral policies

The current baseline complies with all relevant mandatory national and/or sectoral policies which have come into effect after the submission of the project activity for validation or the submission of the previous request for renewal of the crediting period and are applicable at the time of requesting renewal of the crediting period?

No or if it cannot be shown that the policies are systematically not enforced and that non-compliance with those policies is widespread in the country or region

Yes

Step 1.2: Assess the impact of circumstances

Assess the impact of circumstances existing at the time of requesting renewal of the crediting period on the current baseline emissions, without reassessing the baseline scenario. The new circumstances make a continued validity of the current baseline not plausible?

Not plausible

Plausible

Step 1.3: Assess whether the continuation of the use of current baseline equipment(s) is technically possible

This Sub-step should only be applied if the baseline is the continuation of the current practice. Assess whether the remaining technical lifetime of the equipment that would have continued to be used in the absence of the project activity exceeds the crediting period for which renewal is requested.

Yes

No

Step 1.4: Assessment of the validity of the data and parameters

Assess whether data and parameters that were only determined at the start of the crediting period and not monitored during the crediting period are still valid or whether they should be updated. Updates should be undertaken in the following cases:

Not valid

- ☞ Where IPCC default values are used, the values should be updated if any new default values have been adopted and published by the IPCC;
- ☞ Where emission factors, values or emission benchmarks are used and determined only once for the crediting period, they should be updated, except if those figures are based on the historical situation at the site of the project activity and can not be updated because the historical situation does not exist anymore as a result of the CDM project activity.

Valid

If the application of Steps 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 confirmed that the current baseline as well as data and parameters are still valid for the subsequent crediting period, then this baseline, data and parameters can be used for the renewed crediting period.

The current baseline needs to be updated for the subsequent crediting period.

Step 2: Update the current baseline and the data and parameters

Step 2.1: Update the current baseline

Update the current baseline emissions for the subsequent crediting period, without reassessing the baseline scenario, based on the latest version of the AM applicable to the project activity. The procedure should be applied in the context of the sectoral policies and circumstances that are applicable at the time of request for renewal of the crediting period.

Step 2.2: Update the data and parameters

If the application of Step 1.4 showed that the data and/or parameter(s) that were only determined at the start of the crediting period and not monitored during the crediting period are not valid anymore, PPs should update all applicable data and parameters, following the guidance in Step 1.4.

18. Small-scale CDM (SSC)

18-1. Definition of small-scale CDM (SSC)

Simplified modalities and procedures are applicable for the following small-scale CDM project activities. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p43-45]

- ☞ Project activities using a renewable crediting period shall reassess their compliance with the limits at the time when they request renewal of the crediting period. [Glos ver5, p30]


Type I project activities shall remain the same, such that renewable energy project activities shall have a maximum output capacity of 15 MW (or an appropriate equivalent)

[CMP/2006/10/Ad1, p8 para28(a)]


- ☞ As MW(e) is the most common denomination, and MW(th) only refers to the production of heat which can also be derived from MW(e), the EB agreed to define MW as MW(e) and otherwise to apply an appropriate conversion factor.

[Glos ver5, p30]

Type II project activities or those relating to improvements in energy efficiency which reduce energy consumption, on the supply and/or demand side, shall be limited to those with a maximum output of 60 GWh/y (or an appropriate equivalent); [CMP/2006/10/Ad1, p8 para28(b)]



Type III project activities, otherwise known as other project activities, shall be limited to those that result in emission reductions of less than or equal to 60 kt CO₂ equivalent annually; [CMP/2006/10/Ad1, p8 para28(c)]



Eligibility of SSC project activities [EB55 Anx35 para3]

- ◆ SSC project activities shall remain under the limits for SSC project activities types every year during the crediting period. If a project activity goes beyond the limit of its type in any year of the crediting period, the emission reduction that can be claimed during this particular year will be capped by the maximum emission reduction estimated in the CDM-SSC-PDD by the PP for that year during the crediting period.
- ◆ PPs shall provide:
 - ☞ For type I: Proof that the installed capacity of the proposed project activity will not increase beyond 15 MW;
 - ☞ For type II: Proof that the efficiency improvements do not exceed the equivalent of 60 GWh/year every year throughout the crediting period;
 - ☞ For type III: An estimation of emission reductions by the project activity over the crediting period and proof that the emission reductions every year will not go beyond the limits of 60 kt-CO₂/y over the entire crediting period.
- ◆ The three types of project activities outlined above, are mutually exclusive. In a project activity with more than one component that will benefit from simplified CDM modalities and procedures, each component shall meet the threshold criterion of each applicable type, e.g. for a project with both a renewable energy and an energy efficiency component, the renewable energy component shall meet the criterion for “renewable energy” and the energy efficiency component that for “energy efficiency”.
- ◆ The sum of the size of components of a project activity belonging to the same type (capacity for Type I, energy savings for Type II and emission reductions for Type III) should not exceed the limits for SSC project.
- ◆ Definition of “maximum output capacity equivalent of up to 15 MW (or an appropriate equivalent)”, how to determine equipment performance, etc are written in the Guidelines to SSC CDM methodologies. [EB55 Anx35]

18-2. Simplified modalities and procedures

◆ SSC project activities shall follow the stages of the project cycle specified in the CDM M&P. In order to reduce transaction costs, however, modalities and procedures are simplified for SSC project activities, as follows: [\[CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p45 para9\]](#)

- ☞ Project activities may be bundled or portfolio bundled at the following stages in the project cycle: the PDD, validation, registration, monitoring, verification and certification;
- ☞ The requirements for the PDD are reduced;
- ☞ Baselines methodologies by project category are simplified to reduce the cost of developing a project baseline;
- ☞ Monitoring plans are simplified to reduce monitoring costs;
- ☞ The same OE may undertake validation, and verification and certification.

Leakage in SSC project activities

- ☞ In the cases where leakage is to be considered, it shall be considered only within the boundaries of non-Annex I Parties. [\[Glos ver5, p20\]](#)
- ☞ For small-scale energy CDM project activities involving renewable biomass, there are three types of emission sources that are potentially significant (>10% of emission reductions) and attributable to the project activities. [\[EB28 Anx35 para2-5\]](#)
- ☞ The emission impact of continued use of displaced equipment outside the project boundary is subject to uncertainty and difficult to quantify. Therefore leakage from equipment transfer from within to outside the project boundary may be excluded from consideration in SSC methodologies. [\[EB44 Rep para50\]](#)

General guidelines for sampling and surveys for SSC project activities [\[EB50 Anx30\]](#)

- ☞ Several AMs require estimates of parameter values using sampling methods. This guidelines are to specify the reliability requirements and provide guidance on appropriate sampling methods.
- ☞ While the focus of the guidelines is on end-use energy efficiency and renewable energy applications, its application is not limited to these applications alone.

BOX: Simplified baseline and monitoring methodologies

- ☞ There is a “Guidelines to SSC CDM methodologies”. (Version 14) [\[EB55 Anx35\]](#)
- ☞ There is a “Guidelines for Completing CDM-SSC-PDD, F-CDM-SSC-Subm and F-CDM-SSC-BUNDLE”. (Version 9) [\[EB34 Anx9\]](#)
- ☞ There are approved methodologies for small scale CDM project activities (AMS). [\(Att.2\)](#)
- ☞ There is a “Procedures for submission and consideration of request for clarification on the application of approved small scale methodologies (applies mutatis mutandis to small-scale A/R)”. (Version 1) [\[EB34 Anx6\]](#)
- ☞ There is a “Procedures for the revisions of an approved small scale methodology by the EB”. (Version 1) [\[EB34 Anx7\]](#)
- ☞ There is a “Procedures for submission and consideration of proposed SSC methodologies”. (Version 3) [\[EB40 Anx2\]](#)

Additionality for SSC project activities [http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/SSCmethodologies/AppB_SSC_AttachmentA.pdf]

- ◆ The attachment A to Appendix B (=CMP/2005/8/Ad1_p52) corresponds to list of barriers PPs shall use in order to demonstrate that a small-scale project activity would not have occurred otherwise (i.e. is additional).
- ◆ PPs shall provide an explanation to show that the project activity would not have occurred anyway due to at least one of the following barriers:

Investment barrier:

☞ a financially more viable alternative to the project activity would have led to higher emissions;

Technological barrier:

☞ a less technologically advanced alternative to the project activity involves lower risks due to the performance uncertainty or low market share of the new technology adopted for the project activity and so would have led to higher emissions;

Barrier due to prevailing practice:

☞ prevailing practice or existing regulatory or policy requirements would have led to implementation of a technology with higher emissions;

Other barriers:

☞ without the project activity, for another specific reason identified by the PP, such as institutional barriers or limited information, managerial resources, organizational capacity, financial resources, or capacity to absorb new technologies, emissions would have been higher.

- ◆ Quantitative evidence that the project activity would otherwise not be implemented may be provided instead of a demonstration based on the barriers listed above.

Non-binding best practice examples to demonstrate additionality for SSC project activities [[EB35 Anx34](#)]

- ☞ Best practice examples of investment barrier include but are not limited to, the application of investment comparison analysis using a relevant financial indicator, application of a benchmark analysis or a simple cost analysis (where CDM is the only revenue stream such as end-use energy efficiency). It is recommended to use national or global accounting practices and standards for such an analysis.
- ☞ Best practice examples of access-to-finance barrier (the project activity could not access appropriate capital without consideration of the CDM revenues) include but are not limited to, the demonstration of limited access to capital in the absence of the CDM, such as a statement from the financing bank that the revenues from the CDM are critical in the approval of the loan.
- ☞ Best practice examples of technological barrier include but are not limited to, the demonstration of nonavailability of human capacity to operate and maintain the technology, lack of infrastructure to utilize the technology, unavailability of the technology and high level of technology risk.
- ☞ Best practice examples of barrier due to prevailing practice include but are not limited to, the demonstration that project is among the first of its kind in terms of technology, geography, sector, type of investment and investor, market etc.

BOX: Additionality for specific SSC project activities ([Att.5](#))

☞ For project activities up to **5 MW** that employ renewable energy as their primary technology and for energy efficiency project activities that aim to achieve energy savings at a scale of no more than **20 GWh/y**, simplified modalities for demonstrating additionality has been approved by the EB. [[EB55 Anx35 para6](#)]

18-3. Bundling of SSC

Bundling [Glos ver5, p12]

- ◆ Bundle is defined as, bringing together of several SSC project activities, to form a single CDM project activity or portfolio without the loss of distinctive characteristics of each project activity.
- ◆ Project activities within a bundle can be arranged in one or more sub-bundles, with each project activity retaining its distinctive characteristics.
 - ☞ Such characteristics include its:
 - technology/measure; location; and application of simplified baseline methodology.
- ◆ Project activities within a sub-bundle belong to the same type. The sum of the output capacity of projects within a sub-bundle must not be more than the maximum output capacity limit for its type.

Debundling [EB54 Anx13]

- ◆ Debundling is defined as the fragmentation of a large scale project activity into smaller parts.
- ◆ A small-scale project activity that is part of a large scale project activity is not eligible to use the simplified modalities and procedures for SSC project activities.
- ◆ There is the “Guidelines on assessment of de-bundling for SSC project activities (Version 03)”. [EB54 Anx13]
- ◆ A proposed small-scale project activity shall be deemed to be a debundled component of a large scale project activity if there is a registered SSC project activity or a request for registration by another small-scale project activity:
 - ☞ By the same project participants;
 - ☞ In the same project category and technology/measure;
 - ☞ Registered within the previous 2 years;
 - ☞ Whose project boundary is within 1 km of the project boundary of the proposed small-scale activity at the closest point.
- ◆ The flow chart for judging the occurrence of debundling is described in the guidance.

General Characteristics [EB34 Anx10, para1-8]

- ☞ Project activities wishing to be bundled shall indicate this when making the request for registration.
- ☞ The composition of bundles shall not change over time. A project activity shall not be taken out of a bundle nor shall a project activity be added to the bundle after registration.
- ☞ All project activities in the bundle shall have the same crediting period.
- ☞ PPs shall at registration provide a written statement along with the submission of the bundle indicating:
 - ⇒ The agreement of all PPs to bundle their individual project activities;
 - ⇒ One PP who represents all PPs in order to communicate with the EB.
- ☞ Bundled project activities shall be submitted in a single submission to the EB and pay only one fee proportional to the amount of expected average annual emission reductions of the total bundle.
- ☞ If 3 EB members or a Party involved in a project activity requests the review of the project activity, the total bundle remains under review.
- ☞ A form with information related to the bundle “F-CDM-BUNDLE” must be included in the submission.

Letter of approval [EB34 Anx10, para15]

The letter of approval by the host Party(ies) has to indicate that the Party is aware that the project activity(ies) taking place in its territory is part of the bundle.

Overall monitoring plan [Glos ver5, p23]

- ☞ If project activities are bundled, a separate monitoring plan shall apply for each of the constituent project activities, or an overall monitoring plan shall apply for the bundled projects, as determined by the DOE at validation.
- ☞ Only projects within the same category and technology/measure can use an overall monitoring plan.

Validation and verification [EB34 Anx10, para12-14]

- ☞ One DOE can validate this bundle.
- ☞ One verification report is adequate, one issuance will be made at the same time for the same period, and a single serial number will be issued for all the project.

19. Afforestation and Reforestation CDM (A/R CDM)

19-1. Overview of A/R CDM

Rules and procedures regarding A/R CDM project activities are similar to those of GHG emission reduction CDM project activity. The most significant difference of A/R CDM is non-permanence. In A/R CDM, CO₂ once sequestered in trees could be release back into the atmosphere in an occasion of such as forest fire or die back from pests. The issue of non-permanence is addressed by creating different type of CERs, namely temporary CERs (**tCERs**) and long-term CERs (**ICERs**).

Procedures to demonstrate the eligibility of lands for A/R CDM project activities [\[EB35 Anx18\]](#)

- ◆ 1. PPs shall provide evidence that the land within the planned project boundary is eligible for an A/R CDM project activity. (a) Demonstrate that the land at the moment the project starts does not contain forest by providing transparent information that:
 - ⇒ Vegetation on the land is below the forest thresholds adopted by the host country; and
 - ⇒ All young natural stands and all plantations on the land are not expected to reach the minimum crown cover and minimum height chosen by the host country to define forest; and
 - ⇒ The land is not temporarily unstocked, as a result of human intervention.(b) Demonstrate that the activity is a reforestation or afforestation project activity:
 - ⇒ For reforestation project activities, demonstrate that the land was not forest by demonstrating that the conditions outlined under (a) above also applied to the land on 31 December 1989.
 - ⇒ For afforestation project activities, demonstrate that for at least 50 years vegetation on the land has been below the thresholds adopted by the host country for definition of forest.
- ◆ 2. In order to demonstrate steps 1 (a) and 1 (b), PPs shall provide information that reliably discriminates between forest and non-forest land according to the particular thresholds, *inter alia*:
 - ☞ (a) Aerial photographs or satellite imagery complemented by ground reference data; or
 - ☞ (b) Land use or land cover information from maps or digital spatial datasets; or
 - ☞ (c) Ground based surveys (land use or land cover information from permits, plans, or information from local registers such as cadastre, owners registers, or other land registers).If options (a), (b), and (c) are not available/applicable, project participants shall submit a written testimony which was produced by following a Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) methodology or a standard Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) as practised in the host country.

- ☞ An non-Annex I Party may host an A/R CDM project, if it has selected and reported to the EB through its DNA:
 - (a) A single minimum tree crown cover value between 10 and 30%; and
 - (b) A single minimum land area value between 0.05 and 1 hectare; and
 - (c) A single minimum tree height value between 2 and 5 metres. [\[CP/2003/6/Ad2, p17 para7-8\]](#)
- ☞ There is the procedure on change in the selected values of minimum tree crown cover, minimum land area and minimum tree height required for hosting an A/R CDM project activity. [\[EB40 Anx1\]](#)

Crediting period of the A/R CDM project activity

[\[CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p67 para23\]](#)

- ◆ It begins at the start of the A/R CDM project activity and can be either:
 - ☞ A maximum of 20 years, may be renewed twice (total 60 years maximum)
 - ☞ A maximum of 30 years

- ☞ A/R CDM project activity starting after 1 January 2000 can be validated and registered after 31 December 2005 as long as the 1st verification of the project activity occurs after the date of registration.
- ☞ Given that the crediting period starts at the same date as the starting date of the project activity, the projects starting 2000 onwards can accrue tCERs/ICERs as of the starting date. [\[EB21 Rep, para64\]](#)
- ☞ The initial verification and certification of an A/R CDM project activity may be undertaken at a time selected by the PPs. Thereafter, verification and certification shall be carried out **every 5 years** until the end of the crediting period. [\[CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p69 para32\]](#)

Project boundary [\[EB44 Rep para38\]](#)

- ◆ The Board agreed to the “Guidance on the application of the definition of project boundary to A/R CDM project activities” [\[EB44 Anx14\]](#), which provides the option for fixing the project boundary at the first verification, thereby allowing for more flexibility in delineation of areas of land at registration.

19-2. Non-permanence of A/R CDM (tCER and ICER)

Temporary CERs (**tCERs**) and Long-term CERs (**ICERs**):

- ☞ The PPs shall select one of the following approaches to addressing non-permanence of an A/R CDM project activity [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p70 para38]:
 - (a) Issuance of **tCERs** for the net GHG removals by sinks achieved by the project activity since the project starting date; or
 - (b) Issuance of **ICERs** for the net GHG removals by sinks achieved by the project activity during each verification period
- ☞ The approach chosen to address non-permanence shall remain fixed for the crediting period including any renewals.


Expiry of tCERs and ICERs

- ☞ Each **tCER** shall expire at the end of the commitment period subsequent to the commitment period for which it was issued. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p71 para42]
- ☞ Each **ICER** shall expire at the end of the crediting period or, where a renewable crediting period is chosen, at the end of the last crediting period of the project activity. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p71 para46]

Example: Changes in net GHG removals by a A/R project activity


The chart below shows changes in GHG removals by an A/R project activity. In the next two pages, an explanation of issuance and expiration of **tCERs** and **ICERs** will be given based on the assumptions shown in the chart below.

- ☞ Trees are planted in 2007.
- ☞ 1st issuance of **tCERs** or **ICERs** takes place in 2011. Trees are left to grow during the 1st and 2nd commitment periods and 2nd issuance of **tCERs** or **ICERs** takes place in 2016.
- ☞ **Assuming** each commitment period (CP) would be **5 years**.
- ☞ Trees are cut in 2017 before the end of the 2nd commitment period (CP) and 3rd issuance takes place in 2021. The last issuance takes place in 2036.
- ☞ Each **tCER** or **ICER** issued will be used for achieving a Party's emission reduction target.
- ☞ Crediting period is 30 years without renewal.



19-2. Non-permanence of A/R CDM (tCER and ICER)

Example: From issuance to replacement of tCERs




19-2. Non-permanence of A/R CDM (tCER and ICER)

Example: From issuance to replacement of **ICERs**

Actions taken by PPs

Actions taken by Annex I Parties



19-3. Small-scale A/R CDM

Definition of small-scale A/R CDM project activity

- ◆ Those that are expected to result in net GHG removals by sinks of less than 16,000 t-CO₂/year; [CMP/2007/9/Ad1, p26]
 - ☞ The average projected net GHG removals by sinks for each verification period shall not exceed 16,000 t-CO₂/year. [CP/2004/10/Ad2, p26 para1(b)]
- ◆ Developed or implemented by low-income communities and individuals as determined by the host Party. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p62 para1(i)]
 - ☞ Prior to the submission of the validation report to the EB, the DOE have received from the PPs a written declaration of that. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p85 para15(b)]

If a small-scale A/R CDM project activity results in net GHG removals by sinks greater than 16,000t of CO₂ per year, the excess removals will not be eligible for the issuance of **tCERs** or **ICERs**. [CMP/2007/9/Ad1, p26]

The “General principles for bundling” [EB21, Anx 21] may not be applicable mutatis mutandis in the context of bundles of small scale A/R project activities created for the purpose of validation. [EB32 Rep, para42]

Simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale A/R CDM project activity

- ◆ In order to reduce transaction costs, modalities and procedures are simplified for small-scale A/R CDM project activities as follows: [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p82 para1]
 - ☞ The requirements for the project design document are reduced;
 - ☞ Baseline methodologies by project type are simplified to reduce the cost of developing a project baseline;
 - ☞ Monitoring plans are simplified, including simplified monitoring requirements, to reduce monitoring costs;
 - ☞ The same operational entity may undertake validation, and verification and certification.
- ◆ Small-scale A/R CDM project activities shall be:
 - ☞ exempt from the share of proceeds to be used to assist developing country Parties that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change;
 - ☞ entitled to a reduced level of the non-reimbursable fee for requesting registration and a reduced rate of the share of proceeds to cover administrative expenses of the CDM. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p83 para13]

☞ There is a “Guidelines for completing the simplified project design document for small scale A/R (CDM-SSC-AR-PDD) and the form for submissions on methodologies for small scale A/R CDM project activities (F-CDM-SSC-AR-Subm) .” (Version 4) [EB35 Anx23]

20. CDM Programme of activities

20-1. Overview of programme of activities

A programme of activities (PoA) and a CDM programme activity (CPA)

A programme of activities (**PoA**) is [Glos ver.5, p23] :

- ☞ a voluntary coordinated action;
- ☞ by a private or public entity which coordinates and implements any policy/measure or stated goal (i.e. incentive schemes and voluntary programmes);
- ☞ which leads to GHG emission reductions or net removals by sinks that are additional to any that would occur in the absence of the **PoA**;
- ☞ via an unlimited number of CDM programme activities (**CPAs**) .

A CDM programme activity (**CPA**) is [Glos ver.5, p12] :

- ☞ a project activity under a programme of activities,
- ☞ a single, or a set of interrelated measure(s), to reduce GHG emissions or result in net removals by sinks, applied within a designated area defined in the baseline methodology.
 - ⇒ The applied AM shall define whether the **CPA** is undertaken in a single facility/installation/land or undertaken in multiple facilities/installations/land.
 - ⇒ In the case of **CPAs** which individually do not exceed the SSC threshold, SSC methodologies may be used once they have first been reviewed and, as needed, revised to account for leakage in the context of a **CPA**.

Coordinating or managing entity (CME) [Glos ver.5, p14]

- ☞ A **PoA** shall be proposed by the CME which shall be a PP authorized by all participating host country DNAs involved and identified in the MoC ([chap.4-7](#)) as the entity which communicates with the EB, including on matters relating to the distribution of CERs.
- ☞ PPs of the **PoA** shall make arrangements with the CME, relating to communications, distribution of CERs and change of PPs.
- ☞ The operators of individual **CPAs** are not required to be PPs. CDM programme participation is only recorded at the **PoA** level. [EB55 Anx38 para8]
- ☞ The procedures for MoC between PPs and the EB shall apply, with the exception that the CME shall be either sole or joint focal point for each area of communication. The limit of joint focal points for the programme shall be 5, or equal to the number of host Parties if greater than 5. [EB55 Anx38 para11]

☞ The CME shall obtain letters of approval from each host Party and Annex I Party which wishes to be involved in the **PoA**, in accordance with the guidance provided by the EB. The CME shall obtain letters of authorization of its coordination of the **PoA** from each Host Party. [EB55 Anx38 para9-10]

☞ If, subsequent to the registration of the programme, the CME has changed then the DOE who is undertaking the next inclusion of a **CPA** shall submit, (a) new letter(s) of authorization by the each respective host Party, (b) a confirmation from new CME that the **PoA** will be the same set framework, and (c) a validation opinion by a DOE regarding the compliance of the new CME. [EB55 Anx38 para12]

Boundary

- ☞ The physical boundary of a **PoA** may extend to more than one country provided that each participating non-annex I host Party provides confirmation that the **PoA**, and thereby all **CPAs**, assists it in achieving sustainable development. [Glos ver.5, p12]
- ☞ Definition of the boundary for the **PoA** in terms of a geographical area (e.g., municipality, region within a country, country or several countries) within which all **CPAs** included in the **PoA** will be implemented, taking into consideration all applicable national and/or sectoral policies and regulations within that chosen boundary must be reflected in the determination of the baseline. [EB55 Anx38 para6(b)]

Registration fee for a **PoA** [EB33 Rep., para60]

- ☞ The registration fee for a **PoA** is based on the total expected annual emission reductions of the **CPA(s)** that will be submitted together with the request for registration of the **PoA**. The calculation of the amount to be paid and the procedures for payment will follow mutatis mutandis the existing rules. ([chap.12-3](#))
- ☞ For each **CPA** which is included subsequently, no fee is to be paid.
- ☞ Fees are to be paid by the CME to the secretariat.

20-1. Overview of programme of activities

Baseline methodology

- ☞ Description of a typical **CPA** that will be included in the **PoA** covering the technology or measures to be used, justification and application of the choice of an AM (or combination of AMs). [EB55 Anx38 para6(f)]
- ⇒ Such combination will only be allowed once approved in accordance with “Procedures for approval of the application of multiple methodologies to a **PoAs**” (chap.20-2)

- ☞ If the AM is put on hold or withdrawn, not due to the purpose of inclusion in a consolidated methodology, no new **CPAs** shall be included to the **PoA**.
- ☞ If the methodology, subsequent to being placed on hold or withdrawn, is revised or replaced, the **PoA** shall be revised accordingly. The changes shall be subsequently documented in a new version of **PoA**, validated by a DOE and approved by the EB. The EB’s approval defines a new version of the **PoA** and the **PoA** specific **CDM-CPA-DD**. Such revisions to the **PoA** are not required in cases where a methodology is revised without being placed on hold or withdrawn.
- ☞ Once changes have been approved by the EB, the inclusion of all new **CPAs** shall follow the latest version of the **PoA** specific **CDM-CPA-DD**.
- ☞ **CPAs** that were included before the methodology was put on hold, shall apply the latest version of the **PoA** specific **CDM-CPA-DD** at the time of the renewal of the crediting period. [EB55 Anx38 para18-21]

BOX: De-bundling under a PoA

There is the “Guidance for determining the occurrence of de-bundling under a **PoA**.” [EB47 Anx32, para7-9]. The flow chart for judging the occurrence of de-bundling under a **PoA** is described in the guidance.

Duration of the PoA [Glos ver.5, p17]

- ☞ The duration of the **PoA**, shall not exceed **28 years** (**60 years** for A/R project activities), and shall be defined by the entity at the time of request for registration of the **PoA**.
- ⇒ Any **CPA** can be added to the **PoA** at any time during the duration of the **PoA** by the CME. The entity shall inform the EB of the adding of **CPA(s)** through a DOE using a predefined format.

Crediting period and starting date of the CPA [Glos ver.5, p14]

- ☞ A crediting period shall not extend beyond the operational lifetime of the **CPA**.
- ☞ Starting date, type (fixed or renewable) and duration of the crediting period of the **CPA** shall be decided taking into account that the starting date of a crediting period of the **CPA** shall be the date of its inclusion in the registered **PoA** or any date thereafter.
 - ⇒ The starting date of a **CPA** is the earliest date at which either the implementation or construction or real action of a programme activity begins, and cannot be prior to the commencement of validation of the **PoA**, i.e. the date on which the **CDM-PoA-DD** is first published for global stakeholder consultation [Glos ver.5, p28].
- ☞ The crediting period of a **CPA** will be either:
 - ⇒ A maximum of **7 years** (**20 years** for A/R project activities) which may be renewed at most 2 times or;
 - ⇒ A maximum of **10 years** (**30 years** for A/R project activities) with no option of renewal;
 - ⇒ However, the duration of crediting period of any **CPA** shall be limited to the end date of the **PoA** regardless of when the **CPA** was added.

- ☞ **PoAs** which have commenced validation prior to 31 December 2009 may include **CPAs** with a starting date between 22 June 2007 and the commencement of validation of the **PoA**, if a list of such specific **CPAs** is provided to validating DOE and UNFCCC secretariat prior to 31 January 2010. [EB47 Rep para72]

- ☞ The EB agreed that if an A/R project activity was started after 10 December 2005 and complies with the eligibility criteria for inclusion as an A/R **CPA** under the A/R **PoA**, then the project activity may be included as an A/R **CPA** and its crediting period starts at the starting date of the project activity. [EB53 Rep para40]

20-2. Procedures for programme of activities

Procedures for registration of a **PoA** as a single CDM project activity and issuance of CERs for a **PoA** (Version 4) [EB55 Anx38]

Preparation of a **CDM-PoA-DD** and the **CDM-CPA-DD**

- ☞ The **CDM-PoA-DD** shall include, *inter alia*, the following information:
 - ⇒ Description of the operational and management arrangements established by the CME for the implementation of the **PoA**, including a record keeping system for each **CPA** under the **PoA**, a system/procedure to avoid double accounting e.g. to avoid the case of including a new **CPA** that has been already registered either as CDM project activity or as a **CPA** of another **PoA**, the provisions to ensure that those operating the **CPA** are aware and have agreed that their activity is being subscribed to the **PoA**; [EB55 Anx38 para6(i)]
 - ⇒ If the CME does not wish to have all **CPAs** verified, a description of the proposed statistically sound sampling method/procedure to be used by DOEs for verification of the amount of GHG emission reductions or removals achieved by **CPAs** under the **PoA**. [EB55 Anx38 para6(k)]
- ☞ The **CDM-CPA-DD** shall include, *inter alia*, confirmation that the **CPA** is neither registered as a CDM project activity nor included in another registered **PoA**. [EB55 Anx38 para7(h)]

Request for issuance of CERs for a **PoA**

- ☞ A DOE who has not performed validation/inclusion/renewal of crediting period activities for the **PoA**, unless approved by the EB, shall, *inter alia*:
 - ⇒ Identify those **CPAs** that it shall consider for verification in accordance with the method/procedure to be used for verification,
 - ⇒ Take into account the possible existence of different versions of the **PoA** and the need to account for this in its sampling approach, to ensure that a statistically sound sample of **CPAs** from each version of the **PoA** are being verified.
- ☞ A DOE shall request issuance of CERs for a **PoA**. The request shall relate to all **CPAs** included in the **PoA** with a crediting period which overlaps with the specified monitoring period. The monitoring periods shall be consecutive.
- ☞ The period to request review by a Parties involved or 3 EB members shall be **6 weeks** from the date of receipt of the request for issuance.
- ☞ A DOE shall not request issuance of CERs for a **PoA** within **3 months** of the previous request for issuance. [EB55 Anx38 para35-39]

Inclusion of a crediting period of a **CPA** under a registered **PoA**

- ☞ A **CPA** can be included in a registered **PoA** at any time during the duration of the **PoA**. To include an additional **CPA** in a registered **PoA**, the CME shall forward the completed **CDM-CPA-DD** form to any DOE for consistency checking. The CME may forward more than one **CDM-CPA-DD** at one time.
- ☞ If consistency/integrity is confirmed, the DOE shall include the proposed **CPA(s)** in the registered **PoA** by forwarding the **CDM-CPA-DD** to the EB via uploading it through a dedicated interface on the CDM website. Such uploads shall be grouped and not occur more frequently than **once per month**.
- ☞ The **CDM-CPA-DD(s)** uploaded by the DOE will be automatically included in the registered **PoA** and displayed on the view page of that **PoA**. [EB55 Anx38 para22-24]
- ☞ There is “Procedures for review of erroneous inclusion of a **CPA**” (see next page)

Renewal of a crediting period of a **CPA** under a registered **PoA**

- ☞ The latest version of the “Procedures for Renewal of a Crediting Period of a Registered CDM project activity ([chap.17](#))” shall be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to a **PoA** every 7 years (20 years for A/R project activities).
 - ⇒ If the version of the **PoA** has been revised, the renewal shall occur 7 years (or 20 years for A/R project activities) after the approval of the revised version.
- ☞ To renew the crediting period of a **CPA**, the CME shall forward, after having ensured that the **CPA** meets all the requirements, the completed latest version of the **CDM-CPA-DD** to **any DOE**.
- ☞ If consistency/integrity is confirmed, the DOE shall renew the crediting period of the existing **CPA** by forwarding the **CDM-CPA-DD** to the EB via uploading it through a dedicated interface on the CDM website.
- ☞ The **CDM-CPA-DD(s)** uploaded by the DOE will automatically have its crediting period renewed and displayed on the view page of that **PoA**. [EB55 Anx38 para28-32]

20-2. Procedures for programme of activities

Procedures for approval of the application of multiple methodologies to a PoA (Version 1) [EB47 Anx31]

- (1) The DOE shall submit a request for approval to the secretariat together with the latest version of the **CDM-PoA-DD** and **CDM-CPA-DD**.
- (2) The secretariat shall evaluate the request for approval and place it on the agenda of the next meeting of the relevant Panel or WG, if the request has been received and considered complete **4 weeks** prior to the start of the meeting of the relevant Panel or WG.
- (3) The Panel or WG shall evaluate the request to determine whether the applied combination of methodologies will be sufficient to address all project emissions and leakages that may occur as a result of the implementation of the **CPA**.
- (4) If the Panel or WG considers the combination to be sufficient, the request shall be recommended for approval by the EB.
- (5) If the Panel or WG does not consider the combination to be sufficient, the request shall be rejected and the CME shall be recommended to submit a request for new methodology or a revision to an existing methodology to ensure such issues are addressed.
- (6) The secretariat shall make the recommendation of the Panel or WG publicly available, and forward it to the EB for final decision.
 - ☞ A combination of any one of the Type III methodologies where activities lead to generation of methane with any one of the Type I methodologies for utilising the methane generated for generation of renewable energy can be applied in **PoAs** without pre approval of the EB. [EB56 Rep para57]

Procedures for review of erroneous inclusion of a CPA (Version 2) [EB55 Anx37]

- ☞ Erroneous inclusion of a **CPA** into a **PoA** means that the **CPA** does not meet the eligibility criteria as specified in the **CDM-PoA-DD**.
- ☞ If a DNA of a Party involved in the **PoA** or a EB member identifies information that may disqualify a **CPA** from inclusion in the **PoA** or renewal of its crediting period, the EB shall be notified, by means of a request for review form within **1 year** after the inclusion of **CPA** into a registered **PoA** or renewal of the crediting period of the **CPA**, or within **6 months** after the first issuance of CERs for that **CPA**, whichever is the latter.
- ☞ In case the request is received from an EB member, the Chair of the EB will decide, within **10 working days**, whether or not to include the request for review of inclusion on the agenda of the next EB meeting. If the Chair of the EB decides to include, or if the request has been received from a Party involved, the secretariat shall notify the CME, the validating DOE and the DNAs of all Parties involved. The CME and the validating DOE shall be invited to provide initial comments to the request for review.



- ☞ The EB shall decide whether to initiate a review of the inclusion of the **CPA** and shall decide whether to exclude the **CPA** from the **PoA** with immediate effect, if it determines that the **CPA** was erroneously included into the **PoA**.
- ☞ A DOE, that has not performed validation, registration, inclusion or verification functions with regard to this **PoA** shall conduct the review referred above, by assessing a random sample of 10% of all **CPAs** currently included and submitting a report to EB within **8 weeks**.
- ☞ An assessment team shall be established by the EB to analyse the DOE review report and make a recommendation to the EB within **2 weeks**. The assessment team may discuss the findings of the review report and seek comments from the CME and validating DOE, as appropriate. The assessment team shall make a finding as to whether any **CPAs** have been erroneously included into the **PoA**.
- ☞ The EB shall consider the review at the next EB meeting for which the report has been made available within the **2 week** document deadline.

- ☞ The EB shall decide, whether to exclude any of the **CPAs** from the **PoA**, and if so whether to extend the review of the inclusion of **CPAs** to the **PoA**.
- ☞ The EB may decide to exclude a **CPA** from the **PoA**, if it determines that a **CPA** was erroneously included into the **PoA**.
- ☞ The consequences of the exclusion are that:
 - ⇒ The **CPA** that has been excluded shall not be re-included again in that or any other **PoA**, or qualify as a CDM project activity;
 - ⇒ The DOE that included the **CPA**, shall acquire and transfer, within **30 days** of the exclusion of the **CPA**, an amount of reduced t-CO₂ to the amount of CERs issued for the **CPA** as a result of the **CPA** having been included, to a cancellation account in the CDM registry.
 - ⇒ The period covered shall be from the date of the erroneous inclusion of the **CPA** into the **PoA** to the date of exclusion of the **CPA** from the **PoA**.
- ☞ The consequences of the extension of the review are that:
 - ⇒ The further inclusion of new **CPAs** and issuance of CERs to that **PoA** shall be put on hold;
 - ⇒ A further sample of 15% of included **CPAs** shall be reviewed;
 - ⇒ If this second review also leads to the exclusion of further **CPAs**, the EB may decide to extend the review to all included **CPAs**.
- ☞ Only once the EB has decided not to extend the review and all required cancellations have been confirmed, the hold shall be lifted.

21. Registry and international transaction log (ITL)

21-1. CDM registry

- ◆ The EB establishes and maintains a CDM registry to ensure the accurate accounting of the issuance, holding, transfer and acquisition of CERs by non-Annex I Parties. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p27 para1-2]
 - ☞ The EB identifies a registry administrator to maintain the registry under its authority
 - ☞ The CDM registry is in the form of a standardized electronic database, which enables the accurate, transparent and efficient exchange of data between national registries, the CDM registry and the international transaction log.
- ◆ The CDM registry will have the following accounts.

(1) One pending account for the EB, into which CERs are issued before being transferred to other accounts.
[CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p27 para3(a)]

(2) Holding accounts for non-Annex I Party of hosting a CDM project activity or requesting an account.
[CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p27 para3(b)]

(3) Cancellation accounts for excess CERs, to cancel KP units equal to excess CERs issued, as determined by the EB.
[CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p27 para3(c)]

(4) Cancellation account for tCERs and ICERs, that have expired in a holding account of the CDM registry, and ICERs that have become ineligible. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p80 para3]

(5) Accounts for the share of proceeds, to hold and transfer CERs corresponding to the SOP-Adaptation.
[CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p27 para3(d)]

- ◆ Accounts described in (2)(3)(5) above may have multiple accounts.
 - ☞ Each account will have a unique account number comprising a Party/organization identifier and a number unique to that account. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p27 para5]
- ◆ KP units transferred to a cancellation account may not be further transferred or used for the purpose of demonstrating the compliance of a Party with its commitment.
- ◆ Each CER has a unique serial number and be held in only one account in one registry at a given time. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p27 para4]

Publicly accessible information through the CDM registry

The CDM registry shall make non-confidential information publicly available through the Internet. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p28 para9-12]

- ◆ Up-to-date information for account name, representative identifier, Party/organization identifier, etc for each account.
- ◆ CDM project activity information including project name, years of CER issuance, operational entities involved, downloadable documentation to be made publicly available, etc.
- ◆ Holding and transaction information relevant to the CDM registry, by serial number, for each calendar year

Monthly report [EB21 Rep, para70]

The CDM registry will provide the monthly reports to DNAs of respective Parties involved.

21-2. National registry

◆ Each Annex I Party must establish and maintain a national registry to ensure the accurate accounting of the issuance, holding, transfer, acquisition, cancellation and retirement of ERUs, CERs, AAUs and RMUs and the carry-over of ERUs, CERs and AAUs. [CMP/2005/8/Ad2, p28 para17]

☞ Each Party designates an organization as its registry administrator to maintain the national registry of that Party. [CMP/2005/8/Ad2, p28 para18]
 ⇒ Any 2 or more Parties may voluntarily maintain their respective national registries in a consolidated system, provided that each national registry remains distinct.

☞ A national registry is in the form of a standardized electronic database. The accurate, transparent and efficient exchange of data between national registries, the CDM registry and the transaction log should be ensured. [CMP/2005/8/Ad2, p28 para19]

◆ Each national registry has the following accounts in order to account for KP units (AAUs, ERUs, CERs, tCERs, ICERs and RMUs): [CMP/2005/8/Ad2, p28 para21]

(1) Holding account for the Party

(3) Cancellation account for LULUCF activities,
to cancel the KP units in case such activities result in a net source of GHG emissions.

(6) tCER replacement account,
to cancel AAUs, CERs, ERUs, RMUs and/or tCERs for the purposes of replacing tCERs prior to expiry. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p71 para43]

(2) Holding account for each legal entity authorized by the Party,
to hold KP units under its responsibility.

(4) Cancellation account for non compliance,
to cancel the KP units equal to 1.3 times the amount of excess emissions in case the Party was not in compliance in the 1st commitment period

(7) ICER replacement account,
to cancel AAUs, CERs, ICERs, ERUs and/or RMUs for the purposes of replacing ICERs. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p71 para47]

(5) Cancellation account for other cancellations by the Party,
to cancel KP units for purposes of cancellations other than (3) and (4) above.

(8) Retirement account,
used to retire KP units valid for that commitment period for use towards meeting the Party's commitments. [CMP/2005/8/Ad2, p27 para14]

☞ For accounts described in (1) (2)(3)(5), multiple accounts may be established.

☞ Accounts described in (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) should be established for each commitment period.

☞ Each account must have a unique account number comprising a Party identifier and a unique number. [CMP/2005/8/Ad2, p28 para22]

◆ KP units transferred to cancellation accounts may not be further transferred or carried over to the subsequent commitment period, or be used for the purpose of demonstrating the compliance of a Party. [CMP/2005/8/Ad2, p30 para35]

◆ KP units transferred to the retirement account may not be further transferred or carried over to the subsequent commitment period. [CMP/2005/8/Ad2, p30 para35]

Serial number of KP units *Below are images for illustrative purposes

- ◆ Every t-CO₂ of KP units is given a unique serial number.
- ◆ Each KP unit shall be held in only one account in one registry at a given time.

[CMP/2005/8/Ad2, p28 para20]

Serial Number Identifiers

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
XX	1		000,000,000,000,001	999,999,999,999,999	01	01	1	0000001	1	XX/YY/ZZ

	Identifier	Range or Codes
1	Originating Registry	Two-letter country codes in ISO3166, as of 01 January 2005
2	Unit Type	1 = AAU, 2 = RMU, 3 = ERU converted from AAU, 4 = ERU converted from RMU, 5 = CER, 6 = tCER, 7 = ICER
3	Supplementary Unit Type	Blank for Kyoto-only Units, or as defined by STL (supplementary transaction log)
4	Unit Serial Block Start	Unique numeric values assigned by registry from 1 - 999,999,999,999,999
5	Unit Serial Block End	Unique numeric values assigned by registry from 1 - 999,999,999,999,999
6	Original Commitment Period	1 - 99
7	Applicable Commitment Period	1 - 99
8	LULUCF Activity	1 = Afforestation and reforestation, 2 = Deforestation, 3 = Forest management, 4 = Cropland management, 5 = Grazing land management, 6 = Revegetation
9	Project Identifier	Numeric value assigned by registry for Project, unique per originating registry. The Project Number is the combination of the Originating Registry and the Project Identifier.
10	Track	1 or 2
11	Expiry Date	Expiry Date for tCERs or ICERs

[Data exchange standards for registry system under the Kyoto Protocol, technical specifications (Version 1.1.2), 7 April, 2009, p F-2]

Publicly accessible information through national registry

Each national registry shall make non-confidential information publicly available through the Internet.

[CMP/2005/8/Ad2, p32 para44-48]

- ☞ This also applies to information on accounts held by legal entities.
- ◆ Information on accounts
 - ☞ The holder of the account, representative name and contact information of the account holder, etc.
- ◆ Information on the total quantity of KP units
- ◆ Holdings of KP units in each account
- ◆ Information on the JI project
 - ☞ Project name, location, years of ERU issuance, relevant publicly available documentation.
- ◆ A list of legal entities authorized by the Party to participate to the Kyoto Mechanisms.

21-3. International transaction log (ITL)

◆ The UNFCCC secretariat establishes and maintain an international transaction log (ITL) to verify the validity of transactions, including issuance, transfer and acquisition between registries, cancellation, expiration and replacement (in case of tCER and ICER), retirement and the carry-over of KP units. [CMP/2005/8/Ad2, p31 para38] [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p73 para55-56]

☞ The ITL is in the form of a standardized electronic database. The accurate, transparent and efficient exchange of data between national registries, the CDM registry and the ITL should be ensured

◆ The ITL conducts the following automated check. [CMP/2005/8/Ad2, p31 para42]

(1) All transactions (issuance, transfer and acquisition between registries, cancellation, retirement and carry-over)

- ☞ units previously retired or cancelled; units existing in more than one registry; units for which a previously identified discrepancy has not been resolved;
- ☞ units improperly carried over; units improperly issued;
- ☞ the authorization of legal entities involved to participate in the transaction.

(2) Transfers between registries

- ☞ the eligibility of Parties involved in the transaction to participate in the KM;
- ☞ infringement upon the commitment period reserve of the transferring Party.

(3) Acquisitions of CERs from A/R CDM projects

- ☞ infringement of the limits (limitation for net acquisitions of tCERs and ICERs).

(4) Retirement of CERs

- ☞ the eligibility of the Party involved to use CERs to contribute to its compliance.

◆ Prior to the completion of any transactions, the initiating registry sends a record of the proposed transaction to the ITL and, in the case of transfers to another registry, to the acquiring national registry. [CMP/2005/8/Ad2, p31 para41]

◆ The ITL shall records, and makes publicly available, all transaction records and the date and time of completion of each transaction. [CMP/2005/8/Ad2, p32 para43(d)]

◆ The ITL notifies the Annex I Party that a replacement of the tCER or ICER has to occur, **1 month** prior to the expiry of each tCER or ICER. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p73 para55]

☞ Where a Annex I Party does not replace tCERs or ICERs in accordance with the rules, the ITL shall forward a record of non-replacement to the secretariat, for consideration as part of the review process for the relevant Party, under Art.8 of the KP, to the EB and to the Party concerned. [CMP/2005/8/Ad1, p73 para56]

BOX: In case a discrepancy is notified in the automated check by the ITL

☞ The initiating registry shall terminate the transaction, notify the ITL and, in the case of transfers to another registry, the acquiring registry of the termination. The ITL shall forward a record of the discrepancy to the secretariat for consideration as part of the review process for the relevant Party or Parties under Article 8. [CMP/2005/8/Ad2, p32 para43(a)]

☞ In the event of a failure by the initiating registry to terminate the transaction, KP units involved in the transaction shall not be valid for use towards compliance with commitments, until the problem has been corrected and questions have been resolved.

⇒ The Party shall perform any necessary corrective action within **30 days**. [CMP/2005/8/Ad2, p32 para43(b)]

Attachment 1. Project Design Document (CDM-PDD)

- ◆ Revisions come into effect once adopted by the EB.
- ◆ Revisions to the CDM-PDD do not affect project activities:
 - ☞ Already validated, or already submitted to the OE for validation, prior to the adoption of the revised CDM-PDD;
 - ☞ Submitted to the OEs within a month following the adoption of the revised CDM-PDD;
- ◆ The EB will not accept documentation using the previous version of the CDM-PDD **6 months** after the adoption of a new version.

[PDD GL ver7, p3 para10]

(Version 03 - in effect as of 28 July 2006) [EB25 Anx15]

SECTION A. General description of project activity

A.1. Title of the project activity

A.2. Description of the project activity

A.3. Project participants

A.4. Technical description of the project activity

A.4.1. Location of the project activity

A.4.1.1. Host Party(ies)

A.4.1.2. Region/State/Province etc.

A.4.1.3. City/Town/Community etc.

A.4.1.4. Detail of physical location, including information allowing the unique identification of this project activity:

A.4.2. Category(ies) of project activity

A.4.3. Technology to be employed by the project activity

A.4.4. Estimated amount of emission reductions over the chosen crediting period

A.4.5. Public funding of the project activity

SECTION B. Application of a baseline and monitoring methodology

B.1. Title and reference of the approved baseline and monitoring methodology applied to the project activity

B.2. Justification of the choice of the methodology and why it is applicable to the project activity

B.3. Description of the sources and gases included in the project boundary

B.4. Description of how the baseline scenario is identified and description of the identified baseline scenario

B.5. Description of how the anthropogenic emissions of GHG by sources are reduced below those that would have occurred in the absence of the registered CDM project activity (assessment and demonstration of additionality)

B.6. Emission reductions

B.6.1. Explanation of methodological choices

B.6.2. Data and parameters that are available at validation

B.6.3. Ex-ante calculation of emission reductions

B.6.4. Summary of the ex-ante estimation of emission reductions

B.7. Application of the monitoring methodology and description of the monitoring plan

B.7.1. Data and parameters monitored

B.7.2. Description of the monitoring plan

B.8. Date of completion of the application of the baseline study and monitoring methodology and the name of the responsible person(s)/entity(ies)

(Version 03 - in effect as of 28 July 2006) [EB25 Anx15]

SECTION C. Duration of the project activity / Crediting period

C.1. Duration of the project activity

C.1.1. Starting date of the project activity

C.1.2. Expected operational lifetime of the project activity

C.2. Choice of crediting period and related information

C.2.1. Renewable crediting period

C.2.1.1. Starting date of the 1st crediting period

C.2.1.2. Length of the 1st crediting period

C.2.2. Fixed crediting period

C.2.2.1. Starting date

C.2.2.2. Length

SECTION D. Environmental impacts

D.1. Documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts, including transboundary impacts

D.2. If environmental impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the host Party, please provide conclusions and all references to support documentation of an environmental impact assessment undertaken in accordance with the procedures as required by the host Party

SECTION E. Stakeholders' comments

E.1. Brief description of how comments by local stakeholders have been invited and compiled

E.2. Summary of the comments received

E.3. Report on how due account was taken of any comments received

Annex 1. Contact information on participants in the project activity

Annex 2. Information regarding public funding

Annex 3. Baseline information

Annex 4. Monitoring information

Attachment 2. Approved methodologies (AMs) and tools

A tool is used to calculate, determine, demonstrate, estimate, identify and/or test information relating to a CDM project activity. A tool is public property once approved and is usually referenced in a standard or a form. When referenced, all or specified components of the tool are required and mandatory. [EB49 Anx31]

Methodological Tools for Emission Reduction CDM Project Activities (AM Tools)

1. Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality (ver.5.2) [EB39 Anx10]	This document provides for a step-wise approach to demonstrate and assess additionality. (Att.3)
2. Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality (ver.2.2) [EB28 Anx14]	This tool provides for a step-wise approach to identify the baseline scenario and simultaneously demonstrate additionality.
3. Tool to calculate project or leakage CO ₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion (ver.2) [EB41 Anx11]	This tool provides procedures to calculate project and/or leakage CO ₂ emissions from the combustion of fossil fuels. It can be used in cases where CO ₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion is calculated based on the quantity of fuel combusted and its properties.
4. Tool to determine methane emissions avoided from disposal of waste at a solid waste disposal site (ver.5) [EB55 Anx18]	This tool calculates baseline emissions of methane from waste that would in the absence of the project activity be disposed at solid waste disposal sites (SWDS). This tool is not applicable to stockpiles. Emission reductions are calculated with a first order decay (FOD) model.
5. Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption (ver.1) [EB39 Anx7]	The tool may, for example, be used in methodologies where auxiliary electricity is consumed in the project and/or the baseline scenario. The tool can also be applied in situations where electricity is only consumed in the baseline or in the project or as leakage source.
6. Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane (ver.1) [EB28 Anx13]	This tool provides procedures to calculate project emissions from flaring of a residual gas stream (RG) containing methane.
7. Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system (ver.2) [EB50 Anx14]	This methodological tool determines the CO ₂ emission factor for the displacement of electricity generated by power plants in an electricity system, by calculating the “operating margin” (OM) and “build margin” (BM) as well as the “combined margin” (CM).
8. Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream (ver.1) [EB47 Anx10]	This tool provides procedures to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream. The tool can be used to determine the mass flow of the following gases: CO ₂ , CH ₄ , N ₂ O, SF ₆ and/or PFCs.
9. Tool to determine the baseline efficiency of thermal or electric energy generation systems (ver.1) [EB48 Anx12]	The tool provides various options to determine the baseline efficiency of an energy generation system with the purpose of estimating baseline emissions.
10. Tool to determine the remaining lifetime of equipment (ver.1) [EB50 Anx15]	This tool may, for example, be used for project activities which involve the replacement of existing equipment with new equipment or which retrofit existing equipment as part of energy efficiency improvement activities.

Key word	Number	Ver.	Name of the Approved Methodology	AM Tools*	Valid from	Reg*
Renewable energy	ACM0002	12	Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources	1,2,3,7	17-Sep-10	717
	AM0019	2	Renewable energy project activities replacing part of the electricity production of one single fossil-fuel-fired power plant that stands alone or supplies electricity to a grid, excluding biomass projects	1	19-May-06	0
	AM0026	3	Methodology for zero-emissions grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources in Chile or in countries with merit order based dispatch grid	1,7	2-Nov-07	4
	AM0072	2	Fossil Fuel Displacement by Geothermal Resources for Space Heating	2,3,5	30-Oct-09	0
	AMS-I.A.	14	<i>Electricity generation by the user</i>		11-Jun-10	20
	AMS-I.B.	10	<i>Mechanical energy for the user with or without electrical energy</i>		10-Aug-07	0
	AMS-I.C.	18	<i>Thermal energy for the user with or without electricity</i>	3,5	01-Oct-10	98
	AMS-I.D.	16	<i>Grid connected renewable electricity generation</i>	7	11-Jun-10	718
	AMS-I.F.	1	<i>Renewable electricity generation for captive use and mini-grid</i>	3,5	28-May-10	0
Biomass	ACM0006	11	Consolidated methodology for electricity and heat generation from biomass residues	1,3,4,5,7,9,10	17-Sep-10	73
	ACM0018	1.1	Consolidated methodology for electricity generation from biomass residues in power-only plants	1,2,3,4,5,7	12-Feb-10	0
	AM0007	1	Analysis of the least-cost fuel option for seasonally-operating biomass cogeneration plants		14-Jun-07	0
	AM0036	3	Fuel switch from fossil fuels to biomass residues in heat generation equipment	1,3,4,7,9	18-Dec-09	3
	AM0042	2	Grid-connected electricity generation using biomass from newly developed dedicated plantations	1,7	2-Nov-07	0
	AM0085	1	Co-firing of biomass residues for electricity generation in grid connected power plants	2,3,7	4-Dec-09	0
	AMS-I.E.	3	<i>Switch from non-renewable biomass for thermal application by the user</i>		01-Oct-10	3
	AMS-III.E.	16	<i>Avoidance of methane production from decay of biomass through controlled combustion, gasification or mechanical/thermal treatment</i>	4	17-Jul-09	26

There is “Guidelines for the reporting and validation of plant load factors” for the determination of the plant load factor of renewable energy power plants. [EB48 Anx11]

There is “Definition of renewable biomass” [EB23 Anx18] and “General Guidance on Leakage in biomass project activities.” [EB47 Anx28]

Classification based on the key words are made by the author, and not described in the UNFCCC documents.

AM Tools*: Methodological tools which are referenced in the approved methodology. Please see p72 to identify the exact name of the AM tools.

Reg*: Total number of registered CDM projects which applies the listed methodology, including previous versions, as of September 26, 2010.

Key word	Number	Ver.	Name of the Approved Methodology	AM Tools*	Valid from	Reg*
Waste gas or heat	ACM0012	3.2	Consolidated baseline methodology for GHG emission reductions from waste energy recovery projects	1,7	16-Aug-08	18
	AM0009	4	Recovery and utilization of gas from oil wells that would otherwise be flared	2,3,5	8-Apr-09	8
	AM0024	2.1	Methodology for greenhouse gas reductions through waste heat recovery and utilization for power generation at cement plants	1,7	2-Nov-07	8
	AM0037	2.1	Flare (or vent) reduction and utilization of gas from oil wells as a feedstock	1,3,5,7	28-Mar-08	2
	AM0055	1.2	Baseline and Monitoring Methodology for the recovery and utilization of waste gas in refinery facilities	2,5	27-Jul-07	0
	AM0066	2	GHG emission reductions through waste heat utilization for pre-heating of raw materials in sponge iron manufacturing process	2,3,5,7	5-Dec-08	0
	AM0074	2	Methodology for new grid connected power plants using permeate gas previously flared and/or vented	1,3,5,7	18-Dec-09	0
	AM0077	1	Recovery of gas from oil wells that would otherwise be vented or flared and its delivery to specific end-users	1,2,3,5	13-Feb-09	0
	AM0081	1	Flare or vent reduction at coke plants through the conversion of their waste gas into dimethyl ether for use as a fuel	1,3,5	28-May-09	0
	<i>AMS-II.I.</i>	1	<i>Efficient utilization of waste energy in industrial facilities</i>	2	30-May-08	0
	<i>AMS-III.P.</i>	1	<i>Recovery and utilization of waste gas in refinery facilities</i>	3,5	19-Oct-07	3
	<i>AMS-III.Q.</i>	3	<i>Waste Energy Recovery (gas/heat/pressure) Projects</i>	3,5,7	18-Dec-09	8
Fuel switch	ACM0009	3.2	Consolidated methodology for industrial fuel switching from coal or petroleum fuels to natural gas	1	28-Jul-06	4
	ACM0011	2.2	Consolidated baseline methodology for fuel switching from coal and/or petroleum fuels to natural gas in existing power plants for electricity generation	1,2,3,7	2-Nov-07	1
	AM0014	4	Natural gas-based package cogeneration	1	10-Aug-07	4
	AM0029	3	Methodology for Grid Connected Electricity Generation Plants using Natural Gas	1,7	30-May-08	27
	AM0048	3	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	1,7	26-Feb-10	0
	<i>AMS-III.B.</i>	14	<i>Switching fossil fuels</i>		11-Jun-09	11
	<i>AMS-III.Z.</i>	3	<i>Fuel Switch, process improvement and energy efficiency in brick manufacture</i>	3,5	11-Jun-10	0
	<i>AMS-III.AC</i>	1	<i>Electricity and/or heat generation using fuel cell</i>	2,7	28-May-09	0
	<i>AMS-III.AG</i>	2	<i>Switching from high carbon intensive grid electricity to low carbon intensive fossil fuel</i>	2,7	11-Jun-10	0
	<i>AMS-III.AH</i>	1	<i>Shift from high carbon intensive fuel mix ratio to low carbon intensive fuel mix ratio</i>		16-Oct-09	0
	<i>AMS-III.AM</i>	1	<i>Fossil fuel switch in a cogeneration/trigeneration system</i>	3	17-Sep-10	0
<i>AMS-III.AN</i>	1	<i>Fossil fuel switch in existing manufacturing industries</i>	3	17-Sep-10	0	

There is "Information note regarding previous rulings related to the appropriateness of benchmarks for project activities utilizing waste heat/waste gas for power generation." [\[EB51 Anx59\]](#)

Key word	Number	Ver.	Name of the Approved Methodology	AM Tools*	Valid from	Reg*
Energy efficiency - supply side	ACM0007	4	Methodology for conversion from single cycle to combined cycle power generation	2,3,7,10	13-Aug-10	4
	ACM0013	4	Consolidated baseline and monitoring methodology for new grid connected fossil fuel fired power plants using a less GHG intensive technology	1,7	17-Sep-10	1
	AM0017	2	Steam system efficiency improvements by replacing steam traps and returning condensate		22-Jun-05	0
	AM0018	2.2	Steam optimization systems	1,2,3,5	30-May-08	10
	AM0038	2	Methodology for improved electrical energy efficiency of an existing submerged electric arc furnace used for the production of SiMn	1,7	2-Nov-07	1
	AM0044	1	Energy efficiency improvement projects: boiler rehabilitation or replacement in industrial and district heating sectors	1	22-Dec-06	0
	AM0045	2	Grid connection of isolated electricity systems	1,7	2-Nov-07	1
	AM0049	3	Methodology for gas based energy generation in an industrial facility	1,7	27-Feb-09	0
	AM0052	2	Increased electricity generation from existing hydropower stations through Decision Support System optimization	1,7	2-Nov-07	0
	AM0054	2	Energy efficiency improvement of a boiler by introducing oil/water emulsion technology	1,2,7	2-Nov-07	0
	AM0056	1	Efficiency improvement by boiler replacement or rehabilitation and optional fuel switch in fossil fuel-fired steam boiler systems	2,3	27-Jul-07	0
	AM0058	3.1	Introduction of a new primary district heating system	1,2,3,7	11-Jun-09	0
	AM0061	2.1	Methodology for rehabilitation and/or energy efficiency improvement in existing power plants	2,3,7	30-May-08	0
	AM0062	2	Energy efficiency improvements of a power plant through retrofitting turbines	2,3,7,9	13-Aug-10	0
	AM0087	2	Construction of a new natural gas power plant supplying electricity to the grid or a single consumer	1,3,7,9	13-Aug-10	0
	AMS-II.A.	10	<i>Supply side energy efficiency improvements – transmission and distribution</i>		17-Jul-09	0
	AMS-II.B.	9	<i>Supply side energy efficiency improvements – generation</i>		10-Aug-07	10
	AMS-II.K.	1	<i>Installation of co-generation or tri-generation systems supplying energy to commercial building</i>	3,5,9,10	28-May-10	0
AMS-III.M.	2	<i>Reduction in consumption of electricity by recovering soda from paper manufacturing process</i>		10-Aug-07	0	
AMS-III.AL.	1	<i>Conversion from single cycle to combined cycle power generation</i>	3,5,9	30-Jul-10	0	

There is “Note on tools and guidance on energy efficiency methodologies”. [\[EB41 Anx13\]](#)

Key word	Number	Ver.	Name of the Approved Methodology	AM Tools*	Valid from	Reg*
Energy efficiency - demand side	AM0020	2	Baseline methodology for water pumping efficiency improvements	1,7	2-Nov-07	0
	AM0046	2	Distribution of efficient light bulbs to households	1,7	2-Nov-07	0
	AM0060	1.1	Power saving through replacement by energy efficient chillers	2,7	30-Nov-07	0
	AM0067	2	Methodologies for installation of energy efficient transformers in a power distribution grid	2,7	16-Aug-08	0
	AM0068	1	Methodology for improved energy efficiency by modifying ferroalloy production facility	2,5	16-May-08	0
	AM0070	3	Manufacturing of energy efficient domestic refrigerators	7	9-Apr-10	0
	AM0076	1	Methodology for implementation of fossil fuel trigeneration systems in existing industrial facilities	2,3,5,7	13-Feb-09	0
	AM0084	1	Installation of cogeneration system supplying electricity and chilled water to new and existing consumers	2,3,4,7,10	04-Dec-09	0
	AM0086	1	Installation of zero energy water purifier for safe drinking water application	1,3,5,7	26-Mar-10	0
	AM0088	1	Air separation using cryogenic energy recovered from the vaporization of LNG	2,3,5	30-Jul-10	0
	AMS-II.C.	13	<i>Demand-side energy efficiency activities for specific technologies</i>	3,5	17-Jul-09	10
	AMS-II.D.	12	<i>Energy efficiency and fuel switching measures for industrial facilities</i>		18-Dec-09	40
	AMS-II.E.	10	<i>Energy efficiency and fuel switching measures for buildings</i>		2-Nov-07	6
	AMS-II.F.	9	<i>Energy efficiency and fuel switching measures for agricultural facilities and activities</i>		10-Aug-07	0
	AMS-II.G.	2	<i>Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass</i>		18-Dec-09	1
	AMS-II.H	2	<i>Energy efficiency measures through centralization of utility provisions of an industrial facility</i>	3	11-Jun-10	1
	AMS-II.J.	4	<i>Demand-side activities for efficient lighting technologies</i>		11-Jun-10	3
	AMS-III.V.	1	<i>Decrease of coke consumption in blast furnace by installing dust/sludge recycling system in steel works</i>		26-Sep-08	0
AMS-III.AE	1	Energy efficiency and renewable energy measures in new residential buildings		17-Jul-09	0	

There is “Note on tools and guidance on energy efficiency methodologies”. [\[EB41 Anx13\]](#)

There is “Guidelines on apportioning emissions from production processes between main product and co-and by-products (ver.2)” [\[EB56 Anx9\]](#) only applicable for ACM0017, until a further revised version of the guidelines is received.
Also, there is “Guidance on double-counting in CDM project activities using blended biofuel for energy use.” [\[EB26 Anx12\]](#)

Key word	Number	Ver.	Name of the Approved Methodology	AM Tools*	Valid from	Reg*
Biofuel	ACM0017	2	Production of biodiesel for use as fuel	1,3,5,6, AR13	17-Sep-10	0
	AM0089	1	<i>Production of diesel using a mixed feedstock of gasoil and vegetable oil</i>	1,5	17-Sep-10	0
	AMS-I.G.	1	<i>Plant oil production and use for energy generation in stationary applications</i>	3,5	30-Jul-10	0
	AMS-I.H.	1	<i>Biodiesel production and use for energy generation in stationary applications</i>	3,5,AR13	30-Jul-10	0
	AMS-III.T.	2	<i>Plant oil production and use for transport applications</i>		13-Aug-10	0
	AMS-III.AK	1	<i>Biodiesel production and use for transport applications</i>	3,5,AR13	30-Jul-10	0
Transportation	ACM0016	2	Baseline Methodology for Mass Rapid Transit Projects	1,5	13-Aug-10	0
	AM0031	3	Methodology for Bus Rapid Transit Projects	1,5	30-Oct-09	1
	AM0090	1	Modal shift in transportation of cargo from road transportation to water or rail transportation	2,3,5	17-Sep-10	0
	AMS-III.C.	12	<i>Emission reductions by low-greenhouse gas emitting vehicles</i>		13-Aug-10	1
	AMS-III.S.	2	<i>Introduction of low-emission vehicles to commercial vehicle fleets</i>		13-Aug-10	0
	AMS-III.U.	1	<i>Cable Cars for Mass Rapid Transit System (MRTS)</i>	5,7	26-Sep-08	1
AMS-III.AA	1	<i>Transportation Energy Efficiency Activities using Retrofit Technologies</i>		28-May-09	0	
Cement	ACM0003	7.3	Emissions reduction through partial substitution of fossil fuels with alternative fuels or less carbon intensive fuels in cement manufacture	2,3,4,5	14-Dec-07	12
	ACM0005	5	Consolidated Methodology for Increasing the Blend in Cement Production	1,7	30-Oct-09	14
	ACM0015	3	Consolidated baseline and monitoring methodology for project activities using alternative raw materials that do not contain carbonates for clinker manufacturing in cement kilns	1,7	26-Mar-10	0

Classification based on the key words are made by the author, and not described in the UNFCCC documents.

AM Tools*: Methodological tools which are referenced in the approved methodology. Please see p72 to identify the exact name of the AM tools.

Reg*: Total number of registered CDM projects which applies the listed methodology, including previous versions, as of September 26, 2010.

Key word	Number	Ver.	Name of the Approved Methodology	AM Tools*	Valid from	Reg*
Material use	AM0027	2.1	Substitution of CO ₂ from fossil or mineral origin by CO ₂ from renewable sources in the production of inorganic compounds	1	6-Oct-06	1
	AM0050	2.1	Feed switch in integrated Ammonia-urea manufacturing industry	2,7	2-Nov-07	0
	AM0057	2.2	Avoided emissions from biomass wastes through use as feed stock in pulp and paper production or in bio-oil production	1,3,4,5,6	14-Dec-07	0
	AM0063	1.1	Recovery of CO ₂ from tail gas in industrial facilities to substitute the use of fossil fuels for production of CO ₂	1,2,3,5,7	30-Nov-07	0
	AMS-III.J.	3	<i>Avoidance of fossil fuel combustion for carbon dioxide production to be used as raw material for industrial processes</i>		10-Aug-07	1
	AMS-III.O.	1	<i>Hydrogen production using methane extracted from biogas</i>	3.6	19-Oct-07	1
	AMS-III.AD	1	<i>Emission reductions in hydraulic lime production</i>		28-May-09	1
	AMS-III.AI	1	<i>Emission reductions through recovery of spent sulphuric acid</i>		26-Mar-10	0
Others	AM0082	1	Use of charcoal from planted renewable biomass in the iron ore reduction process through the establishment of a new iron ore reduction system	2,3,5, AR7, 9,13	17-Jul-09	0
	AMS-III.A.	2	<i>Offsetting of synthetic nitrogen fertilizers by inoculant application in legumes grass rotations on acidic soils on existing cropland</i>	2	16-May-08	0
	AMS-III.AJ	1	<i>Recovery and recycling of materials from solid wastes</i>	7	26-Mar-10	0

Classification based on the key words are made by the author, and not described in the UNFCCC documents.

AM Tools*: Methodological tools which are referenced in the approved methodology. Please see p72 to identify the exact name of the AM tools.

Reg*: Total number of registered CDM projects which applies the listed methodology, including previous versions, as of September 26, 2010.

Key word	Number	Ver.	Name of the Approved Methodology	AM Tools*	Valid from	Reg*
Biogas	ACM0010	5	Consolidated methodology for GHG emission reductions from manure management systems	1,3,5,6,7	10-Oct-08	3
	ACM0014	4	Mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions from treatment of industrial wastewater	1,3,5,6,7	13-Aug-10	0
	AM0053	2	Biogenic methane injection to a natural gas distribution grid	1,3,5,6	13-Aug-10	0
	AM0069	2	Biogenic methane use as feedstock and fuel for town gas production	1,2,3,5	18-Dec-09	0
	AM0073	1	GHG emission reductions through multi-site manure collection and treatment in a central plant	3,5,6,7	28-Nov-08	0
	AM0075	1	Methodology for collection, processing and supply of biogas to end-users for production of heat	1,3,5,6	13-Feb-09	0
	AM0080	1	Mitigation of greenhouse gases emissions with treatment of wastewater in aerobic wastewater treatment plants	2,3,5,6,7	28-May-09	0
	<i>AMS-III.D.</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>Methane recovery in animal manure management systems</i>	6	9-Apr-10	137
	<i>AMS-III.H.</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>Methane recovery in wastewater treatment</i>	3,4,5,6	13-Aug-10	83
	<i>AMS-III.I.</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>Avoidance of methane production in wastewater treatment through replacement of anaerobic lagoons by aerobic systems</i>		17-Jul-09	7
<i>AMS-III.Y.</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>Methane avoidance through separation of solids from wastewater or manure treatment systems</i>		30-Oct-09	0	
Landfill gas	ACM0001	11	Consolidated baseline and monitoring methodology for landfill gas project activities	1,2,3,4,5,6,7	11-Jun-09	119
	AM0083	1	Avoidance of landfill gas emissions by in-situ aeration of landfills	1,3,4,5,8	17-Jul-09	0
	AMS-III.G.	6	Landfill methane recovery	4	28-Mar-08	13

There is "Guidelines to calculate the fraction of Methane in the landfill gas from periodical measurements (Version 1)". The guidelines is applicable to all the previous version of ACM0001, where periodical monitoring of methane fraction is an available option. This guideline is not applicable to current version of ACM0001 (Version 11). [EB48 Anx13]

Classification based on the key words are made by the author, and not described in the UNFCCC documents.
 AM Tools*: Methodological tools which are referenced in the approved methodology. Please see p72 to identify the exact name of the AM tools.
 Reg*: Total number of registered CDM projects which applies the listed methodology, including previous versions, as of September 26, 2010.

Key word	Number	Ver.	Name of the Approved Methodology	AM Tools*	Valid from	Reg*
Composting	AM0025	12	Avoided emissions from organic waste through alternative waste treatment processes	1,4,6,7	13-Aug-10	14
	AM0039	2	Methane emissions reduction from organic waste water and bioorganic solid waste using co-composting	1,4	2-Nov-07	2
	AMS-III.F.	8	<i>Avoidance of methane emissions through controlled biological treatment of biomass</i>	4,6	17-Jul-09	32
	AMS-III.AF.	1	<i>Avoidance of methane emissions through excavating and composting of partially decayed municipal solid waste (MSW)</i>	4	16-Oct-09	0
Coal mine/bed methane	ACM0008	7	Consolidated methodology for coal bed methane, coal mine methane and ventilation air methane capture and use for power (electrical or motive) and heat and/or destruction through flaring or flameless oxidation	1,3,6,7	13-Aug-10	27
	AM0064	2	Methodology for mine methane capture and utilisation or destruction in underground, hard rock, precious and base metal mines	1,2,3,5,6,7	10-Oct-08	0
Leak reduction	AM0023	3	Leak reduction from natural gas pipeline compressor or gate stations	1	30-Oct-09	1
	AM0043	2	Leak reduction from a natural gas distribution grid by replacing old cast iron pipes or steel pipes without cathodic protection with polyethylene pipes	1	2-Nov-07	0
Other methane related	AM0041	1	Mitigation of Methane Emissions in the Wood Carbonization Activity for Charcoal Production	1	2-Nov-06	1
	AMS-III.K.	4	<i>Avoidance of methane release from charcoal production by shifting from pit method to mechanized charcoaling process</i>	4	5-Dec-08	1
	AMS-III.L.	2	<i>Avoidance of methane production from biomass decay through controlled pyrolysis</i>	4	10-Aug-07	0
	AMS-III.R.	1	<i>Methane recovery in agricultural activities at household/small farm level</i>		19-Oct-07	1
	AMS-III.W.	1	<i>Methane capture and destruction in non-hydrocarbon mining activities</i>	3,6	26-Sep-08	0

Classification based on the key words are made by the author, and not described in the UNFCCC documents.

AM Tools*: Methodological tools which are referenced in the approved methodology. Please see p72 to identify the exact name of the AM tools.

Reg*: Total number of registered CDM projects which applies the listed methodology, including previous versions, as of September 26 2010.

Key word	Number	Ver.	Name of the Approved Methodology	AM Tools*	Valid from	Reg*
N ₂ O	AM0021	3	Baseline Methodology for decomposition of N ₂ O from existing adipic acid production plants	1,3,5	27-Feb-09	4
	AM0028	5	Catalytic N ₂ O destruction in the tail gas of Nitric Acid or Caprolactam Production Plants	1	26-Feb-10	15
	AM0034	5	Catalytic reduction of N ₂ O inside the ammonia burner of nitric acid plants	1	13-Aug-10	49
	AM0051	2	Secondary catalytic N ₂ O destruction in nitric acid plants	1	2-Nov-07	0
HFCs, PFCs, and SF ₆	AM0001	5.2	Incineration of HFC23 Waste Streams (also see "Guidance on Accounting Eligible HFC-23" [EB39 Anx8])		22-Dec-06	19
	AM0030	3	PFC emission reductions from anode effect mitigation at primary aluminium smelting facilities	1	5-Dec-08	3
	AM0035	1	SF ₆ Emission Reductions in Electrical Grids	1	29-Sep-06	0
	AM0059	1.1	Reduction in GHGs emission from primary aluminium smelters	2,5,7	19-Oct-07	1
	AM0065	2.1	Replacement of SF ₆ with alternate cover gas in the magnesium industry	2	16-Aug-08	3
	AM0071	2	Manufacturing and servicing of domestic refrigeration appliances using a low GWP refrigerant	2	9-Apr-10	0
	AM0078	1.1	Point of Use Abatement Device to Reduce SF6 emissions in LCD Manufacturing Operations	2,3,5	13-Feb-09	2
	AM0079	2	Recovery of SF6 from Gas insulated electrical equipment in testing facilities	2,3,5	18-Dec-09	0
	AMS-III.N.	3	Avoidance of HFC emissions in rigid Poly Urethane Foam (PUF) manufacturing		8-Apr-09	0
	AMS-III.X.	2	Energy Efficiency and HFC-134a Recovery in Residential Refrigerators	7	01-Oct-10	0
AMS-III.AB	1	Avoidance of HFC emissions in Standalone Commercial Refrigeration Cabinets		28-May-09	0	

There are several guidance for methodologies related to industrial gases.

- ⇒ Guidance on expansion of industrial gases recovery methodologies to new facilities (Version 1), covering such industrial gases as N₂O, SF₆ and PFC. [EB46 Anx10]
- ⇒ Guidance to calculate adipic acid production in cases where it cannot be measured directly (Version 1). [EB45 Anx13]
- ⇒ Guidance on accounting eligible HFC-23 (Version 1.1). [EB39 Anx8]
- ⇒ Guidance related to the submission of methodologies for substitution, recycling, recovery and destruction of SF₆. [EB38 Rep. para18]

Classification based on the key words are made by the author, and not described in the UNFCCC documents.
 AM Tools*: Methodological tools which are referenced in the approved methodology. Please see p72 to identify the exact name of the AM tools.
 Reg*: Total number of registered CDM projects which applies the listed methodology, including previous versions, as of September 26, 2010.

Methodological Tools for A/R CDM Project Activities (AR-AM Tools)

1. Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality in A/R CDM project activities (ver.2) [EB35 Anx17]
2. Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality in A/R CDM project activities (ver.1) [EB35 Anx19]
3. Calculation of the number of sample plots for measurements within A/R CDM project activities (ver.2) [EB46 Anx19]
4. Tool for testing significance of GHG emissions in A/R CDM project activities (ver.1) [EB31 Anx16]
5. Estimation of GHG emissions related to fossil fuel combustion in A/R CDM project activities (ver.1) [EB33 Anx14]
6. Procedure to determine when accounting of the soil organic carbon pool may be conservatively neglected in CDM A/R project activities (ver.1) [EB33 Anx15]
7. Estimation of direct nitrous oxide emission from nitrogen fertilization (ver.1) [EB33 Anx16]
8. Tool for Estimation of GHG emissions related to displacement of grazing activities in A/R CDM project activity (ver.2) [EB39 Anx12]
9. Tool for estimation of GHG emissions from clearing, burning and decay of existing vegetation due to implementation of a CDM A/R project activity (ver.3) [EB50 Anx22]
10. Procedures to demonstrate the eligibility of lands for afforestation and reforestation CDM Project Activities (ver.1) [EB35 Anx18]
11. Calculation of GHG emissions due to leakage from increased use of non-renewable woody biomass attributable to an A/R CDM project activity (ver.1) [EB39 Anx11]
12. Tool for estimation of carbon stocks, removals and emissions for the dead organic matter pools to due to implementation of CDM A/R project activity (ver.1) [EB41 Anx14]
13. Tool for the identification of degraded or degrading lands for consideration in implementing CDM A/R project activities (ver.1) [EB41 Anx15]
14. Estimation of changes in the carbon stocks of existing trees and shrubs within the boundary of an A/R CDM project activity (ver.02.0.0 [EB56 Anx13]
15. Estimation of the increase in GHG emissions attributable to displacement of pre-project agricultural activities in A/R CDM project activity (ver.1) [EB51 Anx15]
16. Tool for estimation of change in soil organic carbon stocks due to the implementation of A/R CDM project activities (ver.1) [EB55 Anx21]

There are guidance and guidelines for A/R methodologies. <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Guidclarif/ar/index_guid.html>
 There are also clarifications for A/R methodologies. <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Guidclarif/ar/index_clarif.html>

Key word	Number	Ver.	Name of the Approved A/R Methodology	AR-AM Tools*	Valid from	Reg*
Afforestation and reforestation	AR-ACM0001	5	Afforestation and reforestation of degraded land	2,3,4, 8,9,13	17-Sep-10	0
	AR-ACM0002	1	Afforestation or reforestation of degraded land without displacement of pre-project activities	2,3,4,6,9,10,13	25-Mar-09	0
	AR-AM0001	3	Reforestation of degraded land	1	17-Oct-08	2
	AR-AM0002	3	Restoration of degraded lands through afforestation/reforestation	1,2,13	30-Oct-09	1
	AR-AM0004	4	Reforestation or afforestation of land currently under agricultural use	1	30-Oct-09	1
	AR-AM0005	4	Afforestation and reforestation project activities implemented for industrial and/or commercial uses	1,2,3,4,8,13	30-Oct-09	0
	AR-AM0006	3	Afforestation/Reforestation with Trees Supported by Shrubs on Degraded Land	1,2	30-Oct-09	0
	AR-AM0007	5	Afforestation and Reforestation of Land Currently Under Agricultural or Pastoral Use	2,3,4,6	11-Jun-09	0
	AR-AM0008	3	Afforestation or reforestation on degraded land for sustainable wood production	1,3	17-Oct-08	0
	AR-AM0009	4	Afforestation or reforestation on degraded land allowing for silvopastoral activities	2,3,4,13	11-Jun-09	0
	AR-AM0010	3	Afforestation and reforestation project activities implemented on unmanaged grassland in reserve/protected areas	1,3,5,6,7	17-Oct-08	0
	AR-AM0011	1	Afforestation and reforestation of land subject to polyculture farming	2,3,9,13,15	26-Mar-10	0
	AR-AMS0001	6	<i>Simplified baseline and monitoring methodologies for small-scale afforestation and reforestation project activities under the clean development mechanism implemented on grasslands or croplands</i>		17-Sep-10	7
	AR-AMS0002	2	<i>Simplified baseline and monitoring methodologies for small-scale afforestation and reforestation project activities under the CDM implemented on settlements</i>		17-Oct-08	0
	AR-AMS0003	1	<i>Simplified baseline and monitoring methodology for small scale CDM afforestation and reforestation project activities implemented on wetlands</i>		14-Dec-07	0
	AR-AMS0004	2	<i>Simplified baseline and monitoring methodology for small-scale agroforestry - afforestation and reforestation project activities under the clean development mechanism</i>		11-Jun-09	0
	AR-AMS0005	2	<i>Simplified baseline and monitoring methodology for small-scale afforestation and reforestation project activities under the clean development mechanism implementation on lands having low inherent potential to support living biomass</i>		8-Apr-09	0
	AR-AMS0006	1	<i>Simplified baseline and monitoring methodology for small-scale silvopastoral - afforestation and reforestation project activities under the clean development mechanism</i>		28-May-09	0
AR-AMS0007	1	<i>Simplified baseline and monitoring methodology for small-scale A/R CDM project activities implemented on grasslands or croplands</i>	3,9,14,15,16	17-Sep-10	0	

Classification based on the key words are made by the author, and not described in the UNFCCC documents.

AM Tools*: Methodological tools which are referenced in the approved methodology. Please see p72 to identify the exact name of the AM tools.

Reg*: Total number of registered CDM projects which applies the listed methodology, including previous versions, as of September 26, 2010.

Key word	Number	Ver.	Name of the Approved but already Replaced Methodology	Valid until	Reg*	Replaced by
Renewable energy	AM0005	1	Small grid-connected zero-emissions renewable electricity generation	2-Mar-06	4	ACM0002
Biomass	AM0004	2	Grid-connected biomass power generation that avoids uncontrolled burning of biomass	28-Nov-05	2	ACM0006
	AM0015	1	Bagasse-based cogeneration connected to an electricity grid	28-Nov-05	28	ACM0006
Waste gas or heat	ACM0004	2	Consolidated methodology for waste gas and/or heat for power generation	5-Jul-07	111	ACM0012
	AM0032	1	Methodology for waste gas or waste heat based cogeneration system	5-Jul-07	2	ACM0012
Fuel switch	AM0008	1	Industrial fuel switching from coal and petroleum fuels to natural gas without extension of capacity and lifetime of the facility	19-May-06	8	ACM0009
Biofuel	AM0047	2	Production of biodiesel based on waste oils and/or waste fats from biogenic origin for use as fuel	10-Aug-07	0	ACM0017
Cement	AM0033	2	Use of non-carbonated calcium sources in the raw mix for cement processing	13-Dec-07	5	ACM0015
	AM0040	1.1	Baseline and monitoring methodology for project activities using alternative raw materials that contain carbonates in clinker manufacturing in cement kilns	13-Dec-07	0	ACM0015
Biogas	AM0012	1	Biomethanation of municipal solid waste in India, using compliance with MSW rules	5-Oct-06	0	AM0025
	AM0013	4	Avoided methane emissions from organic waste-water treatment	13-Dec-07	8	ACM0014
	AM0022	4	Avoided Wastewater and On-site Energy Use Emissions in the Industrial Sector	13-Dec-07	13	ACM0014
Landfill gas	AM0002	3	Greenhouse gas emission reductions through landfill gas capture and flaring where the baseline is established by a public concession contract	1-Nov-07	1	ACM0001
	AM0003	4	Simplified financial analysis for landfill gas capture projects	1-Nov-07	5	ACM0001
	AM0010	1	Landfill gas capture and electricity generation projects where landfill gas capture is not mandated by law	1-Nov-07	2	ACM0001
	AM0011	3	Landfill gas recovery with electricity generation and no capture or destruction of methane in the baseline scenario	1-Nov-07	6	ACM0001
Afforestation and reforestation	AR-AM0003	4	Afforestation and reforestation of degraded land through tree planting, assisted natural regeneration and control of animal grazing	24-Oct-08	4	AR-ACM0001

Classification based on the key words are made by the author, and not described in the UNFCCC documents.

Reg*: Total number of registered CDM projects which applies the listed methodology, including previous versions, as of September 26, 2010.

The use of this tool is not mandatory for PPs when proposing new methodologies. PPs may propose alternative methods to demonstrate additionality for consideration by the EB, or submit revisions to approved methodologies(AMs) using this tool. But once this tool is included in an AM, its application by PPs using this methodology is mandatory.

Project activities with a start date before the date of validation shall specifically take into account the guidance provided in PDD GL. [PDD GL ver.7, p12]

Step 1. Identification of alternatives to the project activity consistent with current laws and regulations

Sub-step 1a. Define alternatives to the project activity:

- ☞ Identify realistic and credible alternative scenario(s) available to the PPs or similar project developers that provide outputs or services comparable with the proposed CDM project activity.

Sub-step 1b. Consistency with mandatory laws and regulations:

- ☞ The alternative scenario(s) shall be in compliance with all mandatory applicable legal and regulatory requirements. If an alternative does not comply with all mandatory applicable legislation and regulations, then show that those applicable legal or regulatory requirements are systematically not enforced;
- ☞ If the proposed project activity is the only alternative amongst the ones considered by the PPs that is in compliance with all mandatory regulations with which there is general compliance, then the proposed CDM project activity is not additional.

Pass

Step 2 or Step 3, or both step 2 and step 3

Step 2. Investment analysis (also see “Guidance on the Assessment of Investment Analysis ver.2” [EB41 Anx45])

Determine whether the proposed project activity is not the most economically or financially attractive, or economically or financially feasible, without the revenue from the sale of CERs.

Sub-step 2a. Determine appropriate analysis method :

- ☞ If the CDM project activity and the alternatives identified in Step 1 generates no financial or economic benefits other than CDM related income, then apply Option I below. Otherwise, use Option II or Option III.

Sub-step 2b.

Option I. Apply simple cost analysis

- ☞ Document the costs associated with the CDM project activity and demonstrate that there is at least one alternative which is less costly than the project activity.

Option II. Apply investment comparison analysis

- ☞ Identify the financial indicator, such as IRR , NPV, cost benefit ratio, or unit cost of service most suitable for the project type and decision-making context.

Option III. Apply benchmark analysis

- ☞ Identify the financial/economic indicator, such as IRR. The financial/economic analysis shall be based on parameters that are standard in the market but not linked to the subjective profitability.
- ☞ Only in the particular case where the project activity can be implemented by the PP, the specific financial/economic situation of the company undertaking the project activity can be considered.

Sub-step 2c. Calculation and comparison of financial indicators (only applicable to options II and III):

- ☞ Present in the CDM-PDD a clear comparison of the financial indicator for the proposed CDM activity and:
 - ⇒ (a) The alternatives, if Option II (investment comparison analysis) is used, or (b) the financial benchmark, if Option III (benchmark analysis) is used.
 If the CDM project activity has a less favourable indicator, then the CDM project activity cannot be considered as financially attractive.

Sub-step 2d. Sensitivity analysis (only applicable to options II and III) :

- ☞ Include a sensitivity analysis that shows whether the conclusion is robust to reasonable variations in the critical assumptions.

The EB agreed to clarify that investment analysis should be prepared within the context of the underlying project activity and should therefore not be limited to the proposed CDM crediting period. [EB35 Rep para77]

Pass

Step 3. Barrier analysis

Determine whether the proposed project activity faces barriers that prevent the implementation of this type of proposed project activity, and do not prevent the implementation of at least one of the alternatives. Provide transparent and documented evidence, and offer conservative interpretations of this documented evidence, as to how it demonstrates the existence and significance of the identified barriers.

If the CDM does not alleviate the identified barriers that prevent the proposed project activity from occurring, then the project activity is not additional.

Sub-step 3a. Identify barriers that would prevent the implementation of type of the proposed project activity:

- ☞ Establish that there are realistic and credible barriers that would prevent the implementation of the type of proposed project activity from being carried out if the project activity was not registered as a CDM activity. Such barriers may include, among others, investment barriers other than the economic/financial barriers in Step 2 above, technological barriers, barriers due to prevailing practice and other barriers.

Sub-step 3 b. Show that the identified barriers would not prevent the implementation of at least one of the alternatives (except the proposed project activity):

- ☞ If the identified barriers also affect other alternatives, explain how they are affected less strongly than they affect the proposed CDM project activity.

There is “the guidelines for objective demonstration and assessment of barriers [EB50 Anx13]” which is applicable not only to this tool but also to other AMs.

Pass

Step 4. Common practice analysis

Unless the proposed project type has demonstrated to be first-of-its kind (according to Sub-step 3a), the above generic additionality tests shall be complemented with an analysis of the extent to which the proposed project type has already diffused in the relevant sector and region. This test is a credibility check to complement the investment analysis (Step 2) or barrier analysis (Step 3).

Sub-step 4a. Analyze other activities similar to the proposed project activity:

- ☞ Provide an analysis of any other activities that are operational and that are similar to the proposed project activity. Other CDM project activities (registered project activities and project activities which have been published on the UNFCCC website as part of the validation process) are not to be included in this analysis.

Sub-step 4b. Discuss any similar options that are occurring:

- ☞ If similar activities are identified above, then it is necessary to demonstrate why the existence of these activities does not contradict the claim that the proposed project activity is financially/economically unattractive or subject to barriers.

Pass

The proposed CDM project activity is additional

Specific Guidance on the Calculation of Project IRR and Equity IRR [EB51 Anx58 para9-11]

- ☞ The cost of financing expenditures (i.e. loan repayments and interest) should not be included in the calculation of project IRR.
- ☞ In the calculation of equity IRR only the portion of investment costs which is financed by equity should be considered as the net cash outflow, the portion of the investment costs which is financed by debt should not be considered a cash outflow.
- ☞ When a project IRR is calculated, a pre-tax benchmark should be applied. In that case, actual interest payable is taken into account in the calculation of income tax. Interest should be calculated according to the prevailing commercial interest rates in the region, preferably by assessing the cost of other debt recently acquired by the PP and by applying a debt-equity ratio used by the PP for investments taken in the previous 3 years.

Investment comparison analysis and benchmark analysis [EB51 Anx58 para16]

- ☞ If the proposed baseline scenario leaves the project participant no other choice than to make an investment to supply the same (or substitute) products or services, a benchmark analysis is not appropriate and an investment comparison analysis shall be used. If the alternative to the project activity is the supply of electricity from a grid this is not to be considered an investment and a benchmark approach is considered appropriate.

Selection and Validation of Appropriate Benchmarks [EB51 Anx58 para12-15]

- ☞ Local commercial lending rates or weighted average costs of capital (WACC) are appropriate benchmarks for a project IRR. Required/expected returns on equity are appropriate benchmarks for an equity IRR. Benchmarks supplied by relevant national authorities are also appropriate if the DOE can validate that they are applicable to the project activity.
- ☞ In the cases of projects which could be developed by an entity other than the PP the benchmark should be based on publicly available data sources which can be clearly validated by the DOE. Such data sources may include local lending and borrowing rates, equity indices, or benchmarks determined by relevant national authorities. The DOE's validation of such benchmarks shall also include its opinion of the suitability of the benchmark applied in the context of the underlying project activity.
- ☞ Internal company benchmarks/expected returns should only be applied in cases where there is only one possible project developer and should be demonstrated to have been used for similar projects with similar risks, developed by the same company or, if the company is brand new, would have been used for similar projects in the same sector in the country/region. This shall require as a minimum clear evidence of the resolution by the company's Board and/or shareholders and will require the validating DOE to undertake a thorough assessment of the financial statements of the project developer to assess the past financial behavior of the entity during at least the last 3 years in relation to similar projects.
- ☞ Risk premiums applied in the determination of required returns on equity shall reflect the risk profile of the project activity being assessed, established according to national/international accounting principles. It is not considered reasonable to apply the rate general stock market returns as a risk premium for project activities that face a different risk profile than an investment in such indices.

Sensitivity analysis [EB51 Anx58 para17-18]

- ☞ Only variables, including the initial investment cost, that constitute more than 20% of either total project costs or total project revenues should be subjected to reasonable variation (all parameters varied need not necessarily be subjected to both negative and positive variations of the same magnitude), and the results of this variation should be presented in the PDD and be reproducible in the associated spreadsheets. Where a DOE considers that a variable which constitute less than 20% have a material impact on the analysis they shall raise a corrective action request to include this variable in the sensitivity analysis.
- ☞ The DOE should assess in detail whether the range of variations is reasonable in the project context. Past trends may be a guide to determine the reasonable range. As a general point of departure variations in the sensitivity analysis should at least cover a range of +10% and -10%, unless this is not deemed appropriate in the context of the specific project circumstances. In cases where a scenario will result in the project activity passing the benchmark or becoming the most financially attractive alternative the DOE shall provide an assessment of the probability of the occurrence of this scenario in comparison to the likelihood of the assumptions in the presented investment analysis, taking into consideration correlations between the variables as well as the specific socio-economic and policy context of the project activity.

General issues in calculation and presentation


- ☞ See [EB51 Anx58 para3-8].

Attachment 5. Guidelines for demonstrating additionality for specific SSC project activities


For project activities up to **5 MW** that employ renewable energy as their primary technology and for energy efficiency project activities that aim to achieve energy savings at a scale of no more than **20 GWh/y**, simplified modalities for demonstrating additionality has been approved by the EB. (Version 01) [EB54 Anx15]

☞ All CDM project activities that qualify the criteria specified in the guidelines are eligible to apply the guidelines irrespective of the scale of the approved CDM methodology applied to the project. [EB57 Rep para12]

The project size <=5 MW of installed capacity of renewable energy



The project size <=20 GWh energy savings per year



Attachment 6. CDM validation and verification manual (CDM-VVM)

(Version 01.2 - 30 July 2009) [EB55 Anx1]

I. Introduction (para1-6)			
II. Terms for validating and verifying information provided by PPs (para7-13)	1. Accurate, 2. Conservative, 3. Relevant, 4. Credible, 5. Reliable, 6. Completeness, 7. Validation/verification opinion		
III. Principles for validation and verification (para14-23)	1. Consistency, 2. Transparency, 3. Impartiality, independence and safeguarding against conflicts of interest, 4. Confidentiality		
IV. Additional roles of designated operational entities (para24-25)			
V. CDM validation	A. Objective of CDM validation (para26-28)		
	B. Validation approach (para29-32)		
	C. Validation methods (para33-39)	1. Means of validation, 2. Clarification requests, corrective action requests and forward action requests	
	D. Stakeholder consultation process (para40-42)		
	E. Validation requirements based on paragraph 37 of the CDM modalities and procedures (para43-132)	1. Approval, 2. Participation, 3. Project design document, 4. Project description	
		5. Baseline and monitoring methodology	(a) General requirement, (b) Applicability of the selected methodology to the project activity, (c) Project boundary, (d) Baseline identification, (e) Algorithms and/or formulae used to determine emission reductions
		6. Additionality of a project activity, 7. Monitoring plan, 8. Sustainable development 9. Local stakeholder consultation, 10. Environmental impacts	
	F. Specific validation activities (para133-170)	1. Background, 2. Project design of small-scale clean development mechanism project activities	
		3. Afforestation or reforestation project activities under the clean development	(a) General requirement, (b) Project boundary for A/R CDM project activities, (c) Selection of carbon pools, (d) Eligibility of land, (e) Conservative choice and application of default data, (f) Approach proposed to address non permanence (g) Timing of management activities, including harvesting cycles, and verifications, (h) Socio-economic and environmental impacts, including impacts on biodiversity and natural ecosystems
		4. Project design of small-scale afforestation or reforestation project activities	
		5. Programme of activities	(a) Operational and management arrangements for the PoA, (b) Eligibility criteria for CPAs, (c) Validation of CPAs
		6. Renewal of crediting period, 7. Changes to the start date of the crediting period	
		G. Validation report (para171-173)	
H. Validation opinion (para174-175)			

VI. CDM Verification requirements based on paragraph 62 of the CDM M&Ps	A. Objective of verification (para176-177)	
	B. Verification approach (para178-182)	
	C. Verification methods (para183-193)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Means of verification, 2. Quality of evidence 3. Clarification requests, corrective action requests and forward action requests
	D. Verification of specific requirements (para194-208)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project implementation in accordance with the registered project design document 2. Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology 3. Compliance of monitoring with the monitoring plan 4. Assessment of data and calculation of greenhouse gas emission reductions
	E. Additional verification activities (para209-218)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Background 2. Request for deviation 3. Request for revision of the monitoring plan 4. Differences between requests for deviation and requests for revision of the monitoring plan
	F. Verification report (para219-221)	
	G. Certification Report (para222-223)	

Attachment 7. Global warming potential (GWP) and carbon emission factor (CEF)

- ◆ Global warming potential (GWP) is a measure of the relative radioactive effect of GHGs compared to CO₂. GWP used by Parties should be those provided by the IPCC 2nd Assessment Report (“1995 IPCC GWP values”) based on the effects of the GHGs over a 100-year time horizon [CP/1997/7/Ad1, p31 para3]. The value of GWP is fixed for the 1st commitment period, but it is subject to change for the subsequent commitment periods depending on new scientific findings.
- ◆ Carbon Emission Factor (CEF) is the estimated average carbon (or CO₂) emission rate for a given source, relative to units of activity. The EB agreed that the IPCC default values should be used only when country or project specific data are not available or difficult to obtain [EB25 Rep, para59]. The EB further clarified that the ‘2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories’ was published on the IPCC website on 24 October 2006 after which this version shall be considered as the latest version. [EB28 Rep, para68]

Global Warming Potential

Species	Chemical formula	GWP	Species	Chemical formula	GWP
CO ₂	CO ₂	1	HFC-23	CHF ₃	11,700
Methane *	CH ₄	21	HFC-236fa	C ₃ H ₂ F ₆	6,300
Nitrous oxide	N ₂ O	310	HFC-143a	C ₂ H ₃ F ₃	3,800
Perfluoroethane	C ₂ F ₆	9,200	HFC-134a	CH ₂ FCF ₃	1,300
Perfluoropentane	C ₅ F ₁₂	7,500	HFC-134	C ₂ H ₂ F ₄	1,000
Perfluorohexane	C ₆ F ₁₄	7,400	HFC-32	CH ₂ F ₂	650
Sulphur hexafluoride	SF ₆	23,900	HFC-41	CH ₃ F	150

Climate Change 1995: The Science of Climate Change, p. 22, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 1996.

General Conversion Factors for Energy

To:\From:	TJ	Gcal	Mtoe	GWh
	Multiply by:			
TJ	1	238.8	2.388 x 10 ⁻⁵	0.2778
Gcal	4.1868 x 10 ⁻³	1	10 ⁻⁷	1.163 x 10 ⁻³
Mtoe	4.1868 x 10 ⁴	10 ⁷	1	11630
GWh	3.6	860	8.6x10 ⁻⁵	1

CO₂ Emissions from fuel combustion (2006 Edition), p.1.11, International Energy Agency, 2006.

Carbon Emission Factor

Fossil fuel		CO ₂ emission factor (kg/TJ)	Net calorific value (TJ/Gg) Gg=1000t	CO ₂ emission factor (t-CO ₂ /t (Fuel))
Liquid Fossil	Crude Oil	73,300	42.3	3.101
	Motor Gasoline	69,300	44.3	3.070
	Other Kerosene	71,900	43.8	3.149
	Gas/Diesel Oil	74,100	43.0	3.186
	Liquefied Petroleum Gases	63,100	47.3	2.985
Solid Fossil	Anthracite	98,300	26.7	2.625
	Sub-Bituminous Coal	96,100	18.9	1.816
	Lignite	101,000	11.9	1.202
Gaseous Fossil	Natural Gas	56,100	48.0	2.693

2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, p. 1.18-1.24, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2006.

[Default carbon oxidation factor is 1] [CO₂ emission factors t-CO₂/t (Fuel) are calculated for this document and do not appear in the IPCC guideline]

Important changes from previous version (Ver. 10 / June 2010)

<i>Page</i>	<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Changes</i>
8	4-2. Designated National Authority (DNA)	Added new explanation about “Definition of host Party”
14	4-6. Project Participants (PPs)	Added new explanation in the middle and two boxes at the bottom
27-28	7-5. Procedures for the revision of AMs and tools for large scale CDM project activities	Updated and revised overall
35	9. Monitoring plan	Updated and revised overall
39	12-1. Procedures for requests for registration	Updated and revised overall
40	12-2. Procedures for review of requests for registration	Updated and revised overall
42	12-4. Procedures for withdrawal of a request for registration	Updated and revised overall
46	14. Verification and certification	Updated and revised overall
47-48	15-1. Procedures for requests for issuance of CERs	Updated and revised overall
49	15-3. Procedures for withdrawal of a request for issuance of CERs	Updated and revised overall
53	18-1. Definition of small-scale CDM (SSC)	Added new explanation about “Eligibility of SSC project activities”.
54	18-2. Simplified modalities and procedures	Modified explanation at upper right to accommodate the changes of procedures of registration as well as issuance of CERs
55		Added “BOX: Additionality for specific SSC project activities”
62	20-1. Overview of programme of activities	Revised explanation about CME at lower left.
65	20-2. Procedures for programme of activities	Updated and revised overall
76-82	Attachment 2. Approved methodologies and tools	Updated and revised overall
88	Attachment 5. Guidelines for demonstrating additionality for specific SSC project activities	Newly added.
91-92	Attachment 5. CDM validation and verification manual (CDM-VVM)	Added new explanation about CDM validation and verification manual (CDM-VVM)

All the information sources are hyperlinked to the Internet web pages, where possible.



Climate Change Policy Division
Global Environment Bureau
Ministry of the Environment, Japan
1-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku,
Tokyo, 100-8975 Japan
URL: <http://www.env.go.jp/>



Market Mechanism Group
Institute for Global Environmental Strategies
2108-11, Kamiyamaguchi, Hayama,
Kanagawa, 240-0115 Japan
EMAIL: cdm-info@iges.or.jp
URL: <http://www.iges.or.jp/en/cdm/index.html>

© Ministry of the Environment, Japan, 2010.

This copy is made as part of CDM capacity building programme funded by Ministry of the Environment, Japan and published by the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES).

Whilst information in this report is believed to be true and accurate at the date of going to press, neither the author nor publisher can accept any legal responsibility or liability for any errors or omissions that may be made.