CDM: Proposed New Methodology
Meth Panel recommendation to the Executive Board
(version 04)
(To be used by the Meth Panel to make a recommendation to the Board regarding a proposed new methodology)

Date of Meth Panel meeting:	14 - 17 June 2005
Related F-CDM-NM document ID number (electronically available to EB members)	F-CDM-NM0108: "Biodiesel production and switching fossil fuels from petro-diesel to biodiesel in transport sector - 30 TPD Biodiesel CDM Project in Andhra Pradesh, India"
Related F-CDM-NMex document ID number(s) (electronically available to EB members)	F-CDM-NMex0108: Mawandia / Gruetter
Related F-CDM-NMpu document ID number(s) (electronically available to EB members)	F-CDM-NMpu0108: None received.

Note to those completing this form, as applicable: Please provide recommendations on the proposed new baseline and monitoring methodologies based on an assessment of CDM-NMB and CDM-NMM and of their application in sections A to E of the draft CDM-PDD, desk reviews and public input. Please ensure that the form is entirely filled and that arguments and expert judgements are substantiated.

A. Preliminary recommendations by the Meth Panel

I. Recommendation on the proposed new baseline methodology: *(checkmark the choice made)*

Title of proposed new baseline methodology:>> Biodiesel production and switching fossil fuels from petro-diesel to biodiesel in the transport sector

a. To approve this proposed methodology with minor changes

☐

i. Conditions under which this proposed methodology is applicable to other potential CDM project activities (e.g. project type, region, data availability):

>>

ii. Minor changes:

>>

b. To reconsider this proposed methodology, subject to required changes

☒

i. Conditions under which the proposed methodology is applicable to other potential projects (e.g. project type, region, data availability):

>> Partial or full substitution of petro-diesel with bio-diesel in mobile combustion:

- that include the bio-diesel production plant within the project activity and where credits for switching to bio-diesel use are not claimed by down stream parties ;
- that use various feedstocks such as edible/non-edible oils derived from oil bearing seeds which are otherwise neglected or dumped;
- where no regulations exist in host countries on bio-diesel use.

ii. Required changes:

>> This methodology is a resubmission of NM0069. It incorporates many – but not all - the changes requested during the last review. Moreover, the proposed changes have brought forward other issues that need resolving:

- Project participants shall consider the recommendations by the Meth Panel regarding potential changes in carbon pools due to the project activity as contained in the report of its sixteenth meeting and further decisions by the Board on that subject. The consideration of potential changes in carbon pools is particularly important when considering leakage.
- The methodology as currently written would allow project participants to potentially claim for net anthropogenic removals by sinks if actual anthropogenic removals are higher than land-clearance emissions. The methodology should be changed so that if clearance-removals > 0 then include it in project emissions, but if clearance-removals < 0 then use the value of 0. Otherwise the project would claim in fact land-use change credits which would be another category of CDM project activities. If the plantation would qualify as an afforestation and reforestation project activity project participants should treat this component as a separate project activity that would need to use an approved methodology for afforestation and/or reforestation project activities under the CDM.
- The number of potential baseline scenarios have been widened, as requested in the previous review. However, the methodology does not yet include a satisfactory procedure by which PPs can assess which is the most likely baseline scenario. (The methodology indicates that "national circumstances and sectoral policies …. shall be taken into account" but does not say how)..

(Project participants shall make required changes to the proposed new methodology and send it back to the Meth Panel. The proposed new methodology will be reconsidered by the Meth Panel if changes required are made by the project participants. The Executive Board will only consider this proposed new methodology after the revised proposed methodology has been reconsidered by the Meth Panel.)

c. Not to approve the proposed methodology

☐

i. Reasons for non-approval:

>>

(A new proposal should be submitted in accordance with the procedures for submission and consideration of proposed new methodologies of the Executive Board.)

II. Recommendation on the proposed new monitoring methodology: *(checkmark the choice made)*

Title of proposed new monitoring methodology: >> Bio-diesel production and switching fossil fuels from petro-diesel to bio-diesel in the transport sector

a. To approve this proposed methodology with minor changes

☐

i. Conditions under which methodology is applicable to other potential projects (e.g. project type, region, data availability):

>>

ii. Minor changes:

>>

b. To reconsider this proposed methodology, subjected to required changes

☒

i. Conditions under which the proposed methodology is applicable to other potential projects (e.g. project type, region, data availability.):

>> Partial or full substitution of petro-diesel with bio-diesel in mobile combustion:

- that include the bio-diesel production plant within the project activity and where credits for switching to bio-diesel use are not claimed by down stream parties ;
- that use various feedstocks such as edible/non-edible oils derived from oil bearing seeds which are otherwise neglected or dumped;
- where no regulations exist in host countries on bio-diesel use.

ii. Required changes:

- Clarify the scope of the project boundary with respect to plantations. CDM-NMB p6 indicates that the boundary includes preparation/harvesting of oil seeds from "new plantations". However, CDM-NMM indicates that fossil fuels use in plantations, sequestration in plantations, area of plantation will be measured. Please could PP clarify that these items refer to the whole areas of plantation used, not just new plantations, and modify CDM-NMB appropriately.
- The previous recommendation indicated that "the consumption and use(s) of bio-diesel is not monitored. These omissions should be corrected…". The resubmitted version does indicate that "sales records submitted by retail outlets will be used to estimate the bio-diesel consumed". It should be clarified how transport use of bio-fuel in the host country (or other non-Annex I country) is calculated from this data. To ensure that the bio-diesel is used in the host country and for transport, it is suggested that this methodology could be restricted to blended diesel, where the share of bio-diesel is equal to or less than 20%. In case there are national policies mandating a certain percentage of blend only the blend higher than the one regulated by the national policy and below 20% should be considered. Restricting the applicability of this methodology to blended diesel that do not require vehicle modifications would also render the changes requested in assessing the efficiency factor (in the CDM-NMB) unnecessary.
- The CDM-NMM indicates that ACM0002 "or another appropriate baseline methodology" can be used to estimate the grid emission factor. This phrase should either be deleted, or further clarified (it is currently too vague to be verifiable).
- Other requested changes are outlined below.

(Project participants shall make required changes in the proposed new methodology and send it back to the Meth Panel. The proposed new methodology will be reconsidered by the Meth Panel if changes required are correctly made by the project participants. The Executive Board will only consider this proposed new methodology after required changes proposed have been made and the revised proposed methodology has been reconsidered by the Meth Panel.)

c. Not to approve the proposed methodology

☐

i. Reasons for non-approval:

>>

(A new proposal should be submitted in accordance with the procedures for submission and consideration of proposed new methodologies of the Executive Board.)

B. Details of the evaluation of the proposed new methodology by the Meth Panel:

I. Proposed new baseline methodology *(specify title here):* >> Bio-diesel production and switching fossil fuels from petro-diesel to bio-diesel in the transport sector.

(1) Short description of the methodology, including an assessment of which approach from paragraph 48 of the CDM modalities and procedures was used:

a) Describe the methodology:

>> The three-step methodology is developed for fuel-switch activities that partially or fully substitute biodiesel for "petro-diesel" in the transport sector.

- Step 1: assesses the additionality of the proposed project activity by using the EB-approved additionality tool.
- Step 2: calculates the baseline emissions as existing emissions caused by combustion of petro-diesel.

Step 3: calculates the emissions occurring within the project boundary, and those associated with leakage. These include emissions from refining bio-diesel, emissions to transport the bio-diesel, (here the methodology is conservative as emissions related to transportation of petro-diesel are not considered) land-clearing minus sequestration, fuel used to produce bio-diesel. The methodology thus also claims potentially sequestration reductions if sequestration emissions are lower than land-clearance emissions (although this will need changing as outlined above and below).

The methodology has been developed to apply across different types and performances of vehicles and uses one single emissions factor.

b) State the approach selected:

>> The approach selected is as per paragraph 48 (a) of the CDM modalities and procedures: "Existing actual or historical emissions, as applicable"

c) Indicate (in summary form) why the approach selected is the most appropriate. Please provide your expert judgement on the appropriateness of the selected approach to the project category:

>> This is an appropriate approach as the project is a fuel-switch project.

(2) Basis for determining the baseline scenario:

a) State whether the documentation explains how the baseline scenario is to be chosen and identified:

>> The documentation explains which baseline scenarios are to be assessed, but does not indicate how to choose from amongst the suggestions provided.

b) State the basic underlying rationale for algorithms/formulae used (e.g. marginal vs. average basis) (see also section 4 below):

>> The underlying rationale is to answer the question what the petro diesel vehicle owners would do in the absence of the proposed project. The stated assumption underpinning the rationale is that the baseline scenario in the absence of the project activity would be the continuation of the existing practice of using petro diesel.

c) State whether the documentation explains how, through the use of the methodology, it can be demonstrated that a project activity is additional and therefore not the baseline scenario. If so, what are the tools provided by the project participants?

>> The methodology indicates that the EB-approved "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" should be used to assess additionality.

d) State whether the basis for determining the baseline scenario and for assessing additionality is appropriate and adequate:

>>

- Additionality: Using the additionality tool to assess additionality is appropriate. However, the methodology could also benefit from further guidance e.g. as to relevant barriers, or when to use barrier analysis and when to use financial analysis.
- Baseline scenario: This has been improved from the previous methodology submission, but needs further improvement:
  - i) The proposed methodology does indicate three plausible baseline scenarios, and also indicates that if "biodiesel production and use is the only alternative or the cost at the pump of biodiesel produced by other producers" is lower, then this shall be considered as the baseline scenario. However, the proposed methodology does not indicate how to choose between different proposed scenarios other than to indicate that "national circumstances and sectoral policies … shall be taken into account".
  - ii) Guidance is needed on how to assess whether "CNG, LNG or LPG are the most attractive options for fuel switching" (What is "attractive" and how is it assessed?). Further, the draft CDM-PDD indicates that ethanol may also need to be assessed as a potential alternative fuel.
  - iii) No information is given on how to estimate the "efficiency multiplier of petro-diesel", which is to be "based on publicly available sources" (This item is not monitored either). The draft CDM-PDD mentions that a 20% mixture will be used where only minimal changes will occur to fuel efficiency. That might be correct, but it may also be that there are more significant efficiency changes with higher bio-diesel mixes. It should be clarified if the methodology is designed only for biodiesel blends that would result in minimal efficiency changes, or if not, exactly how the efficiency multiplier should be calculated.

(3) Assessment of the description of the proposed methodology and its applicabilitys

a) State whether the methodology has been described in an adequate manner:

>> Yes, with the exception of determining the baseline scenario (see above), and possible further clarifications in the additionality assessment. Otherwise, the methodology is clearly-written and concise.

b) State whether the proposed methodology is appropriate for the referred proposed project activity and the referred project context (described in Sections A - E of the draft CDM-PDD and submitted along with CDM-NMB):

>> With revisions as suggested, the proposed methodology could be used for the referred proposed project.

c) State whether the application of the methodology could result in a baseline scenario that reasonably represents the anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases that would occur in the absence of the proposed project activity.

>> At present, the methodology seems to pre-determine that continuing use of petro-diesel is most likely. Thus the proposed methodology would only result in a reasonable representation of what would have happened otherwise if petro-diesel is indeed the most likely baseline option. This would be made more likely if the methodology were to make clear that it was designed for proposed CDM projects that sold a blend of bio-diesel/diesel that required no vehicle modifications. However, at present this clarification is lacking.

Please explain:

>>

- It is not entirely accurate to assume that alternative fuel options viz. CNG/LPG/ LNG / Fuel Ethanol etc. are not viable alternatives in the absence of suitable regulations. Economics too has a very critical part to play in the fuel switch related decision-making process.
- Issues regarding the efficiency factor need to be addressed / established with more concrete evidence.
- Project emissions exclude potentially important components.

(4) Assessment of algorithms/formulae and type of data needed:

a) State whether the description of the methodology includes algorithms and generic formulae that can be applied to other potential project activities (if not, the proposed new methodology will be considered as a project-specific methodology):

>> Yes, for bio-diesel in general substituting petro-diesel. However, this is potentially too generic as bio-diesel can be produced from a variety of sources. This is not taken into account in an appropriate manner by the proposed methodology.

b) Explain the spatial scope of data used to determine the baseline and whether the scope is appropriate:

>> The scope used is bio-diesel production plant, transport of bio-diesel and feedstocks, use of bio-diesel in vehicles plus preparation of harvesting in new plantations. This latter component is problematic as it seems to exclude emissions from already existing plantations (the monitoring methodology is not clear on this point).

c) Explain the vintage of data used (in relation to the duration of the project crediting period) and whether the vintage of data is appropriate, indicating the period covered by the data:

>> The vintage of data corresponds to the year of production of the biodiesel and the time that fuel-switch occurs. IPCC emission factors (where used) are sourced from the revised 1966 IPCC guidelines.

(5) Definition of the project boundary related to the baseline methodology:

a) State how the project boundary is defined in terms of:

i) Gases and sources

>> Section D5 does not explicitly indicate which gases are included (but should do so). From the rest of the documentation, it would appear that the following are included in the project boundary:

- CO_2, CH_4 and N_2O from petro-diesel;
- CO_2, CH_4 and N_2O from fossil fuel consumed in the biodiesel plant;
- CO_2 from electricity consumption;
- CO_2 from off-site transport emissions (biodiesel transport), it is also implied that CH_4 and N_2O from this source are also accounted for, if data is available.
- CO_2 emissions and sequestration from plantations [NB, this is labelled as "emissions from plantations" but the formula used could lead to accounting for sequestration. This needs to be clarified.]
- CH_4 from methanol production is included in leakage assessments.

ii) Physical delineation

>>

- The bio diesel production plant site
- Transportation of the bio diesel and the feed stock
- Combustion sources or vehicles that substitute petro-diesel with bio diesel.
- The preparation / harvesting of oil bearing seeds from new plantations.

b) Indicate whether this project boundary is appropriate:

>> The inclusion or not of emissions/sequestration from plantations needs to be clarified. Does this include all plantations, or just new plantations? (If the latter, that is problematic). No non-CO_2 emissions occur from the plantation (this should be justified or modified – N_2O emissions could be significant, as could CH_4 emissions from disposed biomass). Otherwise, the project boundary seems appropriate.

(6) Key assumptions/parameters (including emission factors and activity levels) and data sources:

a) List the implicit and explicit key assumptions. Identify those, if any, which are problematic and explain:

>>

Implicit assumptions:

- Amount of biodiesel sold by "retailers" = amount of biodiesel consumed in transport (this is problematic as the NM does not specify whether biodiesel is blended with petro-diesel before being transported to retailers,).
- Amount of biodiesel consumed all occurs in the host country (and not in Annex I countries) – the location of retailers needs to be noted in order for this assumption to be appropriate.
- The baseline fuel does not change over the course of the crediting period. This would need to be reassessed at a minimum at the renewal of a crediting period.

Explicit assumptions:

- CERs will not be claimed by users of biodiesel. This could potentially be problematic if further CDM projects are developed in the host country that encourage the use of biofuels.
- Data will be available by which to calculate an "efficiency multiplier" (comparing biodiesel and petrodiesel motors). However, no data sources for this information are suggested.
- Emissions from the plantation-related activity is limited to the clearing and plantation process. Potentially problematic, as the disposal of the cleared biomass could result in significant GHG emissions.
- Fuel switch to alternative fuel options are not currently a viable option (The majority of the CDM-NMB is focused on biodiesel replacing petro-diesel). Problematic and needs further justification.
- Harvesting of oil seeds involves no fuel use.

b) State whether the key assumptions are arrived at in a transparent manner:

>> No

c) Give your expert judgement on whether the assumptions/parameters are adequate:

>> See a) above.

d) Indicate which data sources are used and how the data are obtained (e.g. official statistics, expert judgement):

>> Efficiency factor data source is unclear. The rest of the data is from project activity reports (quantity of biodiesel produced), actual invoices (sale of biodiesel, transportation of seeds and biodiesel), national/official statistics or revised 1996 IPCC guidelines.

e) Give your expert judgement on whether the data used are adequate, consistent, accurate and reliable:

>> Ok with the exception of data gaps (below).

f) State possible data gaps:

>>

- Efficiency factor used to assess substitution of petro-diesel through bio-diesel. The efficiency change should be based either on using 100% bio-diesel or using a specified blend and determining the efficiency factor based on the blend (efficiency change/percentage blend). In general, vehicles using 100% bio-diesel will be adapted to bio-diesel use. Their efficiency loss will thus be lower than using blends. Using such data would thus understate baseline emissions and be non-conservative. If the methodology does not indicate if blends or pure bio-diesel will be used it must indicate clearly how the efficiency factor will be determined.
- Inclusion of fuel use in existing plantations from which oilseeds are used.
- Inclusion of fossil fuel used in the whole production process of all oilseeds including harvesting.
- nclusion of N_2O emissions resulting from the production of oilseeds (i.e. fertilisers).

(7) Assessment of uncertainties:

a) State whether the methodology includes an assessment of uncertainties regarding:

i) The basis for determining the baseline scenario:

>> No.

ii) Algorithms/formulae:

>> No.

iii) Key assumptions:

>>Some (e.g. emission factors) but not others (e.g. efficiency factor).

iv) Data:

>> Yes.

b) State whether the uncertainties presented are reasonable:

>> The following should be addressed:

- Uncertainty in determining the baseline scenario;
- Efficiency factor bio-diesel/petro-diesel
- Emissions from land clearance, sequestration and fuel use for oilseed production data used to quantify emissions from the transport of bio-diesel (this is not a major issue, but a short discussion would be helpful).

(8) Leakage:

a) State how the baseline methodology addresses any potential leakage due to the project activity:

>>Leakage due to increased demand of methanol is included.

b) Indicate whether the treatment for leakage is appropriate and adequate:

>> Ok, if the above mentioned additional project emissions are included.

(9) Transparency and "conservativeness":

a) Indicate whether the baseline methodology was developed in a transparent way:

>> The selection of the baseline is not transparent. The following procedure to determine baseline emissions is transparent, although there are some data gaps (see above). The procedure to determine project emissions is transparent, with the exception of emissions arising from oil-seed production (the criteria is not clear for what is included and what not). The definition of leakage is transparent.

b) State whether the baseline methodology is conservative:

>> No, because of: uncertainties as to the appropriateness of the baseline scenario; lack of clarity about the blending or otherwise of bio-diesel and its effect on efficiency levels; understated project emissions because of omitting N_2O emissions. Further, a project using the proposed methodology could potentially claim land-use change emissions not attributable to this project type. However, the methodology also includes some conservative aspects, such as assuming conservative (low) emission factors when calculating the baseline emissions.

(10) Potential strengths and weaknesses of the proposed baseline methodology *(please explain)*:

>>

Strengths:

- Simple and
- Straightforward.

Weaknesses:

- Basis for not needing to assess whether there is a gradual fuel substitution under BAU is unconvincing; some parameters are non-transparent and/or non-conservative (see sections above);
- There are some data gaps/areas lacking clarity (e.g. coverage of existing plantations in the project boundary, efficiency factors);
- Exclusion of N_2O emissions from oilseed production;
- Potential claiming of land-use reductions;
- Potential double-counting of CERs from production/use of bio-diesel;
- Potential use of bio-diesel in non-transport uses.
- Others outlined above.

(11) Other considerations, such as a description of how national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances have been taken into account *(please explain)*:

>> Determination of the baseline scenario includes an assessment of national policies (although in a too stringent manner: "in case … national … policies make the bio-diesel production and use is the only alternative…"

(12) Applicability of the proposed methodology across project types and regions *(please indicate)*:

>> This methodology, once revised, should be broadly applicable across countries and regions.

(13) Any other comments:

a) State whether any other source of information (i.e. other than documentation on this proposed methodology available on the UNFCCC CDM web site) has been used by you in evaluating this methodology. If so, please provide specific references:

>> Documentation relative to NM0069 "30 TPD Bio-diesel Project in Andhra Pradesh, India" and its assessment by the Meth Panel.

b) Indicate any further comments:

>> The applicability conditions cannot include the requirement that "the bio-diesel plant developer owns the CERs": the host country may have some requirements on CER-sharing.

II. Proposed new monitoring methodology *(specify title here):* >> Bio-diesel production and switching fossil fuels from petro-diesel to bio-diesel in the transport sector.

In respect of the proposed new monitoring methodology, evaluate each section of CDM-NMM to the draft CDM-PDD. Please provide your comments section by section:

(1) Brief description of new methodology:

Describe new methodology:

>> Baseline emissions in transport depend on many parameters such as technology level, fuel consumed, emission controls, operating characteristics, age of engines etc. The proposed methodology states that monitoring these emissions is difficult and complex. Thus, it uses a common emission factor based on the national data or IPCC emission factors, and monitors electricity consumption, petro-diesel and other fossil fuel use to calculate GHG emissions from bio-diesel production. The methodology also estimates CO_2 emissions/sequestration in plantations - although it is not clear if this is all for new plantations, or for all

relevant plantations (See concern about the sequestration element raised in the section on baselines above). Project emissions are based on the production of bio-diesel, partially emissions caused by the production of oil-seeds, and transport emissions to/from the bio-diesel plant. Most data used is proprietary, or from national sources/IPCC. The project also monitors sales of bio-diesel.

(2) Key assumptions/parameters:

a) List the implicit and explicit key assumptions. Identify those, if any, which are problematic and explain:

>>

- CERs from bio-diesel consumption will not be claimed by bio-diesel users or distributors. Problematic, as no monitoring of this assumption is made.
- Quantity of bio-diesel produced (should be "sold") = quantity of petro-diesel substituted. This is problematic as it does not account for theft, wastage etc (this point was also raised in the review of NM0069).
- All bio-diesel is consumed in the host (or other non-Annex I) country. This should be corrected, e.g. by asking for a list of retailers and the country in which they are located.
- (Other assumptions as per the baseline methodology outlined above).

b) State whether the key assumptions are arrived at in a transparent manner:

>> Assumptions 2 and 3 are not transparent.

c) Give your expert judgement on whether the assumptions/parameters are adequate:

>> Some changes are needed, as outlined in a) above (and also in section I).

(3) Data sources and data quality:

a) Indicate which data sources are used and how the data are obtained (e.g. official statistics, expert judgement):

>> Data sources are project-based for core data such as bio-diesel produced and consumed, electricity and fuel used in plant, land area for oil seeds, identification of vegetation. Some data are proprietary or official. Others are not specified beyond "publicly available sources". Since this is the source for the sequestration rates in plantations, and since such rates can vary significantly, more guidance on this would appear necessary.

b) Give your expert judgement on whether the data used are adequate, consistent, accurate and reliable:

>> Further information is needed on how to assess sequestration rates (particularly if the project is planning to claim credits for sequestration, which is possible under the currently proposed methodology). The efficiency indicator needs to be improved, as outlined above. It should be specified which methodology is to be used to calculate the emission factor for grid electricity. Corrections outlined in section 2 above should be undertaken.

c) *State possible data gaps:*

>> Information needed to assess:

- The "efficiency factor";
- Bio-diesel consumed in the host country for transportation purposes;
- Emissions from production of oil seeds (including N_2O in plantations if significant)
- Ex ante monitoring of type of species/areas covered by plantations for oil seeds (otherwise it is difficult to assess the GHG implications of land clearing)
- That CERs will not be claimed by users of bio-diesel.

(4) Assessment of the description of the proposed methodology and its applicability:

a) State whether the proposed methodology has been described in an adequate manner:

>> Yes.

b) State whether the proposed methodology is appropriate for the referred proposed project activity and the referred project context (described in Sections A - E of the draft CDM-PDD and submitted along with CDM-NMM):

>> Yes, with modifications in CDM-NMB and CDM-NMM as suggested.

c) State whether this proposed monitoring methodology is compatible with the proposed baseline methodology described in CDM-NMB of the draft CDM-PDD:

>> Yes, although both need modification.

(5) Leakage *(please elaborate, if appropriate)***:**

>> The monitoring methodology requires monitoring the methanol consumed in bio-diesel production in order to estimate associated methane emissions.

(6) Quality assurance and control procedures *(please explain)***:**

>> QA/QC planned for some items – although not all are in the control of the project proponent (e.g. estimating sequestration rates).

(7) Potential strengths and weaknesses of the proposed monitoring methodology *(please explain)***:**

>> Simple, but subject to same weaknesses as the baseline methodology (particularly data gaps, potential for double-counting).

(8) Applicability of the proposed methodology across project types and regions *(please indicate)***:**

>> Once modified, the methodology should have a wide applicability.

(9) Any other comments:

a) State whether any other source of information (i.e. other than documentation on this proposed methodology available on the UNFCCC CDM web site) has been used by you in evaluating this methodology. If so, please provide specific references:

>> Data relevant to NM0069 and its assessment.

b) Indicate any further comments:

>> No further comments.

Signature of Meth Panel Chair ……..

Date: 22/06/2005 *Jean-Jacques Becker*

Signature of Meth Panel Vice-Chair ……..

Date: 22/06/2005 *(name)*

Information to be completed by the secretariat	
F-CDM-NMmp doc id number	F-CDM-NMmp-NM0108

Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat	22 June 2005
Date of transmission to the EB	22 June 2005
Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site	22 June 2005