



Mr. Gareth Phillips
Project Developer Forum
100 New Bridge Street,
London, EC4V 6JA
United Kingdom
Sent by e-mail to: gareth.phillips@pd-forum.net

Date: 16 January 2012
Reference: 2011-020-S
Direct line: +49 228 815 1687

Re.: Recommending changes to Annex 11 Guidelines for First of its kind technologies

Dear Mr. Phillips,

Thank you for your letter received on 9 October 2011, which has been made available to the Chair of Board and subsequently placed on the agenda of the sixty-fifth meeting of the Board.

On behalf of the Chair of the Board, I would like to thank you for expressing your concerns and providing your feedback on the application of first-of-its-kind in the context of clean development mechanism projects and programmes.

I would like to inform you that the Board at its sixty-fifth meeting (paragraphs 87, 124 and 125 of the EB65 Meeting Report) considered your letter and others which also highlighted inconsistencies between the “Guidelines on additionality of first-of-its-kind project activities” (version 01.0), the tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality and the combined tool, and acknowledged the need for revision of these tools in order to provide clarity and consistency.

The Board revised the Methodological tool “Demonstration and assessment of additionality” (EB65, Annex 21), in order to incorporate all provisions included in the “Guidelines on additionality of first-of-its-kind project activities” (version 01.0) and the “Guidelines on common practice” (version 01.0) in the revised tool. The Board further requested the secretariat to revise the combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality to incorporate the provisions of the guidelines, for consideration by the Board at a future meeting. Once the combined tool is revised by the Board, the “Guidelines on additionality of first-of-its-kind project activities” (version 01.0) and the “Guidelines on common practice” (version 01.0) are to be withdrawn.

I would also like to clarify that the guidelines in question are not referenced in higher level documents. Hence, conducting an analysis of additionality using a tool or other approach referred in the approved methodology is still a requirement.

I would like to encourage you to continue providing such valuable inputs.

Yours sincerely,

Andrew Howard

Secretary to the CDM Executive Board