<u>International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) Carbon Offsetting and Reduction</u> <u>Scheme for International Aviation (CORSIA)</u>

Application Form for Emissions Units Programs

CONTENTS

Section I: About this Assessment

Background

Disclaimer

Section II: Instructions

Submission and contacts

Form basis and cross-references

Form completeness

Form scope

Program revision

"Linked" certification schemes

Disclosure of program application forms

Section III: Application Form

PART 1: General information

PART 2: Program summary

PART 3: Emissions Unit Program Design Elements

PART 4: Carbon Offset Credit Integrity Assessment Criteria

PART 5: Program comments

Section IV: Signature

SECTION I: ABOUT THIS ASSESSMENT

Background

Following the agreement at the 39th Assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), governments and the aviation industry are getting ready to implement the Carbon Offsetting and Reduction Scheme for International Aviation (CORSIA). Together with other mitigation measures, CORSIA will help achieve international aviation's aspirational goal of carbon neutral growth from year 2020.

Aeroplane Operators will meet their offsetting requirements under CORSIA by purchasing and cancelling CORSIA eligible emissions units, which will be determined by the ICAO Council upon recommendations by its Technical Advisory Body (TAB), according to paragraph 20 d) of ICAO Assembly Resolution A39-3.

As an initial step, in November 2017, the ICAO Council provisionally approved CORSIA Emissions Unit Eligibility Criteria (EUC). Application of the EUC will serve as the basis for the Council's decisions on CORSIA-eligible emissions units.

To make further progress on the application of the EUC, the ICAO Council requested its Committee on Aviation Environmental Protection (CAEP) to informally test emissions unit programs against the EUC. The results and recommendations of the informal testing were provided to the Council, including the recommendation for the EUC to be used by the TAB in this assessment process.

Subsequently, in March 2019, the ICAO Council unanimously approved the EUC for use by the TAB in undertaking its tasks. At the same time, the ICAO Council also approved the 19 members of the TAB and its Terms of Reference (TOR).

ICAO has invited emissions unit programs to apply for the assessment, which will involve collecting information from each program through this program application form.

Through this assessment, the TAB will develop recommendations on the list of eligible emissions unit programs (and potentially project types) for use under the CORSIA, which will then be considered by the ICAO Council to make its decision on CORSIA eligible emissions units.

This form is accompanied by Appendix A "Supplementary Information for Assessment of Emissions Unit Programs", containing the EUC and Guidelines for Criteria Interpretation. These EUC and Guidelines are provided to inform programs' completion of this application form, in which they are cross-referenced by paragraph number.

Program responses to this application form will serve as the primary basis for the assessment. Such assessment may involve e.g. clarification questions, an in-person interview, and a completeness check of the application, as further requested. Programs which are invited for an in-person interview will receive advance notice of the time and date of the interview.

The working language of the assessment process is English. If the program documents and information are not published in English, the program should fully describe in English (rather than summarize) this information in the fields provided in this form, and in response to any additional questions. Translation services are not available for this process. Those programs that need to translate documents prior to submission may contact the ICAO Secretariat regarding accommodation.

Disclaimer: The information contained in the application, and any supporting evidence or clarification provided by the applicant including information designated as "business confidential" by the applicant, will be provided to the members of the TAB to properly assess the Program and make recommendations to the ICAO Council. The application and such other evidence or clarification will be made publicly available on the ICAO CORSIA website for the public to provide comments, except for information which the applicant designates as "business confidential". The applicant shall bear all expenses related to the collection of information for the preparation of the application, preparation and submission of the application to the ICAO Secretariat and provision of any subsequent clarification sought by the Secretariat and/or the members of the TAB. Under no circumstances shall ICAO be responsible for the reimbursement of such or any other expenses borne by the applicant in this regard, or any loss or damages that the applicant may incur in relation to the assessment and outcome of this process.

SECTION II: INSTRUCTIONS

Submission and contacts

A Program is invited to complete and submit the form, and any accompanying evidence, through the ICAO CORSIA website no later than close of business on 12 July 2019. Within seven business days of receiving this form, the Secretariat will notify the Program that its form was received.

If the Program has questions regarding the completion of this form, please contact ICAO Secretariat via email: officeenv@icao.int. Programs will be informed, in a timely manner, of clarifications provided by ICAO to any other program.

Form basis and cross-references

Questions in this form are derived from the criteria and guidelines introduced in Section I (above). To help inform the Program's completion of this form, each question includes the paragraph number for its corresponding criterion or guideline that can be found in Appendix A "Supplementary Information for Assessment of Emissions Unit Programs".

Form completeness

The Program is strongly encouraged to respond to all questions in this application form. If any question(s) in this form does not apply to the Program, please briefly explain the exception.

Where "evidence" is requested, programs are encouraged to substantiate their responses in any one of these ways (in order of preference):

- web-links to supporting documentation included along with the written summary response; with instructions for finding the relevant information within the linked source, if necessary;
- © copying/pasting information directly into this form (no character limits) along with the written summary response;
- attaching supporting documentation to this form at the time of submission, with instructions for finding the relevant information within the attached document(s);

Please note that written summary responses are encouraged—supporting documentation should not be considered as an alternative.

To help manage file size, the Programs should limit supporting documentation to that which directly substantiates the Program's statements in this form.

Form scope

The Program may elect to submit for analysis all or only a portion of the activities supported by the Program.

In the template provided by Appendix B "Program Scope Information Request", the Program should clearly identify and submit along with this form information on the following:

- a) activities that the Program submits for analysis by describing them in this form;
- b) activities that the Program does not wish to submit for analysis, and so are not described in this form;

c) identification details (e.g., methodology date, version) for activities described in this form.

Information provided under "c" should allow for the unambiguous identification of all methodologies/protocols that the Program has approved for use as of the date of submission of this form.

Program revision

Where the Program has any immediate plans to revise the Program (e.g., its policies, procedures, measures) to enhance consistency with a given criterion or guideline, provide the following information in response to the relevant form question(s):

- Proposed revision(s);
- Process and proposed timeline to develop and implement the proposed revision(s);
- Process and timeline for external communication and implementation of the revision(s).

"Linked" certification schemes

This application form should be completed and submitted exclusively on behalf of the Program that was invited to participate in the assessment.

Some programs may supplement their standards by collaborating with other schemes that certify, e.g., the social or ecological "co-benefits" of mitigation. The Program can reflect a linked scheme's procedures in responses to this form, where this is seen as enhancing—i.e. going "above and beyond"—the Program's own procedures.

For example, the Program may describe how a linked scheme audits sustainable development outcomes; but is not expected to report the linked scheme's board members or staff persons.

Programs should clearly identify any information provided in this form that pertains to a linked certification scheme and/or only applies when a linked certification scheme is used.

Disclosure of program application forms

Applications and other information submitted by emissions unit programs will be publicly available on the ICAO CORSIA website, except for materials which the applicants designate as business confidential.

The public will be invited to submit comments on the programs applications including regarding their consistency with the emissions units criteria (EUC), through the ICAO CORSIA website, for consideration by the TAB following its initial assessment of program applications.

SECTION III: APPLICATION FORM

PART 1: General information

A. Program Information

Program name: Gold Standard for the Global Goals (GS4GG)

Official mailing address: Chemin de Balexert 7-9, 1219 Châtelaine, International Environment House 2,

Geneva, Switzerland

Telephone #: +41 (0) 22 788 7080

Official web address: www.goldstandard.org

B. Program Administrator Information

Full name and title: Abhishek Goyal, Senior Technical Director

Employer / Company (if not Program): The Gold Standard Foundation

E-mail address: abhishek.goyal@goldstandard.org Telephone #: +91 9818646979

C. Program Representative Information (if different from Program Administrator)

Full name and title: Margaret Kim, Chief Executive Officer

Employer / Company (if not Program): The Gold Standard Foundation

E-mail address: margaret.kim@goldstandard.org Telephone #: +41 (0) 22 788 7080

D. <u>Program Senior Staff / Leadership</u> (e.g., President / CEO, board members)

List the names and titles of Program's senior staff / leadership, including board members:

Margaret Kim – Chief Executive Officer

Yvo de Boer - President of the Board

Robin Millington – Board Member

Thomas Vellacott – Board Member

Eric Soubeiran – Board Member

Ana Toni – Board Member

Peter White – Board Member

Owen Hewlett - Chief Technical Officer

PART 2: Program summary

Provide a summary description of your program

1. Gold Standard has been a pioneer in raising ambition in carbon mitigation projects since its founding in 2003 by WWF and other international NGOs. Originally created to ensure the highest levels of environmental integrity and sustainable development outcomes for the UN's Sustainable Development Mechanism, Gold Standard is known as the leader for quality in voluntary carbon markets and continues to elevate standard requirements through lessons learned over 15 years, and to innovate with new tools and methodologies that make rigour achievable.

Every carbon mitigation project under our standard, Gold Standard for the Global Goals must follow relevant safeguarding principles, engage local and affected stakeholders, and contribute to a minimum of three SDGs. A broader range of activities, from supply chain interventions to impact investment funds, can also use Gold Standard for the Global Goals to quantify and certify their contributions to the SDGs. (Refer to a <u>video</u> overview of Gold Standard for Global Goals).

The first version of the Gold Standard was released for use in May 2006; Gold Standard for the Global Goals was released in June 2017. Throughout this period, Gold Standard has influenced other standards in both compliance and voluntary markets, as evidenced by the increasing focus on safeguards, stakeholder inclusivity and sustainable development. Gold Standard now has a broad base of NGO supporters and 1400+ projects in over 80 countries, creating billions of dollars of shared value from climate and development action worldwide. (Read more about our impact.)

2. Within carbon markets, Gold Standard for the Global Goals can be applied in the following scopes: Renewable Energy, End-use Energy Efficiency, Waste Handling & Disposal, Agriculture and Land use & Forests.

A quick snapshot of the Gold Standard project development and certification cycle is available at this link; https://globalgoals.goldstandard.org/develop-a-project/

3. We are a professionally run non-for-profit organisation headquartered in Geneva, Switzerland. The Gold Standard Secretariat is supported by the Foundation's Board of Directors and independent Technical Governance Committee, comprised by external experts in the relevant scopes applicable under Gold Standard for the Global Goals. NGO Supporters and approved third Party Auditors serve as our extended arm. Please refer our governance structure: https://www.goldstandard.org/about-us/governance

PART 3: Emissions Unit Program Design Elements

Note—where "evidence" is requested in *Part 3* and *Part 4*, the Program should provide web links to documentation. If that is not possible, then the program may provide responses in the text boxes provided and/or attached supporting documentation, as recommended in "SECTION II: INSTRUCTIONS—*Form Completeness*".

Note—"Paragraph X.X" in this form refers to corresponding paragraph(s) in Appendix A "Supplementary Information for Assessment of Emissions Unit Programs".

Note—Where the Program has any immediate plans to revise the Program (e.g., its policies, procedures, measures) to enhance consistency with a given criterion or guideline, provide the following information in response to the relevant form question(s):

- Proposed revision(s);
- Process and proposed timeline to develop and implement the proposed revision(s);
- Process and timeline for external communication and implementation of the revision(s).

3.1. Clear methodologies and protocols, and their development process

Summarize the Program's processes for developing and approving methodologies, including the timing and process for revision of existing methodologies:

Gold Standard reviews and approves new methodologies submitted by applicants and also relies on Gold Standard approved CDM methodologies that are eligible within scope. Applicants can also propose methodologies eligible under other certification schemes for Gold Standard approval and use. The approval process is governed by the independent Gold Standard Technical Advisory Committee, supplemented by further expert review and public consultation as required.

For a fuller description of the Gold Standard methodology approval procedure, see <u>here</u>. The process for methodological approval is summarized as follows:

Approving new methodologies

Applicants can submit a new methodology for Gold Standard approval at any time. The proposed methodology can be submitted under two pathways -

- 1. Regular approval: A new methodology i.e. not approved under any certification scheme/standard
- 2. Fast track approval: A methodology that has been previously approved by another credible certification scheme/standard (e.g. CDM, VCS, CAR, CFI Australia, ACR and others) or a domestic scheme.

The approval of methodologies falling under these pathways follows a procedure that is summarized below

Regular approval:

Once a methodology is submitted the Gold Standard Secretariat carries out a check to confirm if the activities covered are eligible within the scope of Gold Standard for the Global Goals. Once this is confirmed, Gold Standard identifies, with advice from its independent Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), two external and independent subject matter experts to review the methodology and provide detailed comments. In parallel the methodology is reviewed internally by Gold Standard Secretariat technical staff. The consolidated comments from Gold Standard's review and external experts' review are presented to the TAC. The TAC then reviews and provides any additional comments before the consolidated feedback is sent to the new methodology applicants. There are generally 2-3 rounds of discussions between applicants and Gold Standard before all issues can be closed, after which the methodology is reviewed and decided upon by TAC. If methodology is approved by the TAC then it is made publicly available on the Gold Standard website as an open source for use by any participant. This entire process typically takes 4-7 months' time. A 30-day public

consultation on the draft methodology is conducted at discretion of TAC, dependent on complexity, risk, precedent etc.

Fast track approval:

A simplified approval process is applied in the case of this pathway. The methodology submitted for fast track approval shall go through a mandatory internal review by TAC members (one or two reviewers) prior to its submission for TAC review and approval. If mandated by TAC, external review by one or two reviewers will be required prior to submission of the methodology for TAC review/approval. Public consultation may be required at discretion of TAC or another appointed committee.

Gold Standard approves CDM methodologies in line with its project type eligibility as laid down in its Principles and Requirements document. For CDM methodologies related to energy projects (renewable energy, energy efficiency, waste to energy etc.) the Gold Standard Secretariat checks that the methodology is not related to project types excluded within Gold Standard as per Section 3.1.1.5 of the Gold Standard for the Global Goals Principles and Requirements (for e.g. fossil fuel switch, industrial gas destruction etc.). If the CDM methodology is not related to excluded project type, it is approved for use within Gold Standard scheme. In certain cases, the GS Secretariat may seek advice from its independent Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) which is made up of a range of expert stakeholders relevant to the methodological need.

The AFOLU CDM methodologies are first assessed and reviewed by the TAC of Gold Standard before approval for use within Gold Standard scheme. The TAC evaluates if any additional requirements need to be included with CDM methodology before approval for use within Gold Standard scheme.

Revision of existing methodologies: Revision of an existing methodology is generally triggered by a request from a potential applicant of the methodology who intends to certify the project under Gold Standard (though it can be triggered by any stakeholder). Revisions may also be triggered by Gold Standard where there is an identified need to do so. In both cases a track-change version of the methodology with proposed changes is required to be developed. Based on the review of proposed changes, Gold Standard assesses if there is need for involving external and independent subject matter experts. If a need is identified the revised methodology is sent to experts for review and comments. In parallel, the revisions to the methodology are reviewed internally by Gold Standard technical staff. The consolidated comments from Gold Standard's review and external experts' review are sent to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The TAC may provide any additional comments before the consolidated feedback is sent to the applicants. There are generally 2-3 rounds of discussions between applicants and Gold Standard before all issues can be closed, after which the proposed revisions are reviewed and decided upon by TAC. If revisions are approved by TAC, then a revised version is made publicly available on our website for use by anyone. This entire process typically takes 2-4 months. To protect the interests of other users a grace period is typically allowed for other applicants to still submit projects using the previous version of the methodology. After the end of any stated grace period, all new projects shall be submitted to Gold Standard with the revised version of the methodology. Projects that have reached the validation or registered stage of the certification process with a particular version of the methodology are not required to change to an updated version till renewal of crediting period.

Provide evidence of the public availability of a) the Program's current processes for developing methodologies and protocols and b) the methodologies / protocols themselves: (Paragraph 2.1)

- a) The methodology development and approval process can be found here https://globalgoals.goldstandard.org/impact-quantification-methodology-approval-procedure/
- b) The list of approved methodologies and eligible CDM methodologies is available under 'SDG Impact

¹ For this and subsequent "evidence" requests, evidence should be provided in the text box (e.g., web links to documentation), and/or in attachments, as recommended in "SECTION II: INSTRUCTIONS—Form Completeness".

Quantification" on this link; https://www.goldstandard.org/project-developers/standard-documents

3.2. Scope considerations

SECTION II: Application Form Scope includes questions related to this criterion. No additional information is requested here.

3.3. Offset credit issuance and retirement procedures

Are procedures in place... (Paragraph 2.3)

a) for unit issuance and retirement / cancellation?

b) related to the duration and renewal of crediting periods?

c) for unit discounting (if any)? \boxtimes YES

Provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures related to a) through c) (*if any*, in the case of "c"), including their availability to the public:

a) Refer clause 5.7 and 5.8 of 'GHG Emission Reduction & Sequestration Product Requirements' for procedure on issuance and retirement of units.

Further, the detailed procedures for issuance of units is defined in section 6 of "<u>The Gold Standard</u> <u>Registry Terms of Use</u>" and procedures for retirement are defined in section 8 of the same document.

- b) GS4GG follows 5 years crediting cycle as defined in clause 3.4.1.1 of our "<u>Principles and Requirements (P&R document</u>)". The crediting period can be renewed after five years and requirements on renewal of crediting period are defined under clause 3.4.11.1 of the same document.
- c) While Gold Standard does not employ formal procedures for direct unit discounting, the standard always applies conservative approaches to the emission reductions certified. These are generally captured within the methodologies.

3.4 <u>Identification and Tracking</u>

Does the Program utilize an electronic registry or registries? (*Paragraph 2.4.2*)

Provide web link(s) to the Program registry(ies) and indicate whether the registry is administered by the Program or outsourced to a third party (*Paragraph 2.4 (e)*):

Web link to the Gold Standard registry - https://registry.goldstandard.org

The registry is administered by the Program (Gold Standard).

Do / does the Program registry / registries...:

a) have the capability to designate the ICAO eligibility status of particular units? (*Paragraph* 2.4.3)

⋈ YES⋈ YES

- b) identify and facilitate tracking and transfer of unit ownership/holding from issuance to cancellation/retirement? (*Paragraphs 2.4 (d) and 2.4.4*)
- c) identify unit status, including retirement / cancellation, and issuance status? (*Paragraph 2.4.4*)
- d) assign unique serial numbers to issued units? (Paragraphs 2.4 (b) and 2.4.5)

 \boxtimes YES

e) identify in serialization, or designate on a public platform, each unique unit's country and sector of origin, and vintage year? (Paragraph 2.4.5) \boxtimes YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures related to a) through e), including their availability to the public:

- a) Yes, carbon credits in our registry can be designated as eligible for ICAO. However, while this general functionality (I.e. to designate credits for a pre-set purpose) is available now it will be updated for CORSIA specificity after the program is formally recognized.
- b) Units can be transferred between account holders and can be retired.

Transfer and Retire screenshot:



c) The status of credits is displayed in the registry.

Issued status:

https://registry.goldstandard.org/credit-blocks/details/39352

Retired status:

https://registry.goldstandard.org/credit-blocks/details/39213

Issued and Retired status:

https://registry.goldstandard.org/projects/details/1503

d) and e) The Gold Standard registry generates unique serials numbers upon issuance of GS VERs which gives certain information that is unique to a project.

E.g. GS1-1-ML-GS414-18-2014-6300-5939-5991

ML identifies Malawi, GS414 is the project ID, 18 identifies the project type, 2014 is the vintage of credits, 6300 is the batch number of the issuance that the holding came from, 5939-5991 is the serial range of these 53 credits.

If GS CERs are labeled, the registry displays the unique CDM serial number that has been labelled. e.g. https://registry.goldstandard.org/credit-blocks/details/37661

(for project details see https://registry.goldstandard.org/projects/details/1342)

List any/all international data exchange standards to which the Program's registry(ies) conform: (Paragraph 2.4 (f))

Our registry is built on world-class infrastructure and security systems, with Amazon used as our data center supplier and auth0 used for data authentication. Our secure data centers continually manage risk and undergo recurring assessments to ensure compliance with industry standards.

The following are the specifications that Auth0 currently complies with:

- OAuth 2.0—an authorization framework that enables a third-party application to obtain limited access to resources the end-user owns
- **OpenID Connect**—an identity layer, built on top of the OAuth 2.0 framework, that allows third-party applications to verify end-user identity
- **SAML**—an XML-based framework for authentication and authorization between a service provider and an identity provider
- WS-Federation—a piece of the WS-Security framework that extends the WS-Trust functionality
- LDAP—an application protocol, used for accessing and maintaining distributed directory information services over an Internet Protocol (IP) network.
- **SOC 2 compliance** audits how SaaS companies, like Auth0, manage their subscribers' data on five Trust Principles: Security, Availability, Processing Integrity, Confidentiality, and Privacy

Data Centers

Amazon's data center operations have been accredited under:

- ISO 27001
- SOC 1 and SOC 2/SSAE 16/ISAE 3402 (Previously SAS 70 Type II)
- PCI Level 1
- FISMA Moderate
- Sarbanes-Oxley (SOX)

Physical Security

Our Amazon managed data centers are ISO 27001 and FISMA certified data centers. Amazon has many years of experience in designing, constructing, and operating large-scale data centers. This experience has been applied to the AWS platform and infrastructure. AWS data centers are housed in nondescript facilities, and critical facilities have extensive setback and military grade perimeter control berms as well as other natural boundary protection. Physical access is strictly controlled both at the perimeter and at building ingress points by professional security staff utilizing video surveillance, state-of-the-art intrusion detection systems, and other electronic means. Authorized staff must pass two-factor authentication no fewer than three times to access data center floors. All visitors and contractors are required to present identification and are signed in and continually escorted by authorized staff.

Amazon only provides data center access and information to employees who have a legitimate business need for such privileges. When an employee no longer has a business need for these privileges, his or her access is immediately revoked, even if they continue to be an employee of Amazon or Amazon Web Services. All physical and electronic access to data centers by Amazon employees is logged and audited routinely.

For additional information see: https://aws.amazon.com/security

Are policies in place to prevent the Program registry administrators from having financial, XYES commercial or fiduciary conflicts of interest in the governance or provision of registry services? (Paragraph 2.4.6)

To address and isolate such conflicts, should they arise? (Paragraph 2.4.6)

Summarize and provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures, including their availability to the public:

The program's registry administrators are employed by the Gold Standard Foundation (GSF). GSF has policies in place to prevent program staff from having any possible conflict of interest. These policies are memorialized in our Employee Handbook, our Director Handbook, and in our independent contractor agreements, which each employee, Director and independent contractors are required to sign respectively. Each member of our staff, board, and outside vendor teams have an obligation to keep his or her conflicts form updated throughout their term of service. Where conflicts have arisen and been disclosed in the past, they have been managed through meeting or vote recusal. Access to confidential information is also restricted.

Are provisions in place...

a) ensuring the screening of requests for registry accounts? (Paragraph 2.4.7)

b) restricting the Program registry (or registries) accounts to registered businesses and individuals? (*Paragraph 2.4.7*)

⊠ YES

c) ensuring the periodic audit or evaluation of registry compliance with security provisions? (*Paragraph 2.4.8*)

Summarize registry security provisions, including related to a) through c); and provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures, including their availability to the public:

- a) The Gold Standard registry team carries out 'Know Your Customer' (KYC) due diligence checks on account applicants. They are required to be a registered business and must provide supporting documentation to that affect. They must also explain their business type and reason for requiring a registry account. An account manager must be nominated by a company director.
- b) To open an account on the Gold Standard Impact Registry, following documentation is required to be submitted:
 - A certified copy of organisation's Certificate of Incorporation.
 - Company or organisation's registration number, registered office address, names of all directors (preferably an official extract from the registry) and organisation's website URL.A bank statement less than 90 days old from organisation's bank showing the address of the organisation.
 - A letter on organisation's letterhead stating that the proposed account manager has been duly appointed and is authorised, on behalf of the organisation, to accept The Gold Standard Foundation's Terms of Use and any modification. There must be satisfactory evidence that the individual who has signed the letter is authorised to do so on behalf of organisation (e.g. director or another senior officer).
 - A statement setting out the nature of organisation's business, reason for applying for a Gold Standard registry account and how they intend to use the account.

• A copy of ID for the account manager, and any users who require access to the account, along with their email addresses.

Signed copies of the Terms of Use and Terms and Conditions should be attached.

The applicants are required to submit the completed application form along with supporting documents like Certificate of Incorporation or equivalent. After review of application form and supporting documents the decision is made whether to open an account or not.

c) All of our infrastructure is instrumented to detect any errors that arise or uptime issues. If errors occur, we are immediately notified of the issue with a trace of what occurred leading up to it so we can diagnose the issue. We keep a rolling set of records related to any users accessing the system and any system communications sent, down to the time the email was delivered. Beyond that we track all transactions that take place within the registry for security and auditing purposes.

3.5 <u>Legal nature and transfer of units</u>

Does the Program define and ensure the underlying attributes and property aspects of a unit? \boxtimes YES (*Paragraph 2.5*)

Summarize and provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures, including their availability to the public:

These guidelines clearly define how the various underlying attributes of a certified unit can be managed through appropriately made claims. For example, it is clarified that all attributes related to 1 MWh of renewable electricity generated are carried by this MWh and attributes like emission reductions and other sustainable development outcomes cannot be disaggregated. It is further clarified in section 2.4 of the GHG Emissions Reductions & Sequestration Product Requirements that simultaneous issuance of Renewable Energy Certificates RECs), or other Green or White Certificates and VERs from a given Project for same MWh of electricity generated is not permitted under any circumstance.

3.6 Validation and verification procedures

Are standards and procedures in place for... (Paragraph 2.6)

a) validation and verification processes?

b) validator and verifier accreditation?

⊠ YES

Provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures related to a) and b), including their availability to the public:

a) The validation requirements are detailed out in section 3.4.6 of our "<u>Principles and Requirements</u> (<u>P&R document</u>)";

The verification requirements are detailed out in section 3.4.10 of our "<u>Principles and Requirements</u> (<u>P&R document</u>)";

b) GS4GG relies on UN accredited auditors (DOEs), ISO 14065 accredited auditors (through ANSI) and ASI accredited auditors (FSC Forest Management, for Forestry scope only). This is stated clearly in Annex A of our "Certification Procedures & Requirements For Validation / Verification Bodies".

There are also some qualification requirements for individual team lead, lead auditor and technical experts that operate as part of the audit team of these GS-VVBs. These individuals are required to undergo mandatory trainings and tests to qualify to audit GS projects as part of audit teams.

The validation and verification bodies are assessed for structure and competence of audit teams. The performance of auditors is also assessed regularly and they are required to undergo some mandatory trainings on regular basis to maintain approval to carry out audits on Gold Standard projects. Approved entities are required to undergo re-approval process every three years. List of approved auditors is available on our website at this link; https://www.goldstandard.org/project-developers/approved-auditors

3.7 Program governance

Does the Program publicly disclose who is responsible for the administration of the Program, and how decisions are made? (*Paragraph 2.7*)

Provide evidence that this information is available to the public:

The Gold Standard is responsible for administration of the Program under guidance of the independent Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and we take the final certification decisions (based on third party audits) on projects we certify. Refer our Governance Structure in Part 2 of this document. Certification decision making is undertaken as a five step process, with specific timings and details. The steps are described in section 2.0 of the "Certification Procedures & Requirements For Validation / Verification Bodies".

Can the Program demonstrate that it has... (Paragraph 2.7.2)

a) been continuously governed and operational for at least the last two years?

⊠ YES

b) a plan for the long-term administration of multi-decadal program elements which includes possible responses to the dissolution of the Program in its current form?

⊠ YES

Provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures related to a) and b):

a) The program, Gold Standard for the Global Goals (GS4GG) was launched in August 2017 however, it is an update to latest best practice and consolidation of our previous Standard 'Gold Standard V2.2' and others, which were operational in June 2012. The first version of our Standard V1.0 was announced in May 2006. The earlier versions of our Standard are available at this link; https://www.goldstandard.org/resources/energy-requirements

Moreover, date of certification of Gold Standard Voluntary Emission Reductions (GS-VERs) can be cross-checked from public view of the Registry. For e.g. the page at this link shows that credits for this project were certified on 29 April 2008. https://registry.goldstandard.org/credit-blocks/details/4530 This clearly demonstrates that the Program is governed and operational for more than last two years.

b) Yes, the Gold Standard Foundation has a plan for the long-term administration of the standard across multiple decades. Gold Standard has a short-term strategy through 2020, and a long term strategy that is currently being drafted through 2030. Please see the attached "PDF 1" (CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENT – NOT TO BE MADE PUBLIC) for more information.

The Gold Standard Foundation Board of Directors manages the overall governance of the organisation and, in the event of dissolution makes decisions and appointments to resolve standards related issues. Please see the attached "PDF 2" (CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENT – NOT TO BE MADE PUBLIC) for more information on Gold Standard Policy on dissolution of the Standard.

Are policies in place to prevent the Program staff, board members, and management from

having

financial, commercial or fiduciary conflicts of interest in the governance or provision of \boxtimes YES program services? (*Paragraph 2.7.3*)

To address and isolate such conflicts, should they arise? (Paragraph 2.7.3)

 \boxtimes YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures:

Yes, the Gold Standard Foundation has policies in place to prevent program staff, board members, and management from having any possible conflict of interest. These policies are memorialized in our Employee Handbook (which each employee is required to sign), our independent contractor agreements (Conflict of Interest Declaration), and our Board Manual (memorandum on fiduciary duties under Swiss law). Each member of our staff, board, and outside vendor teams have an obligation to keep the Secretariat apprised of any conflicts throughout their term of service. Where conflicts have arisen and been disclosed in the past, they have been managed through meeting or vote recusal. Access to confidential information is also restricted. Please see the attached "PDF 3" (CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENT – NOT TO BE MADE PUBLIC) for reference to Employee Handbook.

If applicable, can the Program demonstrate up-to-date professional liability insurance policy	\boxtimes YES
of at least USD\$5M? (Paragraph 2.7.4)	

Provide evidence of such coverage:

The Gold Standard Foundation has a professional liability policy at the level of USD \$5M. Please see the attached "PDF 4 (1) and (2)" for reference (CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENT – NOT TO BE MADE PUBLIC).

3.8 Transparency and public participation provisions

Does the Program publicly disclose... (Paragraph 2.6)

a) what information is captured and made available to different stakeholders?

b) its local stakeholder consultation requirements (if applicable)?

- \bowtie YES
- c) its public comments provisions and requirements, and how they are considered (if applicable)?

 YES

 Provide evidence of the public availability of items a) through c):

- a) The Gold Standard Registry includes the relevant documentation for each project concerning its certification under Gold Standard as can be seen here. These documents are publicly accessible as stated within GS4GG Principles and Requirements (Section 5 https://globalgoals.goldstandard.org/100-gs4gg-principles-requirements/#post-3275— Toc507491057)
- b) Stakeholder inclusivity is one of the five Principles that govern our Program (GS4GG). Projects applying for certification under GS4GG, shall identify and engage relevant stakeholders and seek expert stakeholder input where necessary in the design, planning and implementation of the Project. Project design shall reflect the views and inputs of stakeholders and ongoing feedback shall be sought, captured and acted upon throughout the life of the Project. This procedure is described in Section 3.3 of our "Principles and Requirements (P&R document)" and detailed guidelines on how to conduct local stakeholder consultation are provided in the Gold Standard Stakeholder Procedure, Requirements & Guidelines.
- c) The Gold Standard relies on public stakeholder consultations to make its rule-making transparent, informed, and conservative. Our <u>Public Stakeholder Consultation Policy</u> clearly covers public comments provisions and requirements, and how they are considered. We are currently running a public consultation process to seek feedback from stakeholders as part of planned updates to the Standard. The link to consultation can be found here.

Does the Program conduct public comment periods?

Provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures:

Our Program (GS4GG) is divided into several document series like Principles & Requirements, Activity Requirements, Context Requirements, Methodologies and Product Requirements. The requirements for public comments and duration of public comment period is different for different document series. We have developed our Standard Setting Procedures. In Figure 2 in this document we have clearly defined the requirements for public comments and duration of public comment period for each document series.

There is a dedicated section on our website that lists the Open and Closed Public Consultations; https://www.goldstandard.org/our-work/innovations-consultations

For individual projects, each project must include a Stakeholder Consultation that includes a mandatory public commenting period where the project must make documentation available and record and act upon comments received. Requirements: https://globalgoals.goldstandard.org/100-gs4gg-stakeholder-consultation-requirements-guidelines/

We are currently running a public consultation process to seek feedback from stakeholders as part of planned updates to the Standard. The link to consultation can be found here. We are doing this as prescribed under ISEAL Code of Best Practices for Setting Social and Environmental Standards.

3.9 Safeguards system

20

Are safeguards in place to address environmental and social risks? (Paragraph 2.9)

 \boxtimes YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures, including their availability to the public:

Safeguards is one of the five Principles that govern our Program (GS4GG). Projects applying for certification under GS4GG shall conduct a Safeguarding Principles Assessment. This procedure is described in Section 3.2. of our "Principles and Requirements (P&R document)" and detailed guidelines on how to conduct this assessment are provided in Gold Standard's Safeguarding Principles and Requirements.

3.10 Sustainable development criteria

Does the Program publicly disclose sustainable development criteria used (*if any*), and provisions for monitoring, reporting and verification in accordance with these criteria? (*Paragraph 2.10*)

Provide evidence of the public availability of any relevant policies and procedures:

Contribution to sustainable development and demonstration of real outcomes ex-post are two of the five Principles that govern our Program (GS4GG). Projects applying for certification under GS4GG shall demonstrate positive impacts against at least three <u>Sustainable Development Goals</u>, one of which shall be SDG 13 (Climate Action). This procedure is described in Section 3.1.3. of our "<u>Principles and Requirements</u> (P&R document)".

After identifying the relevant SDG Impacts, projects shall set monitoring indicators to be included in the Monitoring & Reporting Plan to track the delivery of real outcomes on the ground. Projects are required to engage a verifier and undergo verification and performance review of monitored data at least once within two years from date of project registration or start of operation, whichever is later. This procedure is described in Section 3.4 of our "Principles and Requirements (P&R document)".

3.11 Avoidance of double counting, issuance and claiming

SECTION III, Part 4.7—Are only counted once towards a mitigation obligation includes questions related to this criterion. No additional information is requested here.

PART 4: Carbon Offset Credit Integrity Assessment Criteria

Note—Where the Program has any immediate plans to revise the Program (e.g., its policies, procedures, measures) to enhance consistency with a given criterion or guideline, provide the following information in response to the relevant form question(s):

- Proposed revision(s);
- Process and proposed timeline to develop and implement the proposed revision(s);
- Process and timeline for external communication and implementation of the revision(s).

4.1 Are additional

What is the threshold for over-issuance risk beyond which the Program provisions or measures require a response? (*Quantify if possible*)

The Program does not prescribe thresholds for over-issuance, rather any over-issuance is considered a non-conformity and an action to investigate act is initiated as prescribed in Section 6.0 of our "Principles and Requirements (P&R document)". This is a rare occurrence as all projects submitted for issuing emission reduction calculations must be based on a Gold Standard or CDM approved methodology. If over-issuance is reported at a later stage by any stakeholder and investigation by Gold Standard finds this to be true, then we generally require cancellation of unsold credits and replacement of sold credits with equivalent credits in amount equal to over-issued credits.

Gold Standard project reviews include an assessment of whether the emission reductions that are being requested to be issued are in line with what is estimated ex-ante in the approved design of the project.

Is additionality and baseline-setting assessed by an accredited and independent third-party verification entity, and reviewed by the Program? (*Paragraph 3.1*)

 \boxtimes YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures, including their availability to the public:

Additionality and baseline setting of all projects submitted to Gold Standard for certification are assessed by an independent and accredited third-party entity called a Gold Standard Validation and Verification Body (GS-VVB). In the context of non-CDM projects or what we call GS-VER projects, Gold Standard systematically reviews the additionality and baseline of all projects that are not covered under the positive list. In the context of CDM projects applying for additional Gold Standard certification, Gold Standard does not review additionality (as it is not the issuer of the unit) but it does carry out a review of the baseline. If the review results in a more conservative baseline, the CDM projects applying for Gold Standard certification are required to adopt the conservative baseline. In such cases, Gold Standard will only label the reduced CERs resulting due to the conservative baseline.

As per Section 3.5 of Gold Standard Principles and Requirements, additionality is one of the Principles that all projects submitted for certification must adhere to. Section 3.4.6.1. of the <u>Gold Standard Principles and Requirements</u> state that "Validation is conducted by a VVB who assesses the up-front design and monitoring plan for a Project against the Eligibility Principles, Criteria and Requirements.". Since, additionality is one of the eligibility principles, it is implicit that it is audited by third-party GS-VVBs.

As per Section 3.4.6. of the <u>Gold Standard Principles and Requirements</u>, "Following submission of the Validation Report by the VVB and payment of any relevant fee by the Project Developer, Gold Standard conducts a Design Review of the Project Documentation and Validation Report."

Does the Program utilize one or more of the methods cited in Paragraph 3.1.2, which can be applied at the project- and/or program-level? (*Paragraphs 3.1.2 - 3.1.3*)

 \boxtimes YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures, including listing and describing any/all analysis / test types that the Program permits for use:

The Program currently makes use of the following methods –

- (A) Barrier analysis;
- (B) Common practice / market penetration analysis;
- (C) Investment, cost, or other financial analysis;
- (D) Performance standards / benchmarks;
- (E) Legal or regulatory additionality analysis

All methods are part of the UNFCCC's CDM tool for demonstration of additionality which is accepted under the Gold Standard Program (please see Section 3.5.1 of the <u>Gold Standard Principles and Requirements</u>. While most projects of small to large size (for e.g. wind/hydro etc.) make use of this CDM tool, simplified approaches to demonstrating additionality are also allowed under the Program.

As the Paris Rulebook is further developed, Gold Standard will be engaged with and closely monitor new tools and approaches for assessing additionality (or other mechanism that replaces it).

If the Program designates certain activities as automatically additional (e.g., through a "positive list" of eligible project types), does the Program provide clear evidence on how the activity was determined to be additional? (*Paragraph 3.1*)

Summarize and provide evidence of the availability to the public of relevant policies and procedures, including the criteria used to determine additionality:

For small/micro scale projects, Gold Standard allows justification of additionality using the CDM's "Tool – Demonstration of additionality of small-scale project activities" and CDM's "Tool – demonstration of additionality for micro scale project". These tools include a positive list of eligible activities that are deemed additional and do not have to apply any other CDM/GS tool for demonstrating additionality. This tool is deemed to be conservative in nature based on discussions around the positive list of project types in the CDM's Small-scale Working Group at its 33rd meeting. Based on the discussions within the CDM's SSC Working Group and the CDM-EB (EB meeting – 63, see report para 102, page 19), the project types included in the positive list are deemed to have inherent

barriers in their operation and maintenance thereby making them a strong case for needing carbon revenue.

Gold Standard does not have a specific formal process in place to update this positive list of projects and would rely on the CDM working group to update this list as appropriate. However, our stakeholders have opportunity to suggest changes to this list at any time and then these suggestions will be considered by Gold Standard at the time of the next planned update of its requirements. Should a decision be made within the CDM process that clashes with Gold Standards Requirements or that Gold Standard disagrees with the decision for any reason then this is reviewed and decided upon by our Technical Advisory Committee.

Describe how the procedures described in this section provide a reasonable assurance that the mitigation would not have occurred in the absence of the offset program: (*Paragraph 3.1*)

As mentioned above, large scale projects undergo a detailed check from an additionality perspective. Such projects need to justify using barrier analysis (i.e. demonstrate that their mitigation project faces barriers that can only be alleviated through carbon revenues), investment analysis (i.e. using financial indicators to determine that without the carbon revenue the mitigation project is not financially viable and hence would not be implemented), common practice analysis (i.e. to show that their mitigation project is not common practice in their sector and geographic boundary). Large scale projects also need to demonstrate that they are not required to be implemented as a result of any host country law. If there is a host country law, projects need to demonstrate that there is widespread non-compliance of this law and hence the mitigation project is necessary.

For mitigation projects of small/micro scale based in the developing world, they face several barriers to their implementation ranging from unreasonably high maintenance costs, lack of technical know-how etc. which would not be alleviated without the offset program.

Further, our Program (GS4GG) requires all projects to be submitted to Gold Standard for listing within one year of start of construction, implementation or real action, whichever is earlier. If projects are not submitted within this timeframe, they become ineligible to apply to become Gold Standard certified. This requirement helps to ensure that carbon revenues were seriously considered in the decision to implement the project and action is being taken to achieve Gold Standard registration.

4.2 Are based on a realistic and credible baseline

Are procedures in place to issue emissions units against realistic, defensible, and conservative
baseline estimations of emissions? (*Paragraph 3.2*)

Summarize and provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures, including that baselines and underlying assumptions are publicly disclosed:

Section 3.1.2 of the Gold Standard Principles and Requirements require all projects to determine their baseline scenario which is defined as the "reasonable, conservative scenario that would exist in the absence of the project." While setting the Baseline Scenario, the Project Developer is required to consider the relevant applicable legislation and how effectively these are enforced.

The actual quantification procedure for establishing the baseline is laid down in the impact quantification methodologies that are allowed under the Gold Standard Program. The approach in these methodologies requires that projects assume a **conservative** business as usual emissions trajectory. For example, in the Gold Standard's <u>Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption</u> methodology, the baseline is determined by carrying out surveys in the project boundary prior to project implementation to determine the baseline technology and fuel usage.

Are procedures in place to ensure that methods of developing baselines, including modelling, benchmarking or the use of historical data, use assumptions, methodologies, and values do not over-estimate mitigation from an activity? (*Paragraph 3.2.2*)

Summarize and provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures:

Gold Standard methodology development involves external experts reviewing the methodology. These experts are individuals with experience in carbon markets as well as the sector for which the methodology is being developed. The final approval on the methodology is given by the Gold Standard Technical Advisory Committee (GS-TAC) which again comprises of carbon market and sector experts. This two-level review ensures that the methods of developing baselines do not overestimate the mitigation from an activity.

Are procedures in place for activities to respond, as appropriate, to changing baseline conditions that were not expected at the time of registration? (Paragraph 3.2.3)

Summarize and provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures:

The Gold Standard Program requires projects to adapt to changing baseline conditions, but this is governed by the methodology applied by the project. If the methodology requires any baseline parameters to be updated during the crediting period then the baseline is to be updated, otherwise it is not required.

4.3 Are quantified, monitored, reported, and verified

Are procedures in place to ensure that...

a) emissions units are based on accurate measurements and valid quantification methods/protocols? (Paragraph 3.3) 🗵 YES

b) validation occurs prior to or in tandem with verification? (Paragraph 3.3.2)

□ YES

□ results of validation and verification are made publicly available? (Paragraph 3.3.2)

□ YES

□ YES

□ YES

conducted at specified intervals throughout the duration of the crediting period? (*Paragraph* 3.3)

⊠ YES

e) mitigation is measured and verified by an accredited and independent third-party verification entity? (*Paragraph 3.3*)

f) *ex-post* verification of mitigation is required in advance of issuance of emissions units? (*Paragraph 3.3*)

Summarize and provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures related to a) through f):

- a) All Gold Standard projects are required to use Gold Standard or CDM approved quantification methodologies that include guidelines on accurate measurement methods for generating emission units. For example, under the GS methodology -<u>Ecologically Sound Fuel Switch to Biomass with Reduced Energy Requirement</u> Section 3 outlines the elements of the monitoring that is required in order to issue emission reductions.
- b) All Gold Standard projects are required to undergo a validation process prior to verification. This is highlighted in Section 3.4.1 Gold Standard Project Cycle of the Gold Standard Principles and Requirements.
- c) The results of Validation and Verification audits are made publically available by publishing the respective reports on the Gold Standard registry. Please see Sections 3.4.6.9 and Section 3.4.10.11 of the Gold Standard Principles and Requirements.
- d) All Gold Standard projects are required to be submitted for verification and Performance certification at least once during their 5-year certification cycle no later than two years after Project implementation or Design Certification, whichever is later. Accordingly, projects are required to carry out necessary monitoring and measurements at least once during their 5-year certification cycle. However, it should be noted that in most cases, Gold Standard approved methodologies require monitoring to be carried out annually/biennially. Please see Section 3.4.10.1 of the Gold Standard Principles and Requirements. All Gold Standard projects are required to also carry out an annual reporting as highlighted in Section 3.4.9 of the Gold Standard Principles and Requirements.
- e) All Gold Standard projects require that mitigation is measured and verified by an accredited and independent third-party verification entity. Please see Section 3.4.6 and Section 3.4.10 of the Gold Standard Principles and Requirements.
- f) Barring certain project types for e.g. Land use, for all Gold Standard projects, *ex-post* verification of mitigation is required in advance of issuance of emissions units. See Section 3.4.10.11 of the Gold Standard Principles and Requirements

Are provisions in place... (*Paragraph 3.3.3*)

- a) to manage and/or prevent conflicts of interest between accredited third-party(ies) performing the validation and/or verification procedures, and the Program and the activities it supports?
- b) requiring accredited third-party(ies) to disclose any conflict of interest?
- c) to address and isolate such conflicts, should they arise?

Summarize and provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures:

- a) The necessary provisions to manage and prevent conflict of interest between accredited third-parties and the Program and the activities it supports are laid down by the external accreditations that GS-VVBs are required to have in order to audit Gold Standard projects. Section 9.1, page 10 of the UNFCCC's <u>CDM Accreditation Standard</u>, provides information on what constitutes a situation of conflict of interest. Section 9.4.2, page 14 of the UNFCCC's <u>CDM Accreditation Standard</u> provides guidelines on what to do when a conflict of interest is identified.
- b) Section 3.3 (b) of Gold Standard's Validation and Verification Body Requirements requires Gold Standard Validation and Verification bodies (GS-VVB) to confirm that they have "no financial interest in and no conflict of interest with Gold Standard or any Gold Standard Project
- c) Section 9.4.2, page 14 of the UNFCCC's <u>CDM Accreditation Standard</u> provides guidelines on what to do when a conflict of interest is identified.

Are procedures in place requiring that renewal of any activity at the end of its crediting period includes a reevaluation and update of baseline? (*Paragraph 3.3.4*)

Summarize and provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures:

All Gold Standard projects are required to renew their crediting period every 5 years. The renewal involves a reevaluation and update of the baseline. Detailed guidelines can be found in Section 3.4.11 of the Gold Standard Principles and Requirements.

Are procedures in place to transparently identify units that are issued *ex-ante* and thus ineligible for use in the CORSIA? (*Paragraph 3.3.5*)

Provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures:

Gold Standard Land-Use projects and certain Energy sector methodologies like the "Indicative Program, Baseline and Monitoring Methodology for the Large Scale Supply & Distribution of Efficient Light Bulbs, Shower Heads and Other Water Saving Devices to Households" allow ex-ante issuance. This is clearly mentioned in the methodologies. These units are also separately demarcated in the Gold Standard registry as 'PERs' such that there could not be any confusion between the two. https://registry.goldstandard.org/credit-blocks/details/2990

Please note that it is also possible to issue credits from land-use project ex-post, if a project owner wished to do so.

4.4 Have a clear and transparent chain of custody

SECTION III, Part 3.4—Identification and tracking includes questions related to this criterion. No additional information is requested here.

4.5 Represent permanent emissions reductions

List any emissions sectors (if possible, activity types) supported by the Program that present a potential risk of reversal of emissions reductions, avoidance, or carbon sequestration:

Emission sequestration in the land-use and forest sector (LUF), specifically Afforestation/Reforestation (A/R) activities present potential risk of reversal. Nevertheless, all LUF project from both forestry and agriculture activity types must deposit 20% of their issued units into a compliance buffer, as stated in Section 7 of the GHG Emissions Reductions & Sequestration Product Requirements.

The purpose of this compliance buffer is to replace units lost in a reversal event due to <u>unforeseen</u> causes (i.e. an unpredicted catastrophic event that is not a direct outcome of an intentional human action or poor management and which was not considered and assessed in a project's <u>Risk and Capabilities Assessment Guideline</u> and/or in the assessment of <u>Safeguarding Principle</u> 4.3.2). The buffer may be substituted by other credits (for example energy) but buffer credits are never returned to the project (i.e. the buffer is permanently held post-project certification and even after end of project's crediting period). In the case where a project suffers a loss due to mismanagement or decision making it is the burden of the project to replace the units, the buffer is not used.

The 20% buffer withholding is based on previous experience and on the fact that each project conducts a risk assessment and implement mitigation measures. Therefore, it is considered unlikely that a project would suffer a reversal larger than 20% of its issued ex-post units. 20% is more conservative than other peer standards and has also been extensively reviewed with our independent Technical Advisory Committee.

However, the Secretariat did conduct a buffer stress test on October 2017 to check the adequacy of the 20% buffer withholding. Three scenarios were assessed involving failure of the three largest LUF projects. The results showed that, at the time, the total number of ex-post units in the buffer was able to cover 32%, 39%, and 54% of a total reversal of all <u>issued</u> VERs credited to the three, two, and the largest LUF project, respectively. Note that not all issued VERs are assigned and hence the total ratio of those that would require backing up (i.e. issued and assigned) is much lower.

The results formed the basis to inform a decision by the LUF Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) on the adequacy of the 20% buffer withholding; it was agreed that the current withholding was acceptable based on the above findings and the VERs sold to date from the projects. It is again worth noting, that the buffer percentage is more conservative than typically applied by other, similar standards.

What is the minimum scale of reversal for which the Program provisions or measures require a response? (Quantify if possible)

The Program addresses any and all reversals from A/R projects regardless of the quantity of lost Verified Emission Reduction (VERs). Current available options to address a reversal event as well as an underperformance event are detailed in Section 7 of GHG Emissions Reductions & Sequestration Product Requirements.

Moreover, as described in our Performance Shortfall Guidelines, depending on the nature of the reversal event, an activity proponent should follow a different course of action:

- Reversal due to an unforeseen event: Activity proponents can access VERs from their compliance buffer account to replace the reversal. If the VERs in the compliance buffer account are insufficient, the activity proponent must cover any gap to meet the reversal by purchasing other Gold Standard LUF VERs (reversal due to an unforeseen event)
- 2) Replace all of the reversal by using Gold Standard LUF VERs (reversal event due to underperformance of the conservative model, poor management, or de-registration of the project)

For sectors/activity types identified in the first question in this section, are procedures / provisions in place to require and support these activities to...

- a) undertake a risk assessment that accounts for, *inter alia*, any potential causes, relative scale, \boxtimes YES and relative likelihood of reversals? (*Paragraph 3.5.2*)
- b) monitor identified risks of reversals? (*Paragraph 3.5.3*)
- c) mitigate identified risks of reversals? (Paragraph 3.5.3)
- d) ensure full compensation for material reversals of mitigation issued as emissions units and used toward offsetting obligations under the CORSIA? (*Paragraph 3.5.4*)

Summarize and provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures related to a) through d):

LUF projects should address reversal events by following the requirements Section 7 of GHG Emissions Reductions & Sequestration Product Requirements. To complement this section, our Performance Shortfall Guidelines provide detailed guidance on how to proceed depending on the nature of the reversal event (i.e. unpredicted catastrophic event or a direct outcome of an intentional human action or poor management).

All LUF projects are required to assess their inherent risk by using our <u>Risk and Capabilities</u>
<u>Assessment Guideline</u>. This guideline assesses risks based on their probability, impact, and scale.

Projects must implement mitigation measures on when their risk is considered high and could lead to reversal events. The appropriateness and implementation status of the mitigation measures are corroborated via a desk review and a site visit.

In addition, risks related to natural disasters have to be assessed as required by our <u>Safeguarding Principle</u> 4.3.2). To reduce their overall risk profile, project must implement mitigation measures.

If a reversal event takes places, projects shall follow the requirements in Section 7 of GHG Emissions Reductions & Sequestration Product Requirements and, more specifically, in our Performance Shortfall Guidelines. The latest provides detailed guidance on how to assess the type of reversal event and the steps required to compensate for the loss of VERs due to the reversal.

Are provisions in place that... (Paragraph 3.5.5)

- a) confer liability on the activity proponent to monitor, mitigate, and respond to reversals in a manner mandated in the Program procedures?

 ⊠ YES

 ⊠ YES
- b) require activity proponents, upon being made aware of a material reversal event, to notify the Program within a specified number of days?
- c) confer responsibility to the Program to, upon such notification, ensure and confirm that such reversals are fully compensated in a manner mandated in the Program procedures?

Summarize and provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures related to a) through c):

Our Performance Shortfall Guidelines specifies that reversal events shall be reported to the Program no later than 30 days of occurring. Moreover, a full report on the reversal event and its impact on the carbon stocks shall be submitted to the Program within 6 months of the date the reversal occurred. This report will be subject to a desk review and a field visit to ensure the information provided is accurate and to assess the nature of the reversal event (which relates to the measures that shall be taken by the activity proponent).

In the case the reversal event is the result of an unpredicted catastrophic event, the activity proponent can access the VERs in his/her compliance buffer account. As part of the requirements to do so, the

activity proponent must identify and implement mitigation measures to prevent a similar catastrophic event from happening again.

In the case the reversal event is not the results of an unpredicted catastrophic event but of a direct outcome of an intentional human action or poor management, the activity proponent shall be responsible for compensating for the shortfall by purchasing VERs from other LUF Gold Standard projects. The Program will follow-up closely to ensure the compensation takes place within 90 days of the reversal taking place.

Does the Program have the capability to ensure that any emissions units which compensate for the material reversal of mitigation issued as emissions units and used toward offsetting obligations under the CORSIA are fully eligible for use under the CORSIA? (Paragraph 3.5.6)

Summarize and provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures:

According to Section 7 of <u>GHG Emissions Reductions & Sequestration Product Requirements</u>, an activity proponent must replace any and all reversals by using Gold Standard VERs. This is further reinforced and complemented in our Performance Shortfall Guidelines.

Would the Program be willing and able, upon request, to demonstrate that its permanence provisions can fully compensate for the reversal of mitigation issued as emissions units and used under the CORSIA? (*Paragraph 3.5.7*)

4.6 Assess and mitigate against potential increase in emissions elsewhere

List any emissions sectors (if possible, activity types) supported by the Program that present a potential risk of material emissions leakage:

Projects certified Gold Standard come from a variety of sectors, notably from renewable energy generation, end-use energy efficiency, waste management and land use and land use change sectors. There are some sectors and activity types that present a potential risk of material emissions leakage. For example, end-user energy efficiency (improved cookstoves, household biogas digester etc.) projects have a risk of leakage emissions. In this regard the Gold Standard methodology <u>Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption</u> requires project developers to investigate the following leakage sources, and discount baseline emissions accordingly –

- a. The displaced baseline technologies are reused outside the project boundary in place of lower emitting technology or in a manner suggesting more usage than would have occurred in the absence of the project.
- b. Non-project users who previously used lower emitting energy sources use the non-renewable biomass or fossil fuels saved under the project activity.
- c. The project significantly impacts the NRB fraction within an area where other CDM or VER project activities account for NRB fraction in their baseline scenario.
- d. The project population compensates for loss of the space heating effect of inefficient technology by adopting some other form of heating or by retaining some use of inefficient technology.
- e. By virtue of promotion and marketing of a new technology with high efficiency, the project stimulates substitution within households who commonly used a technology with relatively lower emissions, in cases where such a trend is not eligible as an evolving baseline.

All land-use and forest projects must also assess leakage following their applicable methodology (each methodology provides detailed guidance on type of leakage to be accounted for and how to be accounted for). Leakage is accounted for and discounted from the carbon units generation of a project on the first year of the crediting period.

Are measures in place to assess and mitigate incidences of material leakage of emissions that \boxtimes YES may result from the implementation of an offset project or program? (*Paragraph 3.6*)

Summarize and provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures:

Potential sources of leakages are identified within the approved Gold Standard and CDM methodologies that projects shall use to certify emissions reductions under our Program. If a project is assessed to cause leakage, then it must estimate and adjust the emission reductions conservatively as per the applied methodology.

The following Gold Standard approved methodologies include an element of leakage –

- 1. Ecologically Sound Fuel Switch to Biomass with Reduced Energy Requirement
- 2. Fuel switch from fossil fuels to biomass residues in boilers for heat generation
- 3. GHG Emission Reductions from Manure Management Systems and Municipal Solid Waste
- 4. Gold Standard A/R GHG Emissions Reduction & Sequestration Methodology
- 5. Gold Standard Agriculture Methodology for Increasing Soil Carbon Through Improved Tillage Practices
- 6. Gold Standard Agriculture Smallholder Dairy Methodology
- 7. <u>Indicative Program, Baseline and Monitoring Methodology for the Large Scale Supply & Distribution of Efficient Light Bulbs, Shower Heads and Other Water Saving Devices to Households</u>
- 8. Methodology for Biodiesel from waste oil/fat from biogenic origin for use as fuel
- 9. Suppressed Demand Methodology Micro-scale Electrification and Energization
- 10. <u>Suppressed Demand Small-scale Methodology for Energy Use for the Processing of</u>
 Agricultural Products
- 11. Thermal energy from plant oil for the user of cooking stoves

Are provisions in place requiring activities that pose a risk of leakage when implemented at the project-level to be implemented at a national level, or on an interim basis on a subnational level, in order to mitigate the risk of leakage? (*Paragraph 3.6.2*)

Summarize and provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures:

Most Gold Standard projects, especially those that have included an element of risk of leakage, are normally implemented within a boundary smaller than country level or, at times, even sub-national level. The methodologies inherently (as shown above) include approaches to determine the leakage suitable for the project boundary and discount emissions accordingly.

Monitoring sources of leakage is included in the monitoring methodologies that are allowed under Gold Standard. E.g. Gold Standard methodology <u>Technologies and Practices to Displace</u> <u>Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption</u> requires project developers to monitor leakage sources every year. See Section 6, page 15 of the methodology.

Are procedures in place requiring activities to deduct from their accounting emissions from any identified leakage that reduces the mitigation benefits of the activities? (*Paragraph 3.6.4*)

 \boxtimes YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures:

All Gold Standard endorsed methodologies that are used by project activities with a risk of leakage emissions require such emissions to be deducted from the baseline emissions. E.g. In the case of Gold Standard methodology <u>Technologies and Practices to Displace</u> <u>Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption</u> methodology, page 25 clearly states that Emission reductions = Baseline emissions – Project emissions – leakage.

4.7 Are only counted once towards a mitigation obligation

Are measures in place to avoid the following, as defined in the corresponding Paragraphs, particularly with respect to registry-related protocols and/or oversight?

a) double-issuance? (Paragraphs 3.7.1 and 3.7.5)

⊠ YES

b) double-use? (Paragraphs 3.7.2 and 3.7.6)

⊠ YES

c) double-selling? (*Paragraph 3.7.7*)

⊠ YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures related to a) through c):

- a) The Gold Standard program has procedures in place to ensure that only one unit is issued for one tonne of mitigation under the Gold Standard Registry. Each unit issued by the Gold Standard has a unique serial number linked to specific project as well as the account holder (project developer). See Section 6 (Listing and Registration of Projects and the Certification of Units) of the Gold Standard Registry Terms of Use. Further as per clause 14.1.a of same document the registry account holder is not allowed to issue two units for one tonne of mitigation. In case any fraud is noticed, Gold Standard has rights to suspend or cancel the account as per clause 9.1 of same document.
- b) The Gold Standard program has procedures in place for program and/or registry administrator monitoring of program registry to ensure that one unit is issued or transferred to, or owned or cancelled by, only one entity at any given time. The process for transferring credits from a project to a buyer, to own or to cancel, is clearly laid out in Section 7 (Recording the transfer of units) of the Gold Standard Registry Terms of Use.
- c) Gold Standard Program has procedures in place to discourage and prohibit the double-selling of units. The process for transferring credits from a project to a buyer, to own or to cancel, is clearly laid out in Section 7 (Recording the transfer of units) of the Gold Standard Registry Terms of Use. Since each credit is attached with a unique serial number, the Gold Standard registry will not allow the same unit to be sold more than once. Moreover, in order to transfer

credits from seller to buyer, the buyer also needs to open an account on the Gold Standard registry hence there is no risk of double selling.

Are measures in place (or *would the Program be willing and able to put in place measures*) to \boxtimes YES avoid double-<u>claiming</u> as defined in *Paragraph 3.7.3*?

As resolved as in Paragraphs 3.7.8 - 3.7.9?

Summarize and provide evidence of any relevant policies and procedures:

Annex A to the <u>GHG Emissions Reductions & Sequestration Product Requirements</u> covers this topic comprehensively. Scenario 2 under Section 4 of the Annex A ensures that no double claiming can occur from issuance of units in countries with cap on emissions. If units are issued in such countries, then an equivalent amount of AAUs shall be cancelled or another eligible unit like CER (from Gold Standard eligible projects) shall be cancelled. Gold Standard acknowledge that these guidelines are valid in the Kyoto regime only.

For addressing this issue under Paris Agreement, Gold Standard is willing to develop procedures and include them as Annex to our <u>GHG Emissions Reductions & Sequestration Product Requirements</u> in line with 'Guidelines on Avoiding Double Counting for CORSIA'.

If no measures are currently in place, describe what measures the Program would consider putting in place in relation to the guidelines in *Paragraphs 3.7.3* and *Paragraphs 3.7.8* – 3.7.9:

As part of the rule update process (which allows for both planned/pre-scheduled changes and interim updates), Gold Standard will develop and publish a formal procedure to allow interested project owners or offset credit holders to make a formal request to Gold Standard to request that offset credits be qualified for meeting offsetting requirements under the CORSIA. The Procedure will include the checklist as available under 'Good practice example 1: Check-list for qualifying offset credits for use under CORSIA' in the Guidelines on Avoiding Double Counting for CORSIA. The applicant project owner or credit holder will be required to provide necessary information as per the checklist and Gold Standard will ensure full compliance with the checklist as well as ensure accuracy of information provided. The completed checklist, evidences of compliance to the checklist and requests by project owners/credit holders to qualify offset credits for use under CORSIA will be made publicly accessible through our registry.

This procedure will be put forward for review by our Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) in September-October 2019 before publishing it as new procedure for use. Once approved by TAC, the procedure along with the checklist will be announced to stakeholders by end of December 2019 and will be available for immediate use.

Are measures in place (or would the Program be willing and able to put in place measures) to...

a) make publicly available any national government decisions related to accounting for the underlying mitigation associated with units used in ICAO, including the contents of host country attestations described in the criterion guidelines (*Paragraph 3.7.10*)

 \boxtimes YES

b) update information pertaining to host country attestation as often as necessary to avoid double-claiming? (*Paragraph 3.7.10*)

⋈ YES⋈ YES

c) monitor for double-claiming by relevant government agency(ies) that otherwise attested to their intention to not double-claim the mitigation? (*Paragraph 3.7.11*)

⊠ YES

d) report to ICAO's relevant bodies, as requested, performance information related to, *inter alia*, any material instances of and Program responses to country-level double-claiming; the nature of, and any changes to, the number, scale, and/or scope of host country attestations; any relevant changes to related Program measures? (*Paragraph 3.7.12*)

 \boxtimes YES

e) to compensate for, replace, or otherwise reconcile double-claimed mitigation associated with units used under the CORSIA which the host country's national accounting focal point or designee otherwise attested to its intention to not double-claim? (*Paragraph 3.7.13*)

Summarize and provide evidence of any relevant policies and procedures related to a) through e):

These measures are not currently in place but Gold Standard is willing to put these measures in place in line with **Guidelines on Avoiding Double Counting for CORSIA**.

If no measures are currently in place, describe what measures the Program would consider putting in place in relation to the guidelines in *Paragraphs 3.7.10* – 3.7.13:

To provide transparency and facilitate the application of adjustments by countries, Gold Standard will implement a process to annually report information on the offset credits that have been issued broken out by country, the status of those offset credits including whether the offset credits are qualified for use under CORSIA, the volume of credits cancelled by aeroplane operators and the quantities of emission reductions or removals that each country has authorized for use by other countries or entities. This process is likely to be in place by end of 2020.

Gold Standard will also establish a process to follow up on whether countries have applied adjustments and obtain required evidence. The evidence will be recorded in the registry. We understand countries will take time to establish internal procedures to apply adjustments in their national accounts. Hence our processes for obtaining evidence from countries for adjustments is contingent to that and is not likely to be in place in near future. This is likely to happen somewhere around 2023-2024.

4.8 Do no net harm

Are procedures in place to ensure that offset projects do not violate local, state/provincial, national or international regulations or obligations? (Paragraph 3.8) \boxtimes YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the relevant policies and procedures:

All Gold Standard projects are required to comply with host country's legal, environmental, ecological and social regulations. Please see Section 2.2 (d) of the Gold Standard Principles and Requirements. The requirement for adherence to "host country" law naturally includes localities (e.g. regional, municipal governments etc.) in the context of requirements that the projects/programmes adhere to laws and regulations of the host country.

Provide evidence that the Program complies with social and environmental safeguards: (Paragraph 3.8)

All projects applying to become Gold Standard certified are required to undergo a detailed Safeguard analysis that entails checking if the project meets all social, environmental and economic safeguards listed in the Gold Standard for the Global Goals Safeguarding Principles and Requirements. In case the project does not meet any of the listed safeguards, it is required to mitigate the associated risk and monitor that the risk has been alleviated over the entire duration of crediting.

Provide evidence of the Program's public disclosure of the institutions, processes, and procedures that are used to implement, monitor, and enforce safeguards to identify, assess and manage environmental and social risks: (*Paragraph 3.8*)

Safeguards is one of the five Principles that govern our Program (GS4GG). Projects applying for certification under GS4GG shall conduct a Safeguarding Principles Assessment. This procedure is described in Section 3.2. of our "Principles and Requirements (P&R document)". Detailed guidelines on how to conduct safeguarding assessment are provided in Gold Standard's Safeguarding Principles and Requirements. These requirements were developed referring to UNDP, IFC and World Bank's safeguarding criteria.

PART 5: Program comments

Are there any additional comments the Program wishes to make to support the information provided in this form?

We are in the process of achieving <u>ISEAL</u> membership. ISEAL is a membership body for credible sustainability standards, with members such as FSC, Fairtrade International and Rainforest Alliance. We have already completed the formal submission of our application and currently awaiting the outcome of review by ISEAL. To the best of our knowledge, we believe that we are first carbon standard in the world to do so.

www.isealalliance.org provides further information on the process

SECTION IV: SIGNATURE

Margaret Kim, Chief Executive Officer

I certify that I am the administrator or authorized representative ("Program Representative") of the emissions unit program ("Program") represented in a) this form, b) evidence accompanying this form, and c) any subsequent oral and/or written correspondence (a-c: "Program Submission") between the Program and ICAO; and that I am duly authorized to represent the Program in all matters related to ICAO's analysis of this application form; and that ICAO will be promptly informed of any changes to the contact person(s) or contact information listed in this form.

As the Program Representative, I certify that all information in this form is true, accurate, and complete to the best of my knowledge.

As the Program Representative, I acknowledge that:

the Program's participation in the assessment does not guarantee, equate to, or prejudge future decisions by Council regarding CORSIA-eligible emissions units; and

the ICAO is not responsible for and shall not be liable for any losses, damages, liabilities, or expenses that the Program may incur arising from or associated with its voluntary participation in the assessment; and

as a condition of participating in the assessment, the Program will not at any point publicly disseminate, communicate, or otherwise disclose the nature, content, or status of communications between the Program and ICAO, and of the assessment process generally, unless the Program has received prior notice from the ICAO Secretariat that such information has been and/or can be publicly disclosed.

Signed:

<i>5</i> ,	<u> </u>
Full name of Program Representative (P	Print) Date signed (Print)
Program Representative (Signature)	
(This signature page may be printed.	signed, scanned and submitted as a separate file attachment)
-	

12 July 2019

SECTION IV: SIGNATURE

I certify that I am the administrator or authorized representative ("Program Representative") of the emissions unit program ("Program") represented in a) this form, b) evidence accompanying this form, and c) any subsequent oral and/or written correspondence (a-c: "Program Submission") between the Program and ICAO; and that I am duly authorized to represent the Program in all matters related to ICAO's analysis of this application form; and that ICAO will be promptly informed of any changes to the contact person(s) or contact information listed in this form.

As the Program Representative, I certify that all information in this form is true, accurate, and complete to the best of my knowledge.

As the Program Representative, I acknowledge that:

the Program's participation in the assessment does not guarantee, equate to, or prejudge future decisions by Council regarding CORSIA-eligible emissions units; and

the ICAO is not responsible for and shall not be liable for any losses, damages, liabilities, or expenses that the Program may incur arising from or associated with its voluntary participation in the assessment; and

as a condition of participating in the assessment, the Program will not at any point publicly disseminate, communicate, or otherwise disclose the nature, content, or status of communications between the Program and ICAO, and of the assessment process generally, unless the Program has received prior notice from the ICAO Secretariat that such information has been and/or can be publicly disclosed.

Signed:

Margaret Kim, Chief Executive Officer	12 July 2019
Full name of Program Representative (Print)	Date signed (Print)
MARGARET KIM	12 JULY 2019

Program Representative (Signature)

Maytho

(This signature page may be printed, signed, scanned and submitted as a separate file attachment)



Program Application Form, Appendix B

Program Scope Information Request

<u>CONTENTS</u>: This document collects information from emissions unit programs pertaining to the following:

- Sheet A) Activities the program describes in this form, which will be assessed by ICAO's body of experts
- Sheet B) Any activities that the program does not wish to submit for assessment
- Sheet C) List of all methodologies / protocols that support activities described under Sheet A

SHEET A: DESCRIBED ACTIVITIES (Here, list activities supported by the program that are described in this form for further assessment)

Sector	Supported activity type(s)	Implementation level(s)	Geography(ies)
e.g. Waste, Energy	e.g., Landfill methane capture; Coal mine methane capture	e.g., Project-level only; Programs of activities; Sector-scale	e.g., Global; Non-Annex I-only; Country X only
	Renewable Energy generation (for e.g. Wind, hydro,		
Carbon di oxide	geothermal, solar etc.)	Project level and Programme of activities	Global
	End-use Energy Efficiency (e.g. improved cookstoves,		
Carbon di oxide	CFL, buildings, ships etc.)	Project level and Programme of activities	Global
	Methane Avoidance / destrcution (e.g. Landfill methane		
	capture, waste water methane capture, manure		
Methane	management systems, household biogas digester etc.)	Project level and Programme of activities	Global
Carbon di oxide	Production and use of of biodiesel	Project level and Programme of activities	Global
Methane and nitrous oxide	End-use Energy Efficiency (e.g. improved cookstoves)		Global
Renewable Energy generation	Wind, hydro, Solar, geothermal, remewable biomass	Project level and Programme of activities	Global
	End-use Energy Efficiency interventions both industrial		
Energy Efficiency	and household level	Project level and Programme of activities	Global
Waste Handling and Disposal			Global
Land Use and Land Use	Afforestation/Reforestation, Agriculture e.g. soil tillage		
change	improvement	Project level	Global

SHEET B: EXCLUDED ACTIVITIES (Here, list activities supported by the program that are <u>not</u> described in this form for further assessment)

Sector	Supported activity type(s)	Implementation level(s)	Geography(ies)
e.g. Waste, Energy	e.g., Landfill methane capture; Coal mine methane capture;		e.g., Global; Non-Annex I-only; Country X only

SHEET C: METHODOLOGIES / PROTOCOLS LIST (Here, list all methodologies / protocols that support activities described in Sheet A)

Methodology name	Unique Methodology / Protocol Identifier	Applicable methodology version(s)	Date of entry into force	Prior versions of the methodology that are credited by the Program (if applicable)	Greenhouse / other gases addressed in methodology	Web link to methodology
e.g. "Methodology to XYZ"	e.g., ABC-123-V.20-XXX	e.g., V2.0	01/01/201		addressed in methodology	
e.g. Methodology to A 1 Z	e.g., ABC-123-V.20-AAA	e.g., v 2.0	01/01/201	o; ;		<u>.</u> 1.
						https://globalgoals.goldstanda
						d.org/401-13-er-esfsb-
Ecologically Sound Fuel Switch to Biomass with						ecologically-sound-fuel-switch- to-biomass-with-reduced-
Reduced Energy Requirement		V1.0	14/06/2017	NA	CO ₂	energy-requirement/
Reduced Energy Requirement			14/00/2017	11/1		1
						https://globalgoals.goldstanda
						d.org/401-er-13-ffbb-fuel- switch-from-fossil-fuels-to-
Fuel switch from fossil fuels to biomass residues in						biomass-residues-in-boilers-
boilers for heat generation		V1.0	14/06/2017	NA	CO ₂ , CH ₄	for-heat-generation/
DOTALISTOT HOM BOTTOTALIST		!	!		!	https://globalgoals.goldstanda
						d.org/401-13-er-ghg-emission-
						reductions-from-manure-
GHG Emission Reductions from Manure						management-systems-and-
Management Systems and Municipal Solid Waste		V1.0	14/06/2017	NA	CO ₂ , CH ₄ , N ₂ O	municipal-solid-waste/
		:				https://globalgoals.goldstanda
						d.org/401-13-gold-standard-ar
Gold Standard A/R GHG Emissions Reduction &					į	ghg-emissions-reduction-
Sequestration Methodology		V1.0	07/03/2017	NA	CO2	sequestration-methodology/
						https://globalgoals.goldstanda
						d.org/401-13-agr-sctitp-gold-
						standard-agriculture-
Gold Standard Agriculture Methodology for						methodology-for-increasing-
Increasing Soil Carbon Through Improved Tillage						soil-carbon-through-improved-
Practices		V0.9	6/22/2017	NA	CO2	tillage-practices/
						d.org/401-13-gs-agr-sdm-gold-
Gold Standard Agriculture Smallholder Dairy						standard-agriculture-
		V1.0	6/22/2017	NA	CO2, CH4, N2O	smallholder-dairy- methodology/
Methodology					1	d.org/401-13-er-tpi-thermal-
Gold Standard Methodology for Thermal						performance-improvements-in
performance improvements in low-income						low-income-dwelling-
dwelling structures		V1.0	14/06/2017	NA	CO ₂	structures/
Gold Standard Technologies and Practices to			1			
Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy						https://globalgoals.goldstanda
Consumption		V3.1	25/09/2017	NA	CO ₂ , CH ₄ , N ₂ O	d.org/2166/
				1		d.org/401-13-er-fie-
						installation-of-flow-
Installation of Flow Improvement Equipment on						improvement-equipment-on-
Ships		V1.0	14/06/2017	NA	CO ₂	ships/
-	!	:		:	<i>F</i>	
						https://globalgoals.goldstanda
						d.org/401-13-er-bfwof-
Mathadalagy for Biodiscal from wests at 16st from						methodology-for-biodiesel-
Methodology for Biodiesel from waste oil/fat from biogenic origin for use as fuel		V1.0	14/06/2017	NA	CO ₂	from-waste-oilfat-from- biogenic-origin-for-use-as-fuel,
orogenic origin for use as fuer		V 1.U	14/00/2017	INA	1002	, brogeriic-origin-ror-use-ds-ruel

					,
					https://globalgoals.goldstandar d.org/401-13-er-ai-programme-
					baseline-and-monitoring- methodology-for-the-
					introduction-of-an-alternative-
Programme, baseline and monitoring methodology					ignition-technique-as-measure-
for the introduction of an alternative ignition technique as measure to improve the energy					to-improve-the-energy- efficiency-of-domestic-coal-
efficiency of domestic coal fires	V1.0	14/06/2017	NA	CO_2	fires/
,	1 110	111100/2017		002	
					https://globalgoals.goldstandar
					d.org/401-13-er-ahc-reducing-
Reducing Vessel Emissions Through the Use of					vessel-emissions-through-the- use-of-advanced-hull-coatings-
Advanced Hull Coatings	V2.0	14/06/2017	NA	CO_2	version-2-0/
	!		:		https://globalgoals.goldstandar
					d.org/401-13-retrofit-energy-
Retrofit Energy Efficiency Measures in Shipping	7/1.0	02/08/2017	NI A	CO ₂ , CH ₄	efficiency-measures-in- shipping/
Retrofit Energy Efficiency Weasures in Simpping	V1.0	02/08/2017	NA	CO ₂ , Cn ₄	https://globalgoals.goldstandar
					d.org/401-13-er-sdmsee-
					suppressed-demand-
Suppressed Demand Methodology Micro-scale					methodology-micro-scale-
Electrification and Energization	V1.0	14/06/2017	NA	CO_2	electrification-and- energization/
Dicetification and Energization	V 1.0	14/00/2017	ina i	1002	<u>Chergization</u>
					https://globalgoals.goldstandar
					d.org/401-13-er-sdss-fp-
Suppressed Demand Small-scale Methodology for					suppressed-demand-small- scale-methodology-for-low-
Low GHG Food Preservation	V1.0	14/06/2017	NA	CO_2	ghg-food-preservation/
		111/00/2017	1177	002	
					https://globalgoals.goldstandar
					d.org/401-13-er-sdss-pap- suppressed-demand-small-
Suppressed Demand Smallscale Methodology for					%c2%adscale-methodology-for-
Energy Use for the Processing of Agricultural					energy-use-for-the-processing-
Products	V1.0	14/06/2017	NA	CO_2	of-agricultural-products/
					https://globalgoals.goldstandar
The Gold Standard Simplified Methodology for					d.org/401-13-er-ms-cs- microscale-methodology-for-
Efficient Cookstoves	V1.0	14/06/2017	NA	CO_2	improved-cookstoves/
			······	!	
					https://globalgoals.goldstandar
Thermal energy from plant oil for the user of					d.org/401-13-er-tepo-thermal- energy-from-plant-oil-for-the-
cooking stoves	V1.0	14/06/2017	NA	CO_2 , N_2O	user-of-cooking-stoves/
	110	1	1	1	http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
					logies/DB/8FKZFJ7SG551TS2C4
AMS-I.A.: Electricity generation by the user	V 16	18/09/2012	NA	CO ₂	MPK78G12LSTW3
AMS-I.B.: Mechanical energy for the user with or					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo logies/DB/M204DLP0XMSWSZ9
without electrical energy	V 12	28/11/2014	NA	CO_2	H4SIZ6W86M8RHCM
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
		į –			logies/DB/JSEM51TG3UVKADP
AMS-I.C.: Thermal energy production with or			i	12.2	
AMS-I.C.: Thermal energy production with or without electricity	V 20	01/06/2014	NA	CO ₂	A25IPUHXJ85HE8A
	V 20	01/06/2014	NA	CO_2	

					;
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-I.E.: Switch from non-renewable biomass for					logies/DB/SO8OOGYGWHMXM
thermal applications by the user	V 8	01/11/2017	V 7	CO_2	287RBNKEYAMN9EUN0
	:			:	http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-I.F.: Renewable electricity generation for					logies/DB/9KJWQ1G0WEG6LKH
captive use and mini-grid	V 3	28/11/2014	NA	CO_2	X21MLPS8BQR7242
	:	:		:	http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-I.G.: Plant oil production and use for energy					logies/DB/OS3W06R22A2YEIQ
generation in stationary applications	V 20	28/11/2014	NA	CO_2	G34LT3KNNC4ZDJT
	!	1		;	http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-I.H.: Biodiesel production and use for					logies/DB/1Y7EK5S8MH3YFDS0
energy generation in stationary applications	V 3	01/03/2018	V 2	CO_2	NJYG862WQRS6WH
		!	:	!	http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
MS-I.I.: Biogas/biomass thermal applications for ouseholds/small users					logies/DB/3WJ6C7R0JFA62VYA
	V 4	03/08/2012	NA	CO_2	2Z2K6WE1RK1PXI
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
					logies/DB/GX9DV8QFP9X8BNR
AMS-I.J.: Solar water heating systems (SWH)	V 1	15/04/2011	NA	CO ₂	5GI1UUJD55EJ03A
			:		http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMC IV . Calan analysm fan hawashalds					logies/DB/5EUY1AEXAX0RKWN
AMS-I.K.: Solar cookers for households	V 1	02/03/2012	NA	$ CO_2 $	J6INHVROP71DD8R
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-I.L.: Electrification of rural communities					logies/DB/CCZKY3FSL1T28BNE
using renewable energy	V 23	28/11/2014	NA	CO_2	GDRSCKS0CY0WVA
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-II.B.Supply side energy efficiency					logies/DB/69MEFLV8HH6LBRAF
improvements – generation	V 9	10/09/2007	NA	CO_2	QRAZ3XEF2BYTMG
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-II.C.Demand-side energy efficiency					logies/DB/7Y44EN2RTD02AJ78J
activities for specific technologies	V 15	13/05/2016	NA	CO2	VWCGARE8W64KP
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-II.D.Energy efficiency and fuel switching					logies/DB/M4LINVAO7Y1OZBC
measures for industrial facilities	V 13	04/10/2013	NA	CO2	UWFBVZBXT3546LM
AMO HEE					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-II.E.Energy efficiency and fuel switching		00444000		gga gyv	logies/DB/9QDGY435JDVTB8H
measures for buildings	V 10	02/11/2007	NA	CO2, CH4	N3VMI61K9XBWY30
AMS-II.F.Energy efficiency and fuel switching					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo logies/DB/JBIGP7UXNB82DGL
measures for agricultural facilities and activities	V 10	16/03/2012	NA	CO2	WTKENW64LZ5D8HD
ineasures for agricultural facilities and activities		10/03/2012	INA		http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-II.G.Energy Efficiency Measures in					logies/DB/DP2BYDIV6RTMZPEZ
Thermal Applications of Non-Renewable Biomass	V 9	01/11/2017	V 8	CO2	2EDLYGLIDPSSU3
Thermal representations of Front Renewable Diomass		1			1
AMS-II.H.Energy efficiency measures through					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
centralization of utility provisions of an industrial					logies/DB/LM7W0MFKXMP1F3
facility	V 3	29/04/2011	NA	CO2	1EWWVUQMGZ73MNKN
}			:		http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-II.I.Efficient utilization of waste energy in					logies/DB/OBBCTATQZSQA6UU
industrial facilities	V 1	16/05/2008	NA	CO2	SYIVAVJ3GZY8W2Y
				:!	http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-II.J.Demand-side activities for efficient					logies/DB/GIIF3094709KR4YEEJ
lighting technologies	V 7	13/05/2016	NA	CO2	XX72UY39L6Y4
	!			!	http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-II.LDemand-side activities for efficient					logies/DB/JXH8OI21V4PIQTL2
outdoor and street lighting technologies	V 2	04/10/2013	NA	CO2	WJLG6KJP5BTY3H
AMS-II.MDemand-side energy efficiency					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
activities for installation of low-flow hot water					logies/DB/748XBKQYSN13E836
savings devices	V 2	04/10/2013	NA	CO2	NPOU9IS4BHOSSJ

AMS-II.N.Demand-side energy efficiency					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
activities for installation of energy efficient lighting					logies/DB/5Z3FA8WFAPJFEXH9
and/or controls in buildings	V 2	04/10/2013	NA	CO2	X0TDO8EL93W9Y0
AMC II O Disconia di con finanza dell'aista					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-II.O.Dissemination of energy efficient		02/02/12			logies/DB/OE502PQ0NA9ETZ5I
household appliances	V 1	02/03/12	NA	CO2	B6HL0ZT2BBKZ35
AMS II DEparts officient number out for					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-II.P.Energy efficient pump-set for	V 1	20/07/12	NA	CO2	logies/DB/RHKFUJR4R2RPM0ZI
agriculture use	V 1	20/07/12	INA	- CO2	9K6K01GUTZ9XAK http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-II.O.Energy efficiency and/or energy					
2 67 7 67 ,	V 1	20/07/12	NA	CO2	logies/DB/YCL1T3NURPHKSHBS
supply projects in commercial buildings	V 1	20/07/12	INA	CO2	R8TIHC2T543HTQ http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-II.R.Energy efficiency space heating					logies/DB/9SD9B6O4446YU1PE
measures for residential buildings	V 1	31/05/13	NA	CO2	V624CYUO5RF3QU
measures for residential buildings	V 1	31/03/13	INA	-	http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
					logies/DB/F5Z29X6OE65C3D2Q
AMS-II.S.Energy efficiency in motor systems	V 1	28/11/14	NA	CO2	WXDZ5AYCCBQ8UL
AMS-III.A.Urea offset by inoculant application	v 1	20/11/17	1 12 1		http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
in soybean-corn rotations on acidic soils on					nttp://cam.unrccc.int/methodo logies/DB/5G3VVUHIXHA0OYIB
existing cropland	V 3	28/11/14	NA	CO2	YJKX7JV02LEUHH
existing cropiand	 V 3	20/11/14	INA		http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.C.Emission reductions by electric and					logies/DB/AWVYMI7E3FP9BDR
hybrid vehicles	V 15	16/04/15	NA	CO2	Q646203OVPKFPQB
nyona veneces	V 13	10/04/13	11//		http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.D.Methane recovery in animal manure					logies/DB/H9DVSB24O7GEZQYL
management systems	V 21	22/09/17	V 20	CH4	YNWUX23YS6G4RC
AMS-III.E.Avoidance of methane production	1 7 21	1 22103/11	1 20		inwox2313004RC
from decay of biomass through controlled					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
combustion, gasification or mechanical/thermal					logies/DB/AZB89EQ3FIRUIN1Q
treatment	V 17	28/11/14	NA	CH4	80MS80RXCLA2TS
ircatricit	V 17	20/11/14	INA	(C114	http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.F.Avoidance of methane emissions					logies/DB/NZ83KB7YHBIA7HL2
through controlled biological treatment of biomass	V 12	04/11/16	NA	CH4	U1PCNAOCHPUQYX
through controlled biological treatment of bioliass	V 12		111/1	10114	http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
					logies/DB/QPVDNPHDG8302KQ
AMS-III.G.Landfill methane recovery	V 9	28/11/14	NA	CH4	5EPGD3OC57KVA3Q
. II. II. III. III. III. III. III. III				(311)	http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.H.Methane recovery in wastewater					logies/DB/5JGU2EUK716KG3UA
treatment	V 18	16/10/15	NA	CH4	E2HBVCK16K199K
AMS-III.I.Avoidance of methane production in			:		http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
wastewater treatment through replacement of					logies/DB/Z5A2LR9Q7XS906TD
anaerobic systems by aerobic systems	V 8	31/07/09	NA	CH4	S4XDC8MKORZ63R
AMS-III.J.Avoidance of fossil fuel combustion		15 170 170 77		(311)	http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
for carbon dioxide production to be used as raw					logies/DB/QC0971YNOM62MV
material for industrial processes	V 3	10/09/07	NA	CO2	YSBSKU2SI532W67D
AMS-III.K. Avoidance of methane release from	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	10/05/07	111/1	1002	13031023133211070
charcoal production by shifting from traditional					h
open-ended methods to mechanized charcoaling					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo logies/DB/5S7G7PZRR5A01LTM
	V 5	09/12/11	NA	CH4	MIQMLVN2BSHCIR
process	V 3	;09/12/11	;NA	;CH4 !	http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.L.Avoidance of methane production					logies/DB/72XV0Z89701S2D87
from biomass decay through controlled pyrolysis	V 2	10/09/07	NA	CH4	UBPFD57WE5AFP5
AMS-III.M.Reduction in consumption of	, v 2	;10/07/07 !	inv.	CH4	
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
electricity by recovering soda from paper	N 2	10/09/07	NA	CO2	logies/DB/58LVBF3H4GKSFFKC
manufacturing process	V 2	;10/09/07	iNA	CO2	HSH0HBEBNJLZM3 http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.O.Hydrogen production using methane					nttp://cdm.unrccc.int/methodo logies/DB/XC2DTEAI88T9TTB3H
extracted from biogas	V 2	24/07/15	NA	CO2	K42GWRFOQ63GD
AGGCCG 110111 010503	i v ∠	;271011J	1177	;CO2	INTEGRAL DOUGGD

					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.P.Recovery and utilization of waste gas					logies/DB/18GIT3IDBVR7RUAI0
in refinery facilities	V 1	19/10/07	NA	CO2	ORD3ID4WHWWAD
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1		http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.Q. Waste Energy Recovery					logies/DB/RGPW18XV4FJH1FTT
(gas/heat/pressure) Projects	V 6.1	16/04/15	NA	CO2	GS2LSD3BWNKNAA
l l		1			http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.R.Methane recovery in agricultural					logies/DB/JQHRMGL23TWZ081
activities at household/small farm level	V 3	28/09/12	NA	CH4	T6G7G1RZ63GM1BZ
activities at nousenous man raim level		20/07/12	1177	CIIT	10070112030W1DZ
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.S.Introduction of low-emission					logies/DB/CAEL7OU5NIMXWM
vehicles/technologies to commercial vehicle fleets	V 4	07/12/12	NA	CO2	9E4RU2C4MV9WHXJN
venicles/technologies to commercial venicle neets	V 4	107/12/12	ina !		
AMC III T Dlout oil muchyotion and use for					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.T.Plant oil production and use for	N 2	28/11/14	NA	CO2	logies/DB/BHJJAG6KCN60INVX
transport applications	V 3	;28/11/14	!NA	CO2	CKXWOXRRX9UKTG
AMC III II Calab Com for Mora Donid Torrain					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.U.Cable Cars for Mass Rapid Transit	***	24/07/115		200	logies/DB/I7O8EX3R0PA22GNG
System (MRTS)	V 2	24/07/15	NA	CO2	BJMH2FHCOIL03L
AMS-III.V.Decrease of coke consumption in					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
blast furnace by installing dust/sludge recycling	İ				logies/DB/QSGY2G2GS87QSIXX
system in steel works	V 1	26/09/08	NA	CO2	MPCWN69ZBOL2B0
AMS-III.Y.Methane avoidance through					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
separation of solids from wastewater or manure					logies/DB/IR1ULTHWQKPQO99
treatment systems	V 4	04/11/16	NA	CH4	2O3UJTTLELME23L
	!				http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.Z.Fuel Switch, process improvement					logies/DB/VLZZ1DVT1QI3KHZKS
and energy efficiency in brick manufacture	V 6	24/07/15	NA	CO2	M6QECOAKNSCXZ
;		1			http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.AA.Transportation Energy Efficiency					logies/DB/4N6Q5WI36PVIUDBJ
Activities using Retrofit Technologies	V 1	28/05/09	NA	CO2	T6M7DBM4I6R5D6
1		20,00,00			http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.AC.Electricity and/or heat generation					logies/DB/OL84HV9C0HNUXAC
using fuel cell	V 1	28/05/09	NA	CO2	6X1H2JYLZYD4OH6
using rue: cen		120/03/07		1002	http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.AD.Emission reductions in hydraulic					logies/DB/GSUXXH5XG6MQNG
	V 1	28/05/09	NA	CO2	F20HQOKFEOL4LL6X
lime production	V 1	128/03/09	ilva	1002	http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.AE.Energy efficiency and renewable					logies/DB/AWRS1U9S13QBGT2
energy measures in new residential buildings	V 1	17/07/09	NA	CO2	FX236Z2CVTMH44A
AMS-III.AF.Avoidance of methane emissions	V 1	17/07/09	NA.	CO2	
:					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
through excavating and composting of partially					logies/DB/CM36WBKIHLSRAOK
decayed municipal solid waste (MSW)	V 1	16/10/09	NA	CH4	AAYDB3N81CQT683
AMS-III.AG.Switching from high carbon					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
intensive grid electricity to low carbon intensive	İ				logies/DB/F29GYOO69Q8XNG
fossil fuel	V 3	24/07/15	NA	CO2	WI65BNI1FX64914A
AMS-III.AH.Shift from high carbon intensive		!			http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
fuel mix ratio to low carbon intensive fuel mix					logies/DB/LPV6TEXQMQK5JQJ7
ratio	V 4	04/05/17	NA	CO2	YZAL97QBIXLXMO
		<u>-</u>			
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.AI.Emission reductions through					logies/DB/ZIKHGNKPYQWDQAE
recovery of spent sulphuric acid	V 1	25/03/10	NA	CO2	1UMUMAOB5HN8Y7G
x	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.AJ.Recovery and recycling of materials					logies/DB/GAEWN9TKQ3RSVT5
from solid wastes	V 6	04/05/17	NA	CO2, CH4	H9JCVQH6EGKUUKD
1011100110 1110000		101703717	1111	1002, 0111	http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.AK.Biodiesel production and use for					logies/DB/LNFDO5DUYAJHKH8
transport applications	V 3	01/03/18	V 2	CO2	DJCRNHTZB9E7P1C
ramoport approunous		101/03/10		1002	103CM4H1ZDJE/T IC

;				;	http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.AL.Conversion from single cycle to					logies/DB/29K4OPZIHAHWEX1L
combined cycle power generation	V 1	29/07/10	NA	CO2	3GM57RXUQTF1J6
contained eyers power generation		1			http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.AO.Methane recovery through					logies/DB/F5U41CTG7ENWK9R
controlled anaerobic digestion	V 1	26/11/10	NA	CH4	SSL5BV1LUPDG76W
controlled anacrobic digestion	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	20/11/10	111/1	CH	http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.AP.Transport energy efficiency					logies/DB/O9M70WPT45KZ55V
activities using post - fit Idling Stop device	V 2	04/03/11	NA	CO2	39IW0BLMGE1ZEPT
activities using post - it fulling stop device	······································	10-703/11	11171	1002	http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.AQ.Introduction of Bio-CNG in					logies/DB/O9M70WPT45KZ55V
transportation applications	V 2	04/03/11	NA	CO2	39IW0BLMGE1ZEPT
transportation applications		0 1703/11	1771	CO2	http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.AR.Substituting fossil fuel based					logies/DB/4K7KI9GY79UEHUKF
lighting with LED lighting systems	V 5	28/11/14	NA	CO2	3140PCID64IXCV
AMS-III.AS.Switch from fossil fuel to biomass		120/11/14	11/1	1002	
in existing manufacturing facilities for non-energy					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo logies/DB/QZLJ9GEQYIAMWGO
applications	V 2	28/11/14	NA	CO2	XCLO8W2AQ6GA7ZE
		28/11/14	INA	 CO2	
AMS-III.AT.Transportation energy efficiency					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
activities installing digital tachograph systems to					logies/DB/I7N1Y6OK4U68VD89
commercial freight transport fleets	V 2	16/03/12	NA	CO2	<u>IPLPXT8WEBTAFH</u>
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.AV.Low greenhouse gas emitting water					logies/DB/FK5MAJTER13DG3ZP
purification systems	V 5	24/07/15	NA	CO2	<u>I76S1RE1QQ6GOB</u>
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.AW.Electrification of rural					logies/DB/GRH88B4S68PO9H0Y
communities by grid extension	V 1	02/03/12	NA	CO2	ELQ8ZMVANO14JR
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.AY.Introduction of LNG buses to					logies/DB/LNSTE8UK3HYYUUZR
existing and new bus routes	V 1	02/03/12	NA	CO2	RHK4JXOAJZCY31
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.BARecovery and recycling of materials					logies/DB/3KXR3AG8ZP2L2Q5T
from E-waste	V 1	11/05/12	NA	CO2	DXXTT17U9GFE70
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.BCEmission reductions through					logies/DB/13LQNV5A5EKORXU
improved efficiency of vehicle fleets	V 2	04/10/13	NA	CO2	G3607N7ROBX6J6K
AMS-III.BDGHG emission reduction due to					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
supply of molten metal instead of ingots for					logies/DB/TM2SA154ZUNU2R6
aluminium castings	V 1	20/07/12	NA	CO2	PAIMAQVE76MF5R7
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AMS-III.BGEmission reduction through					logies/DB/MVOAXD3LGD4ZJEK
sustainable charcoal production and consumption	V 3	01/06/14	NA	CH4, CO2	EERCT39ZLJ3JZA0
AMS-III.BHDisplacement of production of brick					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
and cement by manufacture and installation of					logies/DB/YZBSIH9BCH894GDS
gypsum concrete wall panels	V 1	14/10/13	NA	CO2	D4BP2FMNMI9FU6
**************************************	: :	1			http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AM0007Analysis of the least-cost fuel option for					logies/DB/K1KJFCAOTST4BJOQ
seasonally-operating biomass cogeneration plants	V 1	13/06/14	NA	CO2	M39CB445SF5ZP2
semsonary operating oronauss cogeneration plants		1			http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AM0017Steam system efficiency improvements					logies/DB/E8B6YV4LXC0UFS254
by replacing steam traps and returning condensate	V 2	21/06/05	NA	CO2	Q070PF37XPTNG
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AM0018Baseline methodology for steam					logies/DB/7JODLE9VO380HKU4
optimization systems	V 4	22/07/16	NA	CO2	MYXUJ6D4TMG746
AM0019Renewable energy project activities					
replacing part of the electricity production of one					
single fossil-fuel-fired power plant that stands					
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
alone or supplies electricity to a grid, excluding	V 2	18/05/06	NI A	CO2, CH4	logies/DB/7FFSYZXS2CQHL2051
biomass projects	; V ∠	19/02/00	NA	;CU2, CH4	XI5QBASYNZ2RF

AM0020Baseline methodology for water pumping efficiency improvements	V 2	02/11/07	NA	CO2	http://cdm.unfccc.int/method logies/DB/TH0MTJC0KYJYYMQ
	V Z	02/11/07	iNA	CO2	L9B71Q9QJHOPZ9
AM0026Methodology for zero-emissions grid-					
connected electricity generation from renewable					http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
ources in Chile or in countries with merit order					logies/DB/OOI7OYUFZOXN07H
pased dispatch grid	V 3	02/11/07	NA	CO2, CH4	7EDBA9GVHJ4GK20
AM0027Substitution of CO2 from fossil or					http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
nineral origin by CO2 from renewable sources in					logies/DB/OE28MVRSBGJUV20
he production of inorganic compounds	V 2.1	05/10/06	NA	CO2	B9UB046N62HJ8CP
				:	http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
					logies/DB/V9E3KQAI5433N8ZF
AM0031Bus rapid transit projects	V 6	24/07/15	NA	CO2, CH4	5N7SNKIXE79JTL
			1		http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
AM0036Fuel switch from fossil fuels to biomass					logies/DB/OBDBOHO6HD2U1I
esidues in heat generation equipment	V 4	02/03/12	NA	CO2, CH4	6EIJDODF32WYY3C
AM0038Methodology for improved electrical		102/03/12	11/1	1002, 0114	
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
energy efficiency of an existing submerged electric	W 2	02/06/11	NA	coa	logies/DB/0BTZ9QTVHLGOI619
arc furnace used for the production of SiMn	V 3	03/06/11	NA.	CO2	<u>J3ESTZVOSWJLO</u>
AM0044Energy efficiency improvement					http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
projects: boiler rehabilitation or replacement in	į				logies/DB/3HZ4USHZ2W449HI
ndustrial and district heating sectors	V 2	23/11/12	NA	CO2	AXZN420E5PJB1QF
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
AM0046Distribution of efficient light bulbs to					logies/DB/5SI1IXDIZBL6OAKIB3
nouseholds	V 2	02/11/07	NA	CO2	JFUFAQ86MBEE
AM0048New cogeneration facilities supplying		1			
electricity and/or steam to multiple customers and					http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
lisplacing grid/off-grid steam and electricity					logies/DB/8IOZJL79AXAI87YTB
generation with more carbon-intensive fuels	V 5	04/11/16	NA	CO2	AUWV0318QLEN
Sentential with more encour menorice racio		1	1		http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
AM0049Methodology for gas based energy					logies/DB/ASGAC1E1P2OK7R9
generation in an industrial facility	V 3	27/02/09	NA	CO2	2UPB3RAQ5FHS8B
AM0052Increased electricity generation from		:		!	http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
existing hydropower stations through Decision					
	77.2	22/07/16	27.4	GOO	logies/DB/AMLV2QZ2G46OK2
Support System optimization	V 3	22/07/16	NA	CO2	2QAMRST5LYG4CPY
AM0052D:					http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
AM0053Biogenic methane injection to a natural		12/00/12	27.4	900	logies/DB/FKDGZEEEQC4XNUT
gas distribution grid	V 4	13/09/12	NA	CO2	326116FS0S8USP1
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
AM0055Recovery and utilization of waste gas in					logies/DB/MEIVWRXTD1E4MS
efinery or gas plant	V 2.1	13/06/11	NA	CO2	K9NLTQ452RQQ2OT
AM0056Efficiency improvement by boiler					http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
replacement or rehabilitation and optional fuel					logies/DB/YB7UE3UB2II2INU9
switch in fossil fuel-fired steam boiler systems	V 1	26/07/07	NA	CO2	1CBJYRANZRXER
AM0057Avoided emissions from biomass					http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
vastes through use as feed stock in pulp and paper					logies/DB/9YGTI34RIUKP67M8
production or in bio-oil production	V 3.0.1	13/09/10	NA	CH4	7C4J5OOQ4KOGPP
	, 7 3.0.1	12000110	1 14 4		http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
					logies/DB/QEI1HZXZDIUXMM1
M0058Introduction of a district heating system	V 5	22/07/16	NA	CO2	QDY1P9RVSOQ2Q3
aviousominuduction of a district fleating system	V 3	44/07/10	i1 N/A	<u>i</u> CO2	http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
M0060Power saving through replacement by					
	N 2	22/07/16	NT A	coa	logies/DB/VL1F8D744ZJO9R1E
nergy efficient chillers	V 2	22/07/16	NA	CO2	GM2K0S4CRTRMEF
M0063Recovery of CO2 from tail gas in					http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
dustrial facilities to substitute the use of fossil					logies/DB/NT2ICQVYYXJ1YGS0
uels for production of CO2	V 1.2.0	22/11/07	NA	CO2	PV8FLULKNSN74C
M0066GHG emission reductions through	!			 	http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
vaste heat utilisation for pre-heating of raw					logies/DB/599ZU6S09VXPM7
naterials in sponge iron manufacturing process	V 2	05/12/08	NA	CO2	B80T9SL61GKM20

AM0068Methodology for improved energy efficiency by modifying ferroalloy production					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodc logies/DB/VUJ7B2WM7G0VJAD
facility	V 1	15/05/08	NA	CO2	XC5G9QMAE9QW1Q8 http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AM0069Biogenic methane use as feedstock and					logies/DB/4ZGGL8ZWUVFS1EFI
fuel for town gas production	V 2	18/12/09	NA	CO2	9N6OCAHUXUJQ7T
43.500703.5					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AM0070Manufacturing of energy efficient	V 3.1.0	00/04/10	NA	CO2	logies/DB/R66P8LFQUC30O9F2
domestic refrigerators	V 3.1.0	08/04/10	INA	CO2	GX9Z9CTMN9B8W5 http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AM0072Fossil Fuel Displacement by					logies/DB/TMGAEU1XHW6BFN
Geothermal Resources for Space Heating	V 3	31/05/13	NA	CO2	1CDFCTWV9VUGVI19
AM0073GHG emission reductions through multi-					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
site manure collection and treatment in a central					logies/DB/2N19WQ6DCXNYRN
plant	V 1	27/11/08	NA	CO2	VZQQOHG7TK0Q2D8
AM0075 Methodology for collection, processing					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
and supply of biogas to end-users for production of		12/02/00		900	logies/DB/42ES7QLLGWLEVXR5
heat	V 1	12/02/09	NA	CO2	RTYFFWXQWGMBBC
AM0076Methodology for implementation of					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
fossil fuel trigeneration systems in existing industrial facilities	V 2	24/07/15	NA	CO2	logies/DB/KU3NV20QERK3YGL
AM0080Mitigation of greenhouse gases	V 2	: 24/07/13	,NA	CO2	MR6JQN0KQCXH38D http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
emissions with treatment of wastewater in aerobic					logies/DB/6DITU9V0SFOR7EUY
wastewater treatment plants	V 1	27/05/09	NA	CO2	EBBVRHCAO2RD3Q
AM0081Flare or vent reduction at coke plants		121103109	1171		http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
through the conversion of their waste gas into					logies/DB/06975K2Y497O2WJR
dimethyl ether for use as a fuel	V 1	27/05/09	NA	CO2	8T4SULQQI173DV
AM0082Use of charcoal from planted renewable			1	;	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
biomass in the iron ore reduction process through					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
the establishment of a new iron ore reduction					logies/DB/ZDKO7TGQR2OHHK
system	V 1	16/07/09	NA	CO2, CH4, N2O	MMI1VL9L49LDPR94
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AM0083Avoidance of landfill gas emissions by	V. 1.0.1	1.6/07/00	NT.4	502	logies/DB/R8O6P4ANGE24L906
in-situ aeration of landfills AM0084Installation of cogeneration system	V 1.0.1	16/07/09	NA	CO2	7H08TYVPOM5Q7P
supplying electricity and chilled water to new and					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
existing consumers	V 3	24/07/15	NA	CO2	DOVBINMRONEQC
carsung consumers	, v 3	124/07/13	11171	1002	http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AM0086Installation of zero energy water					logies/DB/RWE3YCC2OXI2Z1O2
purifier for safe drinking water application	V 4	16/04/15	NA	CO2	BK9CRPNX0YZRU5
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AM0088Air separation using cryogenic energy					logies/DB/8OT1457B4DM4ROL
recovered from the vaporization of LNG	V 1	29/07/10	NA	CO2	R4RWSHK9Z252LFO
AM0080Production of discal using a mixed					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AM0089Production of diesel using a mixed feedstock of gasoil and vegetable oil	v 2	24/07/15	NA	CO2	logies/DB/K3NROMK2HSAHE9\ KSSICM06U85OXV2
AM0090Modal shift in transportation of cargo	V 2	24/0//13	INA	CO2	http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
from road transportation to water or rail					logies/DB/4DOIK2WYP8P3AGA
transportation	V 1.1.0	17/09/10	NA	CO2	VJKTOCHY1NXJ4QP
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AM0091Energy efficiency technologies and fuel					logies/DB/32WXA1F47YA70KZT
switching in new buildings	V 3	14/07/15	NA	CO2, CH4	NCXN88W1UUFQTZ
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
AM0094Distribution of biomass based stove		22411			logies/DB/SN0LYZ32U7OZ29CY
and/or heater for household or institutional use	V 2.0	23/11/12	NA	CO2	F3WH6FCFKVGS0
AM0095Waste gas based combined cycle power					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo

AM0098Utilization of ammonia-plant off gas for					http://cdm.unfccc.int/method logies/DB/ONV6MR5V65GXVE
steam generation	V 1	29/09/11	NA	CO2, CH4	RFFSNBNFF0S10TJS
;	;	:			http://cdm.unfccc.int/metho
AM0100Integrated Solar Combined Cycle					logies/DB/BES7OQGMZYOMO
(ISCC) projects	V 1	25/11/11	NA	CO2	9JPTVJHP93BVK4UO
			1		http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
					logies/DB/0U42CLZRFTEERYLA
AM0101High speed passenger rail systems	V 2	24/07/15	NA	CO2, CH4	4SZ87ERW84ZUT
				!	http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
AM0103Renewable energy power generation in					logies/DB/TED4YV12LGKRIU1
solated grids	V 2	11/05/12	NA	CO2	U548D4WPZ5Y6UJ
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
AM0105Energy efficiency in data centres					logies/DB/OW112TO5AHFG5
hrough dynamic power management	V 1	20/07/12	NA	CO2	75LG7ZT1C3BHD7P
AM0106Energy efficiency improvements of a					http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
ime production facility through installation of new					logies/DB/PGRZYPRG0A4MOL
tilns	V 2	13/09/12	NA	CO2	YFV8632P1KUALC9
LIII.					http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
AM0109Introduction of hot supply of Direct					logies/DB/XJSUJMT677WX1Y0
Reduced Iron in Electric Arc Furnaces	V 1	13/09/12	NA	CO2	9VUJBK5GERHQWO
Reduced from in Liteture File I diffaces		1	1		http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
AM0110Modal shift in transportation of liquid					logies/DB/OLZLK5MAYJGJO4D
ruels	V 2	16/04/15	NA	CO2	WV531WVV59GDK53
AM0113Distribution of compact fluorescent	, v 2	10/04/13	111/1	1002	http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
amps (CFL) and light-emitting diode (LED) lamps					logies/DB/MW18NEOFU1PBM
o households	V 1	09/11/12	NA	CO2	
	V 1	08/11/13	iNA		XECFT1RBYPS0VWVL
AM0114Shift from electrolytic to catalytic					http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
process for recycling of chlorine from hydrogen	1				logies/DB/2OB1K4PY36P8EE0
chloride gas in isocyanate plants	V 1	01/07/14	NA	CO2	NOCKLQXRFDZT2U
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
					logies/DB/DH4MT0YS5TCNEZI
AM0116Electric taxiing systems for airplanes	V 2	13/05/16	NA	CO2	1UO61M0Q50LHU2
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
AM0117Introduction of a new district cooling					logies/DB/GSTCEU5OBUFQ6V
system	V 1	04/11/16	NA	CO2	UTX2J80V6UX5UV5
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
	1				logies/DB/Y88077XT5O83TZ2F
ACM0001Flaring or use of landfill gas	V 18	04/05/17	NA	CO2, CH4	EZ36LFIAMAODR
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
ACM0002Grid-connected electricity generation					logies/DB/5725LCHYPYM4I1V
rom renewable sources	V 18	26/04/18	V 17	CO2	OD9SFYVAMFFWNP
ACM0003Partial substitution of fossil fuels with					http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
alternative fuels or less carbon intensive fuels in					logies/DB/DPP1VND7USZ0IGE
ement manufacture	V 8	08/11/13	NA	CO2, CH4	CABT2DF8JCPGG3
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
ACM0006Electricity and heat generation from					logies/DB/SZBV79HP36KDU7F
piomass residues	V 13	04/05/17	NA	CO2, CH4	QI5HFCZJB6OC597
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
ACM0007Conversion from single cycle to					logies/DB/UVVSD3V6CADRJXk
combined cycle power generation	V 6.1	11/05/12	NA	CO2	KGUCFWRH3SRTKA
:	!	!		!	http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
ACM0009Fuel switching from coal or petroleum					logies/DB/CMUDOOMI7G7SY
uels to natural gas	V 5	28/11/14	NA	CO2	DFXA75EIITKEVA4P
×					http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
ACM0010GHG emission reductions from		į			logies/DB/99QRTE6N5QJEBO
nanure management systems	V 8	04/10/13	NA	CO2, CH4, N2O	XP374B25SSIXBB
	;	······	!		http://cdm.unfccc.int/method
					logies/DB/FXBXLVGFF4DLI5W
CM0012Waste energy recovery	V 6	27/11/15	NA	CO2	1PKFW7KBRW62QB

					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
					logies/DB/16BCFQA83AIQG7JF
ACM0014Treatment of wastewater	V 4	04/11/16	NA	CO2	8QGVZOQJUG9FAG
} 		!		;	http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
ACM0015Emission reductions from raw					logies/DB/A8IL4OR2H1FWNDY
materials in clinker production	V 4	01/06/14	NA	CO2	YOJXCMCAA2JA9FV
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
					logies/DB/FXQBDV16UML49NJ
ACM0016Mass Rapid Transit Projects	V 4	24/07/15	NA	CO2, CH4	N03U1QQTEY9J90E
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
					<u>logies/DB/ZNCG27VU8E0ABXO</u>
ACM0017Production of biodiesel	V 3.1.0	04/05/17	NA	CO2	6GHGKTR75U0MIWL
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
ACM0018Electricity generation from biomass					logies/DB/XCP9MV7PKIEXYW7
residues in power-only plants	V 4	22/09/17	NA	CO2, CH4	WCT8U5UYNRK7IJR
ACM0020Co-firing of biomass residues for heat					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
generation and/or electricity generation in grid					logies/DB/EPA4CIV61YIQ7EHB8
connected power plants	V 1	29/09/11	NA	CO2	C1T41SRJ5NMGK
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
					logies/DB/YINQ0W7SUYOO2S6
ACM0022Alternative waste treatment processes	V 2	28/11/14	NA	CO2, CH4	GU8E5DYVP2ZC2N3
					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
ACM0023Introduction of an efficiency					logies/DB/JW18PCU5MLZGRQB
improvement technology in a boiler	V 1	04/10/13	NA	CO2	5QYE6JOM2EUOUDR
ACM0024Natural gas substitution by biogenic					http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodo
methane produced from the anaerobic digestion of					logies/DB/GYN18E8XAL36LNBS
organic waste	V 1	21/02/14	NA	CO2	2TZ9SCTE3RTG9C