



**AMERICAN CARBON REGISTRY**  
**AFOLU TECHNICAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**



<b>Issue Under Review:</b>	Proposed modification to ACR-approved CDM methodology AR-ACM0001, <i>Afforestation and Reforestation of Degraded Lands</i> , to include long-term wood products accounting
<b>Issue Number:</b>	2011-001
<b>Entity Requesting Review:</b>	TREES Forest Carbon Consulting
<b>Date Presented to Committee:</b>	February 2, 2011
<b>Date Decision Returned to ACR:</b>	March 1, 2011
<b>Committee Members Reviewing:</b>	Neil Sampson (Chair), Tim Robards, Marcelo Rocha, Gordon Smith
<b>Earlier Actions (if applicable):</b>	None

### Summary of Issue under Review

A project proponent, TREES Forest Carbon Consulting, would like to use the CDM methodology AR-ACM0001, version 5, for Afforestation and Reforestation of Degraded Lands. ACR has already approved the use of this methodology, providing certain clarifications for compatibility with ACR requirements.

The project proponent proposes to add to ACM0001 selected sections of the VCS-approved methodology VM0003, to incorporate long-term wood products as a significant carbon pool and provide guidance for accounting this pool. The project proponent has laid out the proposed new methodology based on ACM0001 v5, with ACR's earlier clarifications highlighted in green and the proponent's additions (from VM0003) highlighted in yellow. They have also provided a brief explanatory note.

ACR is requesting the Committee's review and recommendation whether the proposed modification (incorporation of long-term wood products accounting from VM0003) is acceptable. Review of ACM0001 v5 itself is outside the scope of this request, since ACR has already approved that methodology. ACR has no automatic approval of VCS-approved methodologies, even when (as in this case) authored by Winrock, so cannot approve this modification without a Committee recommendation.

### Summary of Committee Review and Discussion

The Committee had a significant discussion about the appropriateness of including harvested wood products in an afforestation methodology. The majority of the Committee feels that this is warranted, but this was not unanimous. There are some minor questions, as follows:

On page 4, there is a question about the explanation given in the table. The explanation says "The methodology provides an approach for accounting for this pool, but it allows also for exclusion of the wood products pool if transparent and verifiable information can be provided that carbon stocks in wood products are rising faster in the project case than in the baseline or are decreasing faster in the baseline than in the project case". Since carbon stock changes in long-term wood products in the baseline = 0 (page 9); long-term wood products will always increase faster in the project scenario, if

harvesting occurs, and there could never be a decrease in the zero baseline. So, maybe the best way to explain this pool is simply to say that the choice is optional.

We believe the Program Participant should have the option to use specific values in the Winjum et al. method if they have local or national sources that can be validated by peer-reviewed literature. In the absence of such sources, the default values of the methodology should apply.

Editorial suggestion: Section 5.1.5, page 20, first sentence: "...from [the] project scenario...".

In most of the equations, including the existing methodology as well as the proposed addition, it appears that they apply only to one inventory stratum, and there appears to be no step that sums all strata into a project-wide total. This could be exceptionally difficult in terms of harvested wood products, since the inventory strata and the harvesting boundaries are unlikely to be the same. The proponent may wish to clarify that in Section 5.15.

### **Committee Decision and Recommendation**

The proposed methodology seems to be consistent with the documentation and formulas of the underlying afforestation methodology, and appear to be technically accurate. We recommend that the proposed methodology be approved after the proponent has considered the comments above.