

**FaL-G:CDM Projects (Bundles of micro and small scale FaL-G brick units)
Signed with the World Bank (WB) by Eco Carbon Pvt. Ltd (ECPL),**

**Correspondence and chronological order of submissions over Conflicting definitions
between 'Provisions of Bundling' and 'provisions of Debundling'.**

Date	Issue/Submission	Explanation
21/05/2012	<p>The World Bank submitted:</p> <p><i>' CDM: form for Communication on Policy Issues initiated by AEs/DOEs'</i></p>	<p>Since WB has signed with ECPL for 8 FaL-G bundles way back in 2006, and at every validation debundling has been raised as an issue which is against to the spirit of genuine SSC bundles, WB sent request for clarification:</p> <p><i>"on the applicability of 'Guidelines on assessment of debundling for for SSC project activities' for small scale bundle project activity where the project proponent only acts as coordinator and focal point."</i></p>
27/09/2012	<p>ECPL submitted to EB:</p> <p><i>' Form for submissions on Small Scale Methodologies and Procedures'</i></p>	<p>In response to the RfC submitted by DOE, EB 69 (Para 112) has given a ruling which was contradictory to the spirit of bundling program articulated by CDM-EB. Hence ECPL has submitted a query on approved SSC methodologies or small scale procedures which sought:</p> <p><i>"Precluding the provisions of 'Debundling Assessment' from applying to genuine SSC bundles constituted with independently owned small scale units with holistic production activity; thus facilitating to invoke the provisions of EB-54 Annex, 13, Para 4 and 4() to SSC bundles under Type III.Z also in letter and spirit."</i></p>
19/11/2012	<p>Teleconference among WB-CDM team-ECPL</p>	<p>World Bank and PP, have given various dimensions and explanations to make CDM team to realise that debundling assessment is not applicable to FaL-G bundles submitted by ECPL. EB personnel appeared to have been convinced and asked for representation to EB.</p>
20/11/2012	<p>Pursuant to teleconference, ECPL submitted to EB:</p> <p><i>'form for submission on Small Scale Methodologies and Procedures'</i>.</p>	<p>Since FaL-G project No. 4 got stuck on technical misinterpretation, in order to find a let out, an amendment to procedure was discussed during teleconference in the previous day and the same is submitted as follows:</p> <p><i>"Seeking enhancement of Small Scale threshold from 1% to 6% for projects under AMS III.Z to facilitate their assessment as Independent Subsystem of Small Scale CDM project activity, vide EB 54, Annex 13, Clause B.3."</i></p>

17/12/2012	WB responded to RfR of Project No. 4 (Ref No. 5348)	<p>In order to get Project No. 4 registered, the World Bank has submitted a 'Request for Clarification' clarifying saliently on:</p> <p><i>'Full compliance of the project with Bundling rules; not registering the project is against to the need to simplify the CDM procedures advocated by high level panel and CDM-EB.'</i></p>
18/01/2013	E-mail fm SSC-CDM Team Seeking proposal for revision	<p>CDM SSC Team suggested through e-mail that ECPL may submit:</p> <p><i>'a proposal for revision to the guidelines on assessment of debundling for SSC project activities'</i></p>
30/01/2013	<p>Req. for revision of SSC procedure submitted to EB vide:</p> <p><i>'CDM: Form for submission on Small Scale Methodologies and Procedures'</i></p>	<p>In order to put at rest the applicability of controversial debundling provisions, a revision was submitted to SSC procedures with the title:</p> <p><i>'Precluding debundling assessment to Bundles constituted of individually operated SSC units with holistic production activity right from raw materials to finished product.'</i></p>
20/03/2013	Comments from ECPL uploaded to AMS III.Z directly in CDM website	<p>Notwithstanding various representations, ECPL did submit comments to AMS III.Z online, in order to preclude debundling provisions to independently owned and operated SSC units, which has nothing to do with definition on PP. <u>But ignoring the main text of comments, SSC 680 is shown there giving the same old clarification on definition of PP.</u></p>
28/03/2013	ECPL submitted 'Letter to the Board' seeking to draw dividing line between Bundling and debundling assessment.	<p>By brooding upon the issue relentlessly, ECPL observed that there is conflict of definitions between 'Bundling Provisions (version 2.0 Annex 21, EB 66)' and 'provisions of debundling assessment'. Then it was opined that if SSCWG and EB realise their own definitions and demarcate the applicability of both, it would put at rest all the controversies. Thus the letter to the Board was submitted stating saliently:</p> <p><i>"Drawing dividing line between the definitions of 'Bundling' and Debundling Assessment' in order to avoid rejection of projects on technical misinterpretations.</i></p> <p>This has nothing to do with definition on PP but EB has called for definition of PP at EB 73 in response to this submission, in addition to <u>advising SSC WG to continue in analyse the issue.</u></p>

19/04/2013	Response fm SSCWG 40 on SSC_680, distorting the issue raised in the submission	<p>While SSC_680 specifically sought for ‘precluding debundling assessment’ on the strength of bundling provisions, which has nothing to do with PP definition, WG replies saliently on:</p> <p><i>“It is out of the scope of the SSC WG to modify the definition or to create sub-categories for various types of project participants”.</i></p>
17/05/2013	Mail from SSC CDM Team	Repeating the same argument of SSC-WG on definition about PP; encouraging ECPL to provide comments on the conclusions of SSC_680.
22/05/2013	WB submitted ‘Letter to the Board’	<p>The letter is titled as:</p> <p><i>“Determining ‘Project Participant’ in the application of ‘Guidelines on assessment of debundling for SSC project activities’ (Annex 13, EB 54)”</i></p> <p>WB discussed various provisions of ‘General Principles of Bundling’ vide EB 66 and sought the EB to update the definition of PP since SSC WG 40 mentioned it as out of their scope.</p>
23/05/2013	ECPL addresses letter to the Chair & Members of EB on the illogical ruling of SSC EB 40 over SSC_680.	<p>ECPL highlighted that the ruling of SSC WG40 is irrelevant to the submission on precluding debundling rules vide SSC_680. It further argued that:</p> <p><i>“When two guidelines/rules framed by CDM-EB contradict each other, subjecting the genuine project participants to suffer and lose money on transaction costs, it is fair on the part of EB to evaluate and bring a demarcation between their own two rules.”</i></p>
15/07/2013	EB’s acknowledgement to ECPL on Req. Lr dt. 28.03.2013	<p>EB advised ECPL to refer to EB 73, paragraph 87 (c) which says:</p> <p><i>66. The Board agreed to further consider the request for revision of the “Guidelines on assessment of debundling for SSC project activities”, in the context of submission SSC_680 at a future meeting. In this regard, the Board requested the secretariat to provide legal interpretation of the definition of a project participant and requested the SSC WG to continue analysing the issue at its future meetings and make a recommendation to the Board.</i></p>

29/08/2013	SSCWG 41 discussing on SSC_680, repeating the same old definition on PP ignoring the key issues on 'Bundling definition'	<p>SSC WG 41 talks only definition of PP, ignoring definition of Bundling in the same Glossary of terms and ignoring its relevance to the representation submitted by ECPL dt 28/3/13.</p> <p><i>"The proposal in SSC_680 includes a significant revision to the definition of the project participant included in the CDM glossary of terms and the SSC WG is of the opinion that creating exceptions or modifying the debundling criteria for the unique case indicated in SSC_680 may affect the simplified nature of the debundling rule."</i></p>
02/09/2013	ECPL submits Request Letter to EB seeking permission for resubmitting B-4	Since EB directed the Secretariat 'to continue analyzing the issue (Ref. No. 2013-248-S)' on request to draw dividing line between bundling and debundling assessment, hoping for a judicious outcome, ECPL sought the permission to resubmit project No. 4 (Ref. 5348).
08/10/2013	EB writes to ECPL on resubmitting project No. 4 vide request letter dt. 02.09.2013	EB turns down the request of ECPL for resubmitting India FaL-G Bricks & Block project No. 4 (Ref. 5348) based on the recommendations of SSC WG 41, which again talked only definition of PP, ignoring the definition of Bundling in the same Glossary of terms. Also it did not address the issue of Ref. No. 2013-248-S for drawing dividing line between two contradictory rules of EB.
15/10/2013	Reply fm ECPL to EB protesting the distortion in recommendation of SSCWG 41	Since SSCWG 41 dealt with definition of PP, ignoring the broader subject referred to it, it was brought to the attention of EB that its ruling at EB 75 is not maintainable.

Note: All the above have documentary support which can be submitted on demand.