

MICRO-PROGRAMME RULES AND PROCEDURES

Unless stated otherwise in this document, the rules provided in The Gold Standard Requirements and Toolkit, and in particular the latest version of Annex F on PoAs apply to this scheme. In the case of any discrepancy, the rules in this document shall prevail. The process flow diagram for developing a micro-programme is provided in Annex AF.

1. Eligibility:

- **Scale of the activity:** Emission reductions achieved by each one of the activities considered under the micro-scale programme are limited to a maximum of 10,000 tonnes of CO₂e, in any year of their crediting period.
- **Type of activity:** Eligible types of activities within the programme include renewable energy supply, waste handling & disposal and end-use energy efficiency improvement¹ activities that comply with the GS specific eligibility requirements listed in Annex C.
- **Host country:** Activities can be located in any host country. However, activities located in LDCs, LLDCs and SIDS (see Annexes 1, 2 and 3 respectively) benefit from simplified rules with respect to the demonstration of additionality, as long as they are not retroactive activities.
- **Activity cycle:** Both regular and retroactive cycle activities are eligible under the micro-programme scheme. For details on the different scenarios applicable to an activity, refer to the latest version of Annex F.
 - **Retroactive crediting:** Any activity can claim emission reductions generated between the start date of operation of the project activity and up to a maximum of 2 years prior to the date of its registration or its inclusion in a registered programme.
 - **Retroactive registration:** Retroactive activities shall undergo a pre-feasibility assessment (PFA) as per Gold Standard Requirements. The PFA can be fast-tracked if the activity complies with the rules defined in the latest version of Annex F.
- **Date of submission:** The “date of submission” of a micro-scale programme is defined as the day the POA level consultation report, the *PoA Design Consultation Report*, is uploaded to The Gold Standard Registry. In order for the PoA to be listed under Gold Standard however, the VPA-DD with the Local Stakeholder Consultation Reporting (section A and C of the VPA-DD must be completed) must be submitted and approved for each one of the different methodologies (or combination of methodologies) or technologies/measures (or combination of technologies/measures) to be submitted at the time of PoA validation and registration.

¹ For the definition of what is meant by renewable energy supply, waste handling & disposal and end-use energy efficiency improvement refer to the latest version of The Gold Standard Requirements.

2. Programme Timeframe

The duration of a micro-scale programme shall not exceed 28 years. The duration of a programme shall be defined by the Coordinating/Managing entity at the time of request for registration for the considered programme. A micro-scale project activity can be added to the programme, by the managing entity, at any time within the duration of the programme.

An activity submitted under the programme would either follow a standard 7-year crediting period that could be renewed twice, or a standard 10-year fixed crediting period. The duration of the crediting period of any micro-scale project activity shall be capped by the end date of the PoA, regardless of when the activity was added.

3. Stakeholder Consultations and Sustainable Development Assessment

3.1 Consultation process. Stakeholder consultation must happen at both micro-programme level (generic consultation) and project activity level (specific consultations), unless convincing arguments are provided in the project documentation as to why consultation at the activity level is not necessary, and approval is granted by The Gold Standard Foundation at the registration stage.

The programme level design consultation is conducted to obtain feedback from relevant national and local authorities, NGO communities, and other stakeholders on the design framework of the programme. This consultation does not necessarily require a live meeting. The Coordinating Managing Entity (CME) shall use the design consultation template to report on the programme level consultation.

Stakeholder consultations at the activity level must take place in a two-step process, i.e. the Local Stakeholder Consultation (LSC) meeting and the Stakeholder Feedback Round (SFR). At least one live meeting shall be conducted between the CME/PP and the stakeholders during the LSC for regular activities and potentially another in the SFR for retroactive activities. See The Gold Standard Toolkit for guidance on how to conduct such consultations.²

A single LSC live meeting can be organised for several micro-scale project activities as long as convincing arguments are provided in the project documentation and approved by The Gold Standard Foundation, e.g. they are close enough to each other location wise and time wise (e.g. start of construction/implementation within the same 2 years), similar socio-economic situations, identical activity or technology, etc. This approach would be approved at the time of listing the activity i.e. submission of the activity level LSC Report. CME shall make use of the simplified VPA-DD to report on the Local Stakeholder Consultation for each one of the micro-scale activities separately, including the rationale for using the same LSC meeting for more than one activity.

A simplified VPA-DD with the stakeholder consultation details must be submitted to The Gold Standard Foundation for each activity prior to its submission in view of an inclusion to a registered micro-

² For guidance on how to conduct the LSC, refer to section 2.6 of the GS Toolkit. Under section 2.6.1, the guidance on the blind sustainable development exercise is not applicable to micro-programmes. For guidance on how to conduct SFR, refer to section 2.11 of the GS Toolkit.

programme. The activity is 'listed' upon approval by The Gold Standard Foundation. At this stage, The Gold Standard Foundation can inform the CME if an Objective Observer is to be appointed for a check of the sustainability aspects of the activity as per the process defined in section 3.2.

The Stakeholder Feedback Round shall cover all issues raised in the Local Stakeholder Consultation meeting and report on how due account was taken of the stakeholders' comments in the finalisation of the project design and documentation. The CME shall also make use of the simplified VPA-DD to report the SFR consultation. This information will be reviewed at the time of registration or inclusion, as applicable.

In cases where no activity level consultations are carried out (programme level consultations only), a Local Stakeholder Consultation meeting in the form of a live meeting is also required at programme level, in parallel to the programme design consultation. CME shall make use of the simplified PoA-DD to report on the Local Stakeholder Consultation at the programme level. A Stakeholder Feedback Round must also be conducted at the programme level. See The Gold Standard Toolkit for guidance on how to conduct such consultations³.

The CME/PP shall also implement the continuous input/grievance mechanism to solicit feedback from stakeholders on unforeseen issues throughout the crediting period of the activity.

3.2 Sustainable Development Assessment (SDA): The SDA takes place at the activity level. An Objective Observer(s) shall be appointed for an appraisal of the risks associated with the micro-programme (human rights abuse, environmental degradation, non-adherence to labour laws, corruption, etc.) as well as to identify potential negative social, environmental or economic impacts.

For each one of the activities, the CME shall identify and provide names and contact details for three independent experts from local universities, NGOs, UN bodies, consultancies, etc. The Gold Standard appoints Objective Observer(s) amongst the three people suggested and/or other experts preferably chosen from The GS NGO Supporters, The Gold Standard Roster of Experts, or representatives of development organisations with host country experience such that environmental and socio-economic impacts can be credibly assessed.

CMEs also have the option to provide additional contact details for experts early on, at the time of submission of the PoA, and in such a case The Gold Standard can potentially approve a pool of Objective Observers who may be appointed later on when the activities are submitted, as long as they remain relevant to these activities.

The Objective Observer(s) shall conduct site visit(s) to provide an independent assessment of the activity(ies) submitted for registration along with the programme. They shall make use of *The Gold Standard Sustainable Development Appraisal Report template – Validation stage* to report on their

³ For guidance on how to conduct the LSC, refer to the GS Toolkit, section 2.6. Under section 2.6.1, the guidance on the blind sustainable development exercise is not applicable to micro-programmes. For guidance on how to conduct SFR, refer to section 2.11 of the GS Toolkit.

assessment.

Prior to the registration of the programme, when risks with regards to The Gold Standard safeguarding principles are identified and/or when negative impacts on sustainable development aspects are expected as per the Objective Observer's appraisal, the CME shall prepare and submit an appropriate mitigation plan to the Objective Observer who will evaluate the mitigation measures and report them in *The Gold Standard Sustainable Development Appraisal Report template – Validation stage*. The mitigation plan shall be reflected in the finalised project documentation with a discussion of the mitigation measures implemented and the establishment of an appropriate Monitoring Plan. The Appraisal Report by Objective Observer(s) will be made available to The Gold Standard at the time of validation. The appraisal will be made publicly available together with the rest of the project documentation after registration.

In view of the inclusion of an activity to a micro-programme or of a verification of the activity, a target-random approach is applied to the sustainability appraisal by an Objective Observer(s) who shall conduct a site-visit and report the findings in *The Gold Standard Sustainable Development Appraisal Report template – Validation stage*, or *The Gold Standard Sustainable Development Appraisal Report template – Verification stage* respectively. The inclusion of an activity of a different type than any of those submitted together with the programme at the registration stage (different technology, measure or methodology) requires an appraisal by an Objective Observer(s) in all cases.

For any activity not selected for an appraisal by an Objective Observer, the CME/PP shall conduct a self-assessment of the risks associated with respect to the safeguarding principles⁴ (human rights abuse, environmental degradation, non-adherence to labour laws, corruption, etc.) and shall identify potential negative social, environmental and economic impacts. In view of the inclusion of an activity, the PP shall use the list of SD indicator questions available for assessing the risks during the live meeting with the stakeholders and shall make use of *The Gold Standard Sustainable Development Appraisal Report template – Validation stage* provided to deliver the assessment. For verifications, PP shall make use of *The Gold Standard Sustainable Development Appraisal Report template – Verification stage* and submit it to The Gold Standard Foundation in time for the verification review.

4. Baseline and Project Emissions

Baselines and project emissions shall be defined as per an approved CDM or GS VER methodology. Alternatively, a new methodology may be described and submitted as part of the project documentation for approval by The Gold Standard Foundation during the validation process.

New simplified, conservative approaches (e.g. based on default factors) are encouraged in order to further streamline the evaluation of emission reductions as long as convincing arguments are provided as to why the approach proposed is conservative enough. The simplified methodology is submitted as

⁴ For guidance on the safeguarding principles and sustainability assessment refer Annex H and Annex I of the GS Toolkit respectively.

part of the micro-scale PoA-DD. Once approved as part of a given programme, all project developers can use the new methodologies for future programmes and individual micro-scale project activities.

When The Gold Standard Foundation is not in a position to evaluate with sufficient confidence if the new submitted methodology is appropriate and conservative enough, as per current procedures for approval of new methodologies under Gold Standard, the proposed methodology is sent out for external review and the project participants must cover the cost for this external review.

More than one methodology can be applied under a micro-programme. Each type of methodology that will be applied in the programme must be discussed in the micro-scale PoA-DD along with a justification of their use. These need to be submitted in time for the registration review. CME shall make use of the PoA-DD template.

A VPA-DD based on the application of the programme to real case activities should be submitted in time for the registration review for each one of the different methodologies (or combination of methodologies) and technologies/measures (or combination of technologies/measures considered). CME shall make use of the VPA-DD template for inclusion or registration.

Any activity of a given type (based on a different technology, measure or methodology) not submitted prior to the registration review but at a later stage for inclusion within the registered programme shall undergo design change as per The Gold Standard procedures, followed by an actual validation and an 8-week registration review.

The latest methodology version applicable at the time of first submission of the programme to Gold Standard shall be used. At the time of renewal of the PoA (after every seventh year), the latest version of the methodology available shall then be adopted.

5. Bundling & Debundling

Project activities can be submitted within a bundle. The upper threshold applies to the bundle as a whole. No debundling rules apply. The scheme will be subjected to continuous assessment by The Gold Standard Foundation and can be discontinued anytime upon the decision of The Gold Standard Technical Advisory Committee in case it is shown as being abused. In such a case, activities already submitted remain eligible for their entire crediting period.

6. Additionality

Additionality should be demonstrated at both the micro-programme level and the activity level, using an approved UNFCCC or Gold Standard additionality tool, unless the CME provides convincing arguments as to why this can be conducted at the programme level only, and the approach is validated and approved by The Gold Standard Foundation.

Programme level additionality.

Programme level additionality is required to ensure that the programme being implemented is credible so as to ensure confidence in the expected emission reductions generated from the programme.

A PoA is additional if it can be demonstrated that in the absence of carbon finance (i) the proposed voluntary measure would not be implemented, or (ii) the mandatory policy/regulation would be systematically not enforced and that noncompliance with those requirements is widespread in the country/region, or (iii) that the PoA will lead to a greater level of enforcement of the existing mandatory policy/regulation or to a greater level of adoption of an existing voluntary scheme. This shall constitute the demonstration of additionality of the programme as a whole.

Whenever the demonstration of additionality at programme level only is allowed for, additionality at the VPA level has to be defined as part of the eligibility criteria for inclusion of future VPAs.

Additonality does not need to be demonstrated for a micro-programme that only plans to include activities that are deemed additional as per criteria listed in the section below. This can become the inclusion criteria for future activities.

Activity level additionality

Regular cycle activities that meet any one of the criteria defined below shall be deemed additional:

- i. The project activity is located in a Least Developed Country (LDC), Small Island Developing States (SIDS) or a Land Locked Developing Country (LLDC).⁵
- ii. The project activity is located in a special underdeveloped zone of the host country identified by the Government before 28 May 2010. CME shall refer to the list published by the host country DNA.
- iii. The project activity is located in any host country different from the countries defined above but project participants can demonstrate that project implementation will essentially benefit poor communities. No specific definition of 'poor communities' is pre-established. The Millennium Development Goals-based long term National Development Strategy (NDS) can serve as the basis to assess the eligibility of the targeted communities. Project participants shall seek approval from The Gold Standard Foundation on the basis of a formal request providing detailed arguments as to how the activity will benefit the poor communities.

⁵ List as per UN Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States

- iv. The project activity generates electricity:
 - a. As on-site generation, i.e. electricity generated at the point of use and no connection with any grid, OR
 - b. Feeds into an existing or new local, low voltage isolated grid⁶. It may also feed into the regional or national high voltage grid if convincing evidence can be provided to demonstrate that the implementation of the project activity will significantly improve electricity access for the poor local communities, households or SMEs.
- v. The project activity employs specific renewable energy technologies or measures recommended by the host country DNA and approved by the CDM EB (project participants shall refer to the list published by the host country), OR approved by The Gold Standard Foundation.
- vi. The project activity is an emission reduction project in which each of the independent subsystems or measures achieve annual emission reductions equal to or less than 600 tCO₂ or annual energy savings equal to or less than 600 MWh or installed capacity is less than 1500 kW for households/SMEs or communities. The limits defined above apply to each subsystem or the measure implemented.

For regular cycle activities that do not comply with any of the criteria above and for all retroactive activities, project participants are required to use either an UNFCCC-approved or a Gold Standard-approved additionality tool to demonstrate project additionality.

Any project with a renewable crediting period that benefits from deemed additionality will be reassessed at the end of each crediting period, i.e. every seven years as per latest approved criteria.

7. Monitoring of Emission Reductions.

The monitoring of emission reductions shall be defined as per an approved CDM or GS methodology. Alternatively, a new methodology may be described and submitted as part of the project documentation for approval by The Gold Standard during the validation process.

New, simplified approaches are encouraged in order to further streamline the monitoring of emission reductions as long as convincing arguments are provided as to why the approach proposed is conservative enough. The simplified methodology is submitted as part of the micro-scale PoA-DD. Once approved as part of a given programme, all project developers can use the new methodologies for future programmes and individual micro-scale project activities.

When The Gold Standard Foundation is not in a position to evaluate with sufficient confidence if the new submitted methodology is appropriate and conservative enough, as per the current procedures for approval of new methodologies under Gold Standard, the proposed methodology is sent out for external review and the project participants must cover the cost for this external review.

⁶ Is from down to the consumption level and up to a distribution level in the order of 10 kV. Or as an off grid activity supplying energy to households/communities with less than 12 hours grid availability per 24 hour day,

A VPA-DD based on the application of the programme for real cases must be submitted on time for the registration review for each one of the different methodologies (or combination of methodologies) and technologies/measures (or combination of technologies/measures) considered. The CME shall make use of the VPA-DD template for inclusion or registration.

Any activity of a type (based on a different technology, measure or methodology) not submitted prior to the registration review and submitted at a later stage for inclusion within the registered programme shall undergo design change as per The Gold Standard procedures, followed by an actual validation and an 8-week registration review period.

The latest methodology version applicable at the time of first submission to Gold Standard shall be used. At the time of renewal of the PoA (after every seventh year), the latest version of the methodology available shall then be adopted.

8. Validation of the Programme

The validation process shall be conducted in one of the following ways:

- The contracting of a DOE, as for conventional PoAs. In such a case, the activity must make use of an existing methodology or submit the new methodology to The Gold Standard Foundation for approval prior to validation by the DOE.
- The submission to *The Gold Standard Internal Validation process*. This option implies the payment of a USD 20,000 fee to The Gold Standard Validation Fund, to initiate the validation of the programme. In addition, a fee of USD 2,500 must be paid for each micro-scale project activity submitted along with the programme prior to registration.

If the micro-scale programme proposes a new methodology for the accounting and monitoring of emission reductions, the internal validation process includes the approval or rejection of the proposed new approach for the evaluation of the emission reductions and the monitoring procedures.

For The Gold Standard Validation Fund option, the following procedure applies:

1. The Gold Standard Secretariat shall be notified of the choice of the Validation Fund option;
2. The completed PoA-DD with generic information on baseline and monitoring must be uploaded into the registry for each one of the methodologies (or combination of methodologies) and different technologies or practices (or combination of technologies or practices) considered under the programme.
3. A VPA-DD based on the application of the programme to one real case, must be uploaded into the registry with necessary supporting documentation, if any, for each one of the different methodologies (or combination of methodologies) and different technologies or practices (or combination of technologies or practices) considered under the programme.
4. The CME is notified on whether the programme will be selected for an external validation of the emission reductions by a DOE, or if it will be validated internally by The Gold Standard

Foundation. This decision is made through a 'target-random' selection among micro-scale programmes opting to make use of the Validation Fund. The CME requested to have the programme externally validated must provide The Gold Standard with several competitive offers from DOEs (at least three), contract the DOE selected, and follow the steps of regular validation. The Validation Fund covers the cost of validation. At all times, any assistance from The Gold Standard Validation Fund is subject to the availability of funds.

In all cases, an Objective Observer(s) shall carry out the sustainable development assessment as per the process defined in section 3.2.

9. Inclusion of Micro-scale Project Activities to a Registered Micro-programme

CMEs can request for the inclusion of micro-scale project activities any time during the 28 years of the crediting period of the registered programme.

For any project activity to be included, the completed VPA-DD (along with the SFR Reporting) and *Gold Standard Sustainable Development Appraisal Report template – Validation stage* must be submitted and a fee of USD 2,500 must be paid to initiate the process:

- a) If no Objective Observer is appointed, The Gold Standard Foundation conducts a compliance check based on a desk review for the carbon and sustainability aspects. Activities proposed for inclusion after the compliance check must undergo a 2-week review period during which GS TAC and NGO Supporters can request for clarification or corrective actions. The Gold Standard will then formally include it in the Programme.
- b) If an Objective Observer is appointed for a check of the sustainability aspects of the activity upon listing the activity (see section 3.2), then the selected activity undergoes a compliance check for the carbon aspects by The Gold Standard Foundation, followed by a 2-week review period during which requests for clarification or corrective actions may be raised by The Gold Standard TAC and NGO Supporters.

The 2-week period starts the day relevant documents (VPA-DD, *Gold Standard Sustainable Development Appraisal Report – Validation stage* and VPA Inclusion Report) are uploaded on The Gold Standard Registry. The formal date retained for the inclusion is when the 2-week review period ends, even if actual inclusion takes longer due to potential requests for clarification or corrective action.

The process is different for an activity undergoing a complete validation in view of an inclusion. In such a case, the activity must go through an 8-week review period and potential requests for clarification or corrective action must be closed for the inclusion to be approved. The formal date retained for the inclusion is when the 8-week review period ends, even if actual inclusion takes longer due to potential requests for clarification or corrective action.

10. Verification

The verification process shall be conducted in either of the two following ways:

1. The contracting of a DOE, as for conventional PoAs;
2. The submission to *The Gold Standard Internal Verification process*. Internal verification is initiated upon request for issuance and as long as the fee of USD 1,500 per annum for each micro-scale project activity being verified in the registered micro-scale programme has been paid.

The following procedure applies for The Gold Standard Verification Fund option:

1. The Gold Standard Secretariat shall be notified of the choice of the Verification Fund option;
2. The CME shall submit Monitoring Reports and *Gold Standard Sustainable Development Appraisal Report template – Verification stage* for all micro-scale project activities included in the registered programme and for which issuance of VERs is requested. The CME cannot request for the internal verification of micro-scale project activities more than once in three months.
3. The approach for sampling verification shall be defined in the PoA-DD and shall be applied during verification of activities. In the case of sampling verification, The Gold Standard shall choose activities for actual verification as per the statistically sound sampling plan in the PoA-DD, and may appoint DOE/Objective Observer to conduct site visit(s).
4. The CME is notified on which micro-scale project activities are selected for an external verification of the emission reductions by a DOE, and which will be verified internally by The Gold Standard Foundation. In both cases, the Verification Fund covers the costs. This selection of activities sent for external verification is made through a 'target-random' selection among the micro-scale project activities selected for actual internal verification. The CME requested to have the programme externally verified must provide The Gold Standard with several competitive offers from DOEs (at least three), contract the DOE selected, and follow the steps of regular verification.
5. If the micro-scale project activity is selected for external verification or sustainability appraisal, a DOE or Objective Observer, respectively, will carry out a site visit.
6. The Gold Standard will carry out a desk review of the monitoring reports of the activities selected for actual internal verification.

In the case of issuance of credits from an activity, GS shall not issue credits beyond the threshold even though the activity may have realised surplus emission reductions.

A 3-week verification review period is initiated for all activities requesting issuance. During which, requests for clarification or corrective action may be raised by The Gold Standard Foundation and its TAC and NGO Supporters.

The Gold Standard Foundation can conduct spot-checks at any time for any of the activities not selected for actual verification.

11. Design Change Rules: Project participants shall refer to the most recent version of The Gold Standard Rules for design change requests.

12. Micro-scale Programme and Liability

For Gold Standard voluntary PoAs, the liability lies with the Coordinating and Managing Entity.

An activity is said to be erroneously included when it violates the inclusion criteria set in the PoA-DD. Whenever an erroneous inclusion is identified by the DOE or The Gold Standard Foundation at the time of verification, and in case of sampling verification, activities that have actually been verified, site-visit included, can proceed to issuance while issuance is on hold for the erroneous one/s. All activities that have not actually been verified due to the choice of a sampling verification are also put on hold until the issue is resolved.

Whenever a micro-scale activity is found to be erroneously included in the Voluntary PoA and has already been issued credits, the CME shall within sixty (60) calendar days after receiving notification of non-compliance:

- Compensate issued Gold Standard credits with Gold Standard credits from other projects of its portfolio; or
- Compensate issued Gold Standard credits with Gold Standard credits bought from other Gold Standard projects.

Whenever a verified micro-scale activity is found not to deliver according to the registered Voluntary PoA (e.g. VPA no longer operating), but credits have already been issued to that PoA, the CME shall within sixty (60) calendar days after receiving notification of non-compliance:

- Compensate issued Gold Standard credits with Gold Standard credits from other projects of its portfolio; or
- Compensate issued Gold Standard credits with Gold Standard credits bought from other Gold Standard projects.

Fraud occurs when a CME has deliberately provided information that is clearly incorrect, and used to obtain Gold Standard status, or inflate the amount of emission reductions from the project. The determination of fraud would be pre-empted by several rounds of requests for clarification and/or corrective action. A ban will only be imposed if The Gold Standard has credible evidence that shows the negative intent of the project participant. If during the verification of an activity it is observed that the project documentation is fraudulent, the party submitting the micro-scale project activity is permanently disqualified and this is publicly announced.

13. Use of Gold Standard Registry: Project Participants shall refer to the most recent version of the Annex F of The Gold Standard Toolkit.

14. Share of Proceeds: Project Participants shall refer to the most recent version of the Annex F of The Gold Standard Toolkit.

15. Methodology Versions and Renewal of Crediting Period for Programme and Micro-scale Project

Activities: Project Participants shall refer to the most recent version of the Annex F of The Gold Standard Toolkit.

16. Templates:

For micro-programme:

a) PoA Design Consultation Template

b) PoA-DD Template

For micro-activities:

a) VPA-DD Template

b) Gold Standard Sustainable Development Appraisal Report template – Validation stage

c) Gold Standard Sustainable Development Appraisal Report template – Verification stage

The table below provides a summary of documents submitted at different stages of the programme.

Stage	Document
Listing	PoA Design Consultation Report
	LSC reporting in micro VPA-DD
Validation	Micro PoA-DD
	Micro VPA-DD
	Sustainable Development Appraisal Report - Validation Stage
Inclusion	Micro VPA-DD
	Sustainable Development Appraisal Report - Validation Stage
Verification	Monitoring Report
	Sustainable Development Appraisal Report - Verification Stage

Annex 1: List of LDCs (www.unohrrls.org/en/ldc/related/62/)

Africa (33)

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|---|
| 1 | Angola | 18 | Madagascar |
| 2 | Benin | 19 | Malawi # |
| 3 | Burkina Faso # | 20 | Mali # |
| 4 | Burundi # | 21 | Mauritania |
| 5 | Central African Republic # | 22 | Mozambique |
| 6 | Chad # | 23 | Niger # |
| 7 | Comoros * | 24 | Rwanda # |
| 8 | Democratic Republic of the Congo | 25 | São Tomé and Príncipe * |
| 9 | Djibouti | 26 | Senegal |
| 10 | Equatorial Guinea | 27 | Sierra Leone |
| 11 | Eritrea | 28 | Somalia |
| 12 | Ethiopia # | 29 | Sudan |
| 13 | Gambia | 30 | Togo |
| 14 | Guinea | 31 | Uganda # |
| 15 | Guinea-Bissau * | 32 | United Republic of Tanzania |
| 16 | Lesotho # | 33 | Zambia # |
| 17 | Liberia | | |

Asia (15)

- | | | | |
|---|--|----|-----------------------------------|
| 1 | Afghanistan # | 9 | Nepal # |
| 2 | Bangladesh | 10 | Samoa * |
| 3 | Bhutan # | 11 | Solomon Islands * |
| 4 | Cambodia | 12 | Timor-Leste * |
| 5 | Kiribati * | 13 | Tuvalu * |
| 6 | Lao People's Democratic Republic # | 14 | Vanuatu * |
| 7 | Maldives * | 15 | Yemen |
| 8 | Myanmar | | |

Latin America and the Caribbean (1)

- | | |
|---|-------------------------|
| 1 | Haiti * |
|---|-------------------------|

*** Also SIDS**
#Also LLDCs

UN Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries,
Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States

Annex 2: List of LLDCs (www.un.org/special-rep/ohrls/lldc/list.htm)

List of Landlocked Developing Countries

1. Afghanistan *	16. Malawi *
2. Armenia	17. Mali *
3. Azerbaijan	18. Moldova, Republic of
4. Bhutan *	19. Mongolia
5. Bolivia	20. Nepal *
6. Botswana	21. Niger *
7. Burkina Faso *	22. Paraguay
8. Burundi *	23. Rwanda *
9. Central African Republic *	24. Swaziland
10. Chad *	25. Tajikistan
11. Ethiopia *	26. The Former Yugoslav Rep. of Macedonia
12. Kazakhstan	27. Turkmenistan
13. Kyrgyzstan	28. Uganda *
14. Lao People's Democratic Republic *	29. Uzbekistan
15. Lesotho *	30. Zambia *
	31. Zimbabwe

* Also LDCs

UN Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States

Annex 3: List of SIDS (www.un.org/special-rep/ohrls/sid/list.htm)

List of Small Island Developing States (UN Members)			
1	Antigua and Barbuda	20	Federated States of Micronesia
2	Bahamas	21	Mauritius
3	Bahrain	22	Nauru
4	Barbados	23	Palau
5	Belize	24	Papua New Guinea
6	Cape Verde *	25	Samoa *
7	Comoros *	26	São Tomé and Príncipe *
8	Cuba	27	Singapore
9	Dominica	28	St. Kitts and Nevis
10	Dominican Republic	29	St. Lucia
11	Fiji	30	St. Vincent and the Grenadines
12	Grenada	31	Seychelles
13	Guinea-Bissau *	32	Solomon Islands *
14	Guyana	33	Suriname
15	Haiti *	34	Timor-Lesté *
16	Jamaica	35	Tonga
17	Kiribati *	36	Trinidad and Tobago
18	Maldives *	37	Tuvalu *
19	Marshall Islands	38	Vanuatu *

UN Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States