

	CDM: Response form for Request for revision of approved methodologies (version 01.1)	
<i>Date of Meth Panel meeting:</i>	7 - 11 April 2008	
<i>Title and number of Request for revision</i>	Revision to recognise a baseline scenario that is a counterfactual anaerobic treatment system that generates methane without destruction by flaring or energy production. AM_REV_0082	
Summary of the query: Please use the space below to summarize the request for revision on the related approved methodologies.		
<p>The request for revision follows the request for clarification AM_CLA_0052, discussed by 29th Meth Panel meeting, which was related to a situation where an existing anaerobic treatment system, that would be the baseline, is not functioning.</p> <p>The present request for revision proposes the following amendments to the methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include those facilities in the baseline scenario candidates, which are constructed prior to the start of the project activities so long as it can be demonstrated that using such facility is the identified baseline scenario; • Use the COD as an optional indicator to calculate the MCF factor in order not to abide by the applicability condition that the residence time in the baseline treatment facility is at least 30 days. To reduce the residence period, project proponents propose that the COD of the digestate has to be reduced by at least 70% compared to the COD input value before digestion; • Clarify that the applicability condition relating to discharge of waste in natural water resources refers to the project activity. 		

Recommendation by the Meth Panel:

(a) Please use the space below to provide amendments /changes (in your expert view, if necessary).

The Meth Panel would like to clarify to the project proponents that ACM0010 is only applicable where the manure is treated on site in the project activity and not in a central treatment plant where manure is collected from several farms.

Meth Panel cannot accept to revise the methodology based on the request in present form. In order to consider the request for revision, the project proponents have to address the following issues:

1. From the information provided in the PDD, it seems that the project is a centralized treatment plant, which collects manure from individual farms and transports it to the centralized treatment plant (Page 21 in the PDD). This is similar to the case of NM0239 where the Meth Panel raised several issues that need to be addressed. The most important of these issues was the unsuitability of IPCC parameters when the manure is stored and transported to a central treatment plant. It must be assessed whether the IPCC value of Bo (provided for fresh manure) can be applied since Bo values presented in IPCC are based on the total Vs (biodegradable and non-biodegradable). Most of the biodegradable portion would be consumed in the storage tanks at individual farms, if any. Therefore, the remaining portion may contain a very low methane generation potential, which implies that using default IPCC Bo values are not suitable for the manure entering the central treatment plant. The project proponents are requested to provide information on how they would like to address this issue;

All other recommendations raised by the Meth Panel pertaining to NM0239¹ should be assessed by the project proponents from the view of their relevance to this case.

2. The PPs are required to provide detailed information about different investment/operational costs that are proposed to be included in the investment analysis calculation for the case of operation of anaerobic digester without flaring of the biogas or generation of energy. In particular, project proponents are required to confirm whether or not the full cost of the bio digester has been included in the analysis. Moreover, more clarity is needed on the accounting of revenues to be included in the analysis.

(b) Please use the space below for providing guidance, as per Para 93 of EB25 Report, on what type of projects need to revise the PDD as a consequence of the suggested revision, if the recommendation is to revise the methodology.

The recommendation is not to revise the methodology.

Answer to authors of the request for revision by the Meth Panel :

Please use the space below to provide an answer to the authors of the above query

The Meth Panel agrees not to consider the request of revision until the project proponents address the issues raised in the recommendation section above.

¹ Further information on the recommendation for NM0239 can be found in <http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/publicview.html?OpenRound=20&OpenNM=NM0239&cases=B#NM0239>.



Signature of Meth Panel Chair

Date: 11/04/2008

(Akihiro Kuroki)



Signature of Meth Panel Vice-Chair

Date: 11/04/2008

(Philip Gwage)

Information to be completed by the secretariat

F-CDM-AM	AM_REV_0082
Name of the authors of the query:	TUEV-SUED
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat	11 April 2008
Date of transmission to the EB	11 April 2008
Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site	11 April 2008