CDM: Response form for Request for revision of approved methodologies (version 01.1)

Date of Meth Panel meeting:	15 – 19 January 2007
Title and number of Request for revision	East Coast Power Plant (S) Sdn. Bhd. 13MW biomass power generation project (the Project or the Project activity) / AM_REV_0030

Summary of the query:

Please use the space below to summarize the request for revision on the related approved methodologies.

The requests provides a procedure in ACM0006 and in the "tool to determine methane emission from dumping waste at a solid waste disposal site" that allows to account for methane emissions from stock-piling of biomass. It is proposed to use a methane conversion factor of 0.4 for stock piles of biomass.

Recommendation by the Meth Panel:

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

It is recommended NOT to approve the request for revision, for the following reasons:

1. There are only few studies available on methane generation from stock-piling of biomass residues. These studies indicate a high variability and large spatial and temporal variations. Methane generation is likely to depend on several factors, such as the type, size and structure of the biomass, the humidity of the biomass, the way of stock-piling and other conditions such as climatic condition (temperature, precipitation, etc). For example, if dry wood branches or other bulky dry biomass residues are stock-piled and not being compacted, it is rather unlikely that anaerobic pockets will form and that significant amounts of methane will be generated at all. If one type of biomass residue is disposed of on a stock pile and loosely piled it may likely behave differently from disposal in landfills. In this regard, the IPCC default value for the methane decay rate for unmanaged shallow landfills seems not an appropriate generic default for stock-piling of biomass. Rather, it may be necessary to define emission rates as a function of the most relevant factors determining emissions.
2. The revision to the methodology does not require that the biomass in the baseline would be stock-piled for long time periods, although it allows to credit for methane emissions throughout all crediting periods. However, if it is common practice in the country to stock-pile biomass residues only for a couple of years, any methane emissions should only be credited for this time frame. Project participants propose as an alternative that the applicability of the methodology be limited to biomass residues where the residence time is less than three years. However, the IPCC default values for the decay rate, as used in the "tool to determine methane emission from dumping waste at a solid waste disposal site", are all of a magnitude where still significant quantities of biomass are emitted after three years. In this regard, this applicability condition is not consistent with the decay rates provided in the tool. A revision to ACM0006 would need to address for how long biomass would be stock-piled in the absence of the project activity.

3. In the request for revision it is argued that the surface area to volume of unmanaged shallow landfills would be "much greater" than for large stock piles. This is not necessarily the case. For example, a stock pile of 5 meter height and 10 meter diameter has a similar surface to volume ratio (0.85) compared to a very shallow landfill of about 1.2 meter thickness. Thus, stock piles of five meter height may have a larger surface to volume ratio compared with unmanaged shallow landfills, which are categorized by the IPCC with up to 5 meter thickness (5 meter would correspond to a surface to volume ratio of about 0.2). Moreover, the stock-piles (if left for decay) may decrease in size over time, thereby further increasing the surface to volume ratio.

Project participants may consider to undertake measurements campaign before the implementation of the project activity specifying the measurement procedures to estimate methane emissions.

(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.

Not applicable.

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

Signature of the Meth Panel Chair
Date: 25/01/2007 *(Rajesh Sethi)*

Signature of the Meth Panel Vice-Chair
Date: 25/01/2007 *(Jean-Jacques Becker)*

Information to be completed by the secretariat	
F-CDM-AM	AM_REV_0030
Name of the authors of the query:	DNV-UK
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat	25 January 2007
Date of transmission to the EB	25 January 2007
Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site	25 January 2007