



CDM: Recommendation Form for Small Scale Methodologies (version 01)
(To be used for presenting questions/proposals/amendments to the simplified methodologies for small-scale CDM project activity categories)

<i>Date of SSC WG meeting:</i>	11–14 January 2011, SSC WG 29
<i>Title/Subject (give a small title or specify the subject of your submission, maximum 200 characters):</i>	Clarification on the applicability of AMS-III.D to a dry cattle feedlot baseline treatment system
<i>Indicative methodology to which your submission relates (refer the items of Appendix B of the Simplified Modalities and Procedures), if applicable.</i>	<p>AMS-I.D “Grid connected renewable electricity generation”</p> <p>AMS-III.D “Methane recovery in animal manure management systems”</p>
<i>Name of the authors of the query:</i>	<p>Isabelle van Zyl</p> <p>Institution: Farmsecure Carbon, South Africa</p> <p>ivanzyl@farmsecure.co.za</p>

Summary of the query:

Please use the space below to summarize the query related to SSC methodologies/categories SSC Modalities and Procedures provide recommendation/analysis of the SSC WG.

Original text from PP:

- I.D Reference:** In the case of landfill gas, waste gas, wastewater treatment and **agro-industries projects**, recovered methane emissions are eligible under a relevant Type III category.
- III.D. Reference:** This methodology covers project activities involving the replacement or modification of existing anaerobic manure management systems in livestock farms to achieve methane recovery and destruction by flaring/combustion or gainful use of the recovered methane.

Question: We plan to do a renewable energy project through anaerobic digestion with manure from a cattle feedlot. The baseline manure management treatment system is a “dry lot system” (IPCC definition: a paved or unpaved open confinement area without any significant vegetative cover where accumulation manure may be removed periodically) with a MCF of 1.5%. Do we need to apply the III.D methodology to this project? The methane emission reduction with methodology III.D is negative. The MCF of a anaerobic digester is 10% and for a dry lot is 1.5% (1.5% - 10% = -8.5%)

Recommendation by the SSC WG:

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

Please refer to paragraph 27 of the meeting report of the SSC WG 29
http://cdm.unfccc.int/Panels/ssc_wg.

Answer to authors of query by the SSC WG:

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

The small-scale working group of the CDM Executive Board would like to thank the author for the submission.

The SSC WG agreed to clarify that since the underlying project will lead to increase in methane emissions if AMS-I.D is applied on a stand-alone basis, AMS-III.D shall be applied in conjunction to account for the increased emissions.

The SSC WG also would like to refer the project proponent to its previous response to a related submission SSC_173 “Clarification on use of AMS-I.C and AMS-I.D for a project using biogas from gas water”, extract of which is reproduced below:

“The SSC WG further clarified that, in accordance with the guidance from the Board¹, AMS I.D and/or AMS I.C can be applied for biogas electricity/heat generation activities on a stand-alone basis, i.e. without using a type III methodology for avoided methane emissions as long as modalities and procedures of SSC CDM including demonstration of additionality are also complied with on a stand-alone basis.

Further the SSC WG noted that under certain situations it is possible that biogas for energy generation is sourced from a Type III activity with net positive contribution to anthropogenic emissions, i.e. higher project emissions than baseline emissions. For example animal manure treated in the baseline in ‘drylots’ is now treated in ‘biogas digesters’ to supply biogas to the type I project activity. 2006 IPCC guidelines for national GHG inventories assign an emission factor ten times higher to biogas digesters as compared to drylot, i.e. 1% -2% of methane production potential (B_0) of the manure is emitted as methane in the case of drylots whereas as much as 10% of B_0 is emitted from biogas digesters due to physical leakages. Under such situations, where net emissions from the Type III component that can be reasonably attributed to the Type I activity can not be ruled out during the crediting period, the modalities and procedures require that the necessary parameters of the Type III component are also monitored and the emission reductions achieved by the Type I activity are discounted. Below are the relevant extracts of definitions of boundary, baseline, leakage and monitoring as provided by the modalities and procedures of small-scale CDM

“Boundary: The project boundary shall encompass all anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases under the control of the project participants that are significant and reasonably attributable to the CDM project activity”

“A baseline shall cover emissions from all gases, sectors and source categories listed in Annex A within the project boundary.”

“Leakage is defined as the net change of anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases which occurs outside the project boundary, and which is measurable and attributable to the CDM project activity”

“Monitoring shall include: The collection and archiving of all relevant data necessary for estimating or measuring anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases occurring within the project boundary during the crediting period;”

“Monitoring shall include: The identification of all potential sources of, and the collection and archiving

¹ The Board at its third meeting considered the above issues in drawing out a list of activities eligible under Type I, II and III respectively (see annex to the annotations of the third meeting of the Board). The particular issue of two eligible components (e.g. methane avoidance under Type III and electricity/heat from methane under Type I) was considered in the context of a question whether they should be mutually exclusive or mutually inclusive (‘mutually inclusive’ would mean that the multi component project in the example would belong to either Type I or Type III). The Board agreed that the components are mutually exclusive, i.e. the thresholds are to be met separately and components are treated separately.

of data on, increased anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases outside the project boundary that are significant and reasonably attributable to the project activity during the crediting period;"

Signed by the Chair, Mr. Peer Stiansen

Date: 14/01/2011

Signed by the Vice-Chair, Mr. Hugh Sealy

Date: 14/01/2011

Information to be completed by the secretariat

SSC-Submission number	SSC_485
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat	14 January 2011
Date of transmission to the EB	14 January 2011
Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site	14 January 2011