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)

Date of SSC WG meeting:	15–18 March 2011, SSC WG 30
Title/Subject (give a small title or specify the subject of your submission, maximum 200 characters):	Biogas electricity/heat generation from stockpiled food waste on a stand-alone basis
Indicative methodology to which your submission relates (refer the items of Appendix B of the Simplified Modalities and Procedures), if applicable.	AMS-I.D "Grid connected renewable electricity generation"
Name of the authors of the query:	Isabelle Barnard Institution: Farmsecure Carbon (Pty) Ltd isabelle.barnard@farmsecure.co.za

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.

We plan to do renewable energy projects through anaerobic digestion with agro-industry waste. For example, we plan to use potato rejects (not suitable for human consumption) from different farmers in anaerobic digesters. The current practise is to stockpile the rejects potatoes.

We prefer to apply only methodology AMS-I.D for electricity generation from renewable biomass on a stand-alone basis, i.e. without using a type III methodology for avoided methane emissions. The main reason is the difficulty in identifying and describing the baseline scenario for methane emission avoidance. The current food waste treatment systems (stock piles) varies on farms and between farms.

According to SSC_485, the SSC WG clarified that, in accordance with the guidance from the Board, 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. 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.

According to methodology AMS_III.E, the MCF for stock piles is 28% and according to the 2006 IPCC guidelines for national GHG inventories the MCF for biogas digesters is 10%. Therefore the net contribution to anthropogenic emission will be negative. Methane emissions in the project activity will be lower than in the baseline.

Questions:

May we therefore apply AMS I.D and/or AMS I.C on a stand-alone basis as long as modalities and procedures of SSC CDM including demonstration of additionality are also complied with on a stand-alone basis?

Do we need to explain the situation and calculations for net negative emissions in the PDD? If possible, please refer me to a existing PDD using the stand alone scenario to use as a example.

Recommendation by the SSC WG:

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

Please refer to paragraph 34 of the meeting report of the SSC WG 30 <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.

At the outset, the SSC WG agreed to clarify that the value of 10% referred by the author of the submission is the default value for accounting for physical leakage of the anaerobic digester, rather than MCF.

However, the SSC WG acknowledged that it may be difficult for the project proponent to determine and quantify the possible emissions by following the procedure in AMS-III.E for stockpile case, in order to meet the requirement clarified in SSC_485. Therefore, as a simpler, but a conservative solution for the project where Type I methodology is used on a stand alone basis, the SSC WG agreed to the clarify that the project proponent may disregard the potential emissions from the waste disposal activity (i.e. potato disposal in the submission) while determining the baseline emissions, but need to take fully into account any possible emissions due to the implementation of the project activity (e.g. physical leakage of the anaerobic digester, emissions due to inefficiency of the flaring), either as project emissions or leakage.

Signed by the Chair, Ms. Fatou Gaye

Date: 18/03/2011

Signed by the Vice-Chair, Mr. Peer Stiansen

Date: 18/03/2011

Information to be completed by the secretariat	
SSC-Submission number	SSC_516
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat	18 March 2011
Date of transmission to the EB	18 March 2011
Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site	18 March 2011