



## CDM: Recommendation form for Small Scale Methodologies (Version 01.1)

*(To be used for presenting questions/proposals/amendments to the simplified methodologies for small-scale CDM project activity categories)*

<b>Date of SSC WG meeting:</b>	20–23 August 2012, SSC WG 38
<b>Title/Subject (give a small title or specify the subject of your submission, maximum 200 characters):</b>	Clarification on the monitoring of the baseline for biomass waste disposal under AMS-III.E
<b>Indicative methodology to which your submission relates</b> <i>(refer the items of Appendix B of the Simplified Modalities and Procedures), if applicable:</i>	AMS-III.E “Avoidance of methane production from decay of biomass through controlled combustion, gasification or mechanical/thermal treatment”
<b>Name of the authors of the query:</b>	Martin Jenk  Institution: Foundation myclimate – The Climate Protection Partnership  martin.jenk@myclimate.org

### **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:

During first verification of the second crediting period of our project ‘CDM 0168: BK Energia Itacoatiara Project’ we face some struggling with the DOE concerning our monitoring plan:

Paragraph 28 of AMS-III.E. (Version 16, Section Monitoring), prescribes that “*In the case of project activities processing newly generated biomass wastes, the project participants demonstrate annually, through the assessment of common practices at proximate waste disposal sites, what percentage of the amount of waste combusted in the project activity facility would have been disposed in a solid waste disposal site without methane recovery in the absence of the project activity and would decay anaerobically in the disposal site throughout the crediting period.*”

Our registered baseline assessment in the PDD determines the amount of waste combusted in the project activity that would have been disposed in a unmanaged solid waste disposal site without methane recovery in the absence of the project activity and would decay anaerobically.

- 1) First question is now: Does the project monitoring require an annual re-evaluation of the baseline scenario, meaning that we have to evaluate every year available disposal sites or other recipients of biomass in the region?
- 2) Second question: How would such an assessment have to look like in detail: a) what means “proximate” (km of distance, accessible under economic conditions)? b) How should the common practices of the disposal sites be demonstrated? (Written statement of the operator? On-site-visit?)
- 3) Third question: how should the conclusions be drawn and baseline adapted if any change occurs (e.g. new landfill with methane recovery available in the region or new interested buyer of biomass wastes (e.g. factory with thermal needs))?

Thanks a lot for your explanations.

**Recommendation by the SSC WG:**

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

Please refer to paragraph 16 of the meeting report of the SSC WG 38  
<[http://cdm.unfccc.int/Panels/ssc\\_wg](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.

In response to this query requesting clarification on the monitoring requirements related to baseline biomass waste disposal, under AMS-III.E, the SSC WG agreed to clarify that paragraph 28 of AMS-III.E (version 16) does not imply that the baseline scenario is to be re-evaluated annually, and thus there is no need to monitor or reassess the baseline, which was validated at the time of registration or renewal of the crediting period.

The SSC WG would like to clarify that, this paragraph is applicable to those project activities for which it was demonstrated during validation that the newly generated waste treated in the project activity would have been disposed of at two or more distinct destinations or applications (e.g. procured by third parties, disposed in sites with distinct MCF values, used in agricultural applications, etc.). For these cases, the fraction of the waste treated by the project activity that would have been sent to each identified baseline application/destination, shall be determined and justified throughout the crediting period.

The SSC WG further agreed to propose guidance to improve the clarity of the methodology with respect to this issue in the next revision of AMS-III.E.

The SSC WG also agreed that this clarification is applicable to project activities applying AMS-III.E version 8 to version 16.

Signature of SSC WG Chair: Mr. Peer Stiansen

Date: 23/08/2012

Signature of SSC WG Vice-Chair: Ms. Fatou Gaye

Date: 23/08/2012

**SECTION TO BE FILLED IN BY THE UNFCCC SECRETARIAT**

**SSC-Submission number:**

SSC\_638

**Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat:**

23 August 2012

**Date of transmission to the EB:**

23 August 2012

**Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site:**

23 August 2012

-----

## History of the document

Version	Date	Nature of revision(s)
01.1	12 April 2012	Editorial changes to include new logo and other improvements.
01.0	2005	Initial publication.
<b>Decision Class:</b> Regulatory <b>Document Type:</b> Form <b>Business Function:</b> Methodology		