



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

<i>Date of Meth Panel meeting:</i>	14 - 18 September 2009
<i>Title and number of Request for revision</i>	Later installation of abatement catalyst AM_REV_0163
<b><u>Summary of the query:</u></b> Please use the space below to summarize the request for revision on the related approved methodologies.	
<p>A campaign is defined as the period of time beginning from the installation of a new gauze pack until the subsequent plant shutdown. Circumstances may exist in which the first abatement catalyst is installed after the installation of a new gauze pack.</p> <p>Applying the current definition of campaign, this result in a high <math>EF_n</math> and consequently a high <math>EF_{ma}</math>. This is because part of the campaign is run without an abatement catalyst. The project participant would prefer to wait until the next change of primary gauzes in order to avoid this penalization.</p>	
<b><u>Recommendation by the Meth Panel:</u></b>	
(a) Please use the space below to provide amendments /changes (in your expert view, if necessary).	
<p>Project proponents propose not to include the values obtained during the time the plant operated without the abatement (as, according to project proponents, “circumstances may exit in which the first abatement catalysit is installed after the installation of a new gauze pack”) for the main parameters (VSG, NSCG, OH, and NAP) and recalculate the EFBL because the campaign length, discounting the hours when the plant worked without abatement device, is shorter than the average historic campaign.</p> <p>The suggested approach might not be conservative, because it just eliminates real N2O emissions occurring in the project activity due to an unconsidered circumstance. Thus, a change in the methodology should aim to include these emissions as project emissions in a specific campaign first, and then provide provisions to endure that the situation mentioned in the request is not taken into account in the estimation of the <math>EF_{ma}</math>.</p>	
(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.	
<b><u>Answer to authors of the request for revision by the Meth Panel :</u></b> Please use the space below to provide an answer to the authors of the above query	
<p>The recommendation is not to revise the methodology.</p> <p>Project proponents could submit a new revision taking into account the above suggestion.</p>	



Signature of Meth Panel Chair .....

Date: 18/09/2009

(Philip Gwage)



Signature of Meth Panel Vice-Chair .....

Date: 18/09/2009

(Pedro Martins Barata)

**Information to be completed by the secretariat**

F-CDM-AM	AM_REV_0163
Name of the authors of the query:	DNV
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat	18 September 2009
Date of transmission to the EB	18 September 2009
Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site	18 September 2009