

	<b>CDM: Response form for Request for revision of approved methodologies (version 01.1)</b>
<i>Date of Meth Panel meeting:</i>	22 - 26 June 2009
<i>Title and number of Request for revision</i>	Expansion of applicability of AM0014 to natural gas-based energy generation facilities owned by third party and providing power or heat directly to an industrial user.  AM_REV_0153
<b>Summary of the query:</b> Please use the space below to summarize the request for revision on the related approved methodologies.	
<p>The approved methodology AM0014 is applicable to third-party or self owned natural gas-based package cogeneration project activities, supplying heat and power to industrial consumers. This request for revision proposes to expand AM0014 to the natural gas-based energy generation facilities owned by third party, those supply power or heat directly to an industrial user. The project proponents have submitted revised methodology based on above proposal.</p>	
<b>Recommendation by the Meth Panel:</b>	
(a) Please use the space below to provide amendments /changes (in your expert view, if necessary).	
<p>The Meth Panel recommends not <u>to approve</u> the request for revision due to following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The fundamental difference between an emission reduction due to a cogeneration facility and an energy generation facility is that, in the cogeneration case, claims in emission reductions are mainly due to an overall efficiency improvement in the system as compared to a simple energy generation activity (either for heat or electricity), whereas in the case of energy generation only the claims will be mainly based on fuel switch, provided a higher carbon fuel in the baseline is identified as opposed to a lower carbon fuel in the project situation;</li> <li>2. The baseline technologies to be identified for a cogeneration system are completely different from the baseline technologies for energy generation. The entire section of baseline scenario identification has to be rewritten, which is not done in the revised draft of the methodology submitted by project proponents. Please note that the barriers provided in the existing methodology for demonstration of additionality are for natural gas-based cogeneration and not for energy generation;</li> <li>3. It is agreed that some of the equations of the existing methodology can be used for energy generation methodology as well. However, this reason is not sufficient to proceed with opening up of this methodology for energy generation activities, as there are fundamental differences in overall approach that methodology should follow;</li> <li>4. It is suggested that either methodology can be used/ revised, which is applicable to only energy generation activity or a new methodology may be submitted for the project PPs refer to.</li> </ol>	
(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

[Please see above.](#)


Signature of Meth Panel Chair .....

Date: 26/06/2009

(Philip Gwage)



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

Date: 26/06/2009

(Pedro Martins Barata)

**Information to be completed by the secretariat**

F-CDM-AM	AM_REV_0153
Name of the authors of the query:	JQA
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat	26 June 2009
Date of transmission to the EB	26 June 2009
Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site	26 June 2009