



**CDM: Response form for request for clarification on  
Approved Methodologies  
(version 01.1)**

<i>Date of Meth Panel meeting:</i>	15 - 19 August 2011
<i>Title and number of request for clarification</i>	Definition of an existing reservoir AM_CLA_0215

**Summary of the query:**

Please use the space below to summarize the request for clarification on the related approved methodologies.

The request seeks clarification about one hydro power generation project being implemented on a new reservoir, which is being built in parallel, primarily for the purpose of irrigation/flood protection. The permission for building this reservoir for the purpose of irrigation/flood protection was granted in 2005 by the host country Government, whereas the investment for building the hydro power plant was approved in 2006. The construction of the reservoir and the dam began in 2007 and is expected to be completed by the end of 2011, the construction of the hydro power plant started in 2008 and will be completed in 2012. The power density in the proposed project falls below 4 W/m<sup>2</sup>.

Under methodology the existing reservoir, by definition, should have operational history for the three years before the power plant is constructed.

In view of the above the project participants (PPs) seek the following clarifications:

- (i) Can this project be developed under ACM0002 and whether the project activity can be considered as implemented in an existing reservoir?
- (ii) If not, can one of the following actions taken: (a) whether new applicability criteria should be proposed for the methodology ACM0002 to consider dams built for irrigation and flood protection separately/in parallel, or (b) whether a deviation can be taken from the methodology to classify this project as a project activity implemented in an existing reservoir?

**Recommendation by the Meth Panel:**

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

Please refer to the next section.

**Answer to authors of the request for clarification by the Meth Panel :**

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

The Meth Panel clarifies that the project reservoir does not meet the definition of an existing reservoir.

The Meth Panel would like to bring to the attention of the PPs the rationale behind: (i) the requirement of power density of 4 W/m<sup>2</sup>, and why this is important in the context of CDM; and (ii) the requirement of three year operational history of a reservoir.

**(i) The requirement of power density of more than 4 W/m<sup>2</sup>, and why this is important in the context of CDM:**

The Board, at its twenty-third meeting approved annex 5 “Thresholds and criteria for the eligibility of hydroelectric power plants with reservoirs as CDM project activities”, this document explains that there are scientific uncertainties concerning greenhouse gas emissions from reservoirs. That is why it is not possible to include a monitoring procedure for these emissions and instead, a default factor for projects with power density higher than 4 W/m<sup>2</sup> is provided. This requirement in the methodology helps to confirm high amounts of electricity generation with low reservoir catchment area. For other cases, with low power density, it may be possible that in some situations the methane emissions from the reservoir could be significant, and as mentioned before, there is no procedure to monitor them.

**(ii) The requirement of three year operational history of a reservoir:**

This requirement exists to avoid a situation where first a project or reservoir is implemented, then immediately followed by a hydro power project. The methodology does not require a threshold of power density for an existing reservoir if the volume is not increased because it is assumed that if methane is being emitted in the project scenario, it would also have been emitted in the baseline scenario. This is not the case if the operational history of a minimum three years before implementation of hydro power plant does not exist.

The project participants may consider to submit a request for revision to the methodology to cover their case, including technically sound proposals to address the issues outlined in this response.

Signed by the Chair, Mr. Philip Gwage

Date: 08/08/2011

Signed by the Vice-Chair, Mr. Lex de Jonge

Date: 08/08/2011

**Information to be completed by the secretariat**

F-CDM-AM	AM_CLA_0215
Name of the authors of the query:	Tuev-Nord
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat	8 August 2011
Date of transmission to the EB	8 August 2011
Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site	8 August 2011