



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)

<i>Date of SSC WG meeting:</i>	26–29 April 2010, SSC WG 25
<i>Title/Subject (give a small title or specify the subject of your submission, maximum 200 characters):</i>	Revision of AMS-III.D to expand the applicability to include Greenfield project
<i>Indicative methodology to which your submission relates (refer the items of Appendix B of the Simplified Modalities and Procedures), if applicable.</i>	AMS-III.D, ver. 15 “Methane recovery in animal manure management systems”
<i>Name of the authors of the query:</i>	Takashi KOZAKI Institution: Marubeni Corporation Kozaki-Takashi@marubeni.com

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:

Project activity this request to revision concerned is an introduction of manure management system with methane recovery and destruction instead of conventional common practice manure management system with no methane recovery, to Greenfield livestock farm.

Since the proposed project satisfies all the conditions in small scale CDM methodology, AMS-III.D. (version 15), the methodology seems to be applicable to the proposed project.

However, in paragraph 1 of AMS-III.D. (version 15), it is said that “This methodology covers project activities involving the replacement or modification of existing anaerobic manure management systems.....”, thus the methodology seems to be applicable only to the cases where anaerobic manure management systems exist.

Meanwhile, in the paragraph 14 of EB41 Report, Annex 20, it is said that “Type II and III Greenfield projects may use a Type II and III small scale methodology provided that they can demonstrate that the most plausible baseline scenario for this project activity is the baseline provided in the respective Type II and III small scale methodology.”

Therefore, the author would like to request the Small Scale Working Group to consider the revision of the methodology to include the Greenfield project in its applicability conditions as follows;

2. This project category also applies to proposed manure management systems in new installations wherein the baseline can be clearly identified and demonstrated. This baseline should be identified through an analysis of the prevailing practice in the relevant geographical area for manure management in similar farms in terms of a kind of livestock and its population. This analysis of prevailing practice should lay particular weight on recently constructed manure management systems, and should demonstrate that more than 50% of the last 10 plants built in that industry (or more than 50% of the total number of plants, if less than 10) are currently using the selected baseline approach. In addition, a financial and/or barrier analysis should be carried out to demonstrate that the proposed methane recovery system is less attractive than the selected baseline. These steps should be carried out separately to the requirement to prove additionality.

For the detail of revision, please find attached draft methodology with changes highlighted as per the requirement of below item 3.

Recommendation by the SSC WG:

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

Please refer to paragraph 14 of the meeting report of the SSC WG 25
(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.

The SSC WG agreed to clarify that AMS-III.D is applicable to Greenfield projects and that the procedures for Greenfield projects included in the revised General Guidelines to SSC methodologies (see annex 9 of the meeting report of SSC WG 25) may be followed, if approved by the Board.

Signed by the Chair, Mr. Peer Stiansen

Date: 29/04/2010

Signed by the Vice-Chair, Mr. Hugh Sealy

Date: 29/04/2010

Information to be completed by the secretariat

SSC-Submission number	SSC_397
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat	29 April 2010
Date of transmission to the EB	29 April 2010
Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site	29 April 2010