



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)

Date of SSC WG meeting:	21–24 September 2009, SSC WG 22
Title/Subject (give a small title or specify the subject of your submission, maximum 200 characters):	Applicability condition under AMS-III.F for measures limited to those resulting in emission reductions of less than or equal to 60 kt CO ₂ equivalent annually
Indicative methodology to which your submission relates (refer the items of Appendix B of the Simplified Modalities and Procedures), if applicable.	AMS-III.F, version 8
Name of the authors of the query:	Sumit Barat Institution: IL&FS Ecosmart Limited sumit.barat@ilfsecosmart.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:

This methodology comprises measures to avoid the emissions of methane to the atmosphere from biomass or other organic matter that would have otherwise been left to decay anaerobically in a solid waste disposal site (SWDS), or in an animal waste management system (AWMS).

According to the applicability conditions of methodology, para 3, measures are limited to those that result in emission reductions of less than or equal to 60 kt CO₂ equivalent annually.

The yearly Methane Generation Potential for the solid waste is calculated using the first order decay model as described in the latest version of the “Tool to determine methane emissions avoided from disposal of waste at a solid waste disposal site”. The baseline emissions as per the first order decay model are credited in phased manner (proportional to amount of Methane that would have been emitted in absence to project activity in a landfill site). This leads to crediting significantly low Emission Reductions to the project in first few years (since release of methane from waste deposited in a landfill site occurs in a phased manner over a period of time) and then gradually increasing over the crediting period inspite of the annual quantity of waste processed being constant over the crediting period. An illustration of this is given under table 1:

Year	Emission Reductions (in tonnes of CO ₂ e)
1	9,449
2	19,473
3	28,721
4	37,255
5	45,131
6	52,402
7	59,114
8	65,313
9	71,038
10	76,327
Total estimated reductions (tonnes of CO₂e)	464,221
Total number of crediting years	10
Annual average over the crediting period of estimated reductions (tonnes of CO₂e)	46,422

Table 1

Kindly note that as shown in table 1, emission reductions are exceeding the limit of 60 kt CO₂e in last three years. However, the average annual emission reductions are 46,222 tonnes of CO₂e which is far below the limit of 60 kt CO₂e inspite of processing same quantity of waste every year.

Due to this, a small scale project with emission reduction may exceed 60 kt CO₂equivalent in the later part of the crediting year due to the effect of waste being processed in previous years. However the average annual emission reductions for such kind of project are far less than 60 kt CO₂ equivalent.

Under these circumstances as per the current methodology the project would be classified as a large scale project. But converting the project to large scale project leads to unjustified cost and complexity to project proponent along terms of time delay, increased monitoring requirements of a large scale project and other miscellaneous cost incurred related to large scale CDM process while in essence the project is small scale.

Hence a revision in the current methodology is proposed in the para 3 of applicability section from:

- Measures are limited to those that result in emission reductions of less than or equal to 60 kt CO₂ equivalent annually

To

- Measures are limited to those that result in average annual emission reductions of less than or equal to 60 kt CO₂ equivalent

Recommendation by the SSC WG:

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

Please refer to paragraph 15 of the meeting report of the SSC WG 22
(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 not to recommend the revision of AMS-III.F. The SSC WG agreed to clarify that a project is eligible as a small-scale project only if ex ante calculations show that emissions reductions do not exceed the applicable SSC thresholds in any of the seven or ten years of the crediting period. This is an annual limit, not an average of the crediting period. The project participant may consider using a large-scale methodology.



Signature of SSC WG Chair

(Hugh Sealy)

Date: 24/09/2009



Signature of SSC WG Vice-Chair

(Peer Stiansen)

Date: 24/09/2009

Information to be completed by the secretariat

SSC-Submission number	SSC_343
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat	24 September 2009
Date of transmission to the EB	24 September 2009
Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site	24 September 2009