



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:	27–30 October 2009, SSC WG 23
Title/Subject (give a small title or specify the subject of your submission, maximum 200 characters):	Revision to redefine Project Boundary in AMS-III.F
Indicative methodology to which your submission relates (refer the items of Appendix B of the Simplified Modalities and Procedures), if applicable.	AMS-III.F
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:

Request for revision in definition of Project Boundary in AMS III F

The methodology “AMS III F- Avoidance of methane emissions through controlled biological treatment of biomass (Version 08)” in it’s current form includes geographical locations where the residual waste from biological treatment or products from those treatments, like compost and slurry, are handled, disposed, submitted to soil application within the project boundary (Section 16 d) .

Though two project activities producing compost may be located a great distance from each other (in different cities) their soil application sites may overlap. The soil application area of compost produced in a CDM project activity may be spread over a great distance from the source of production, resulting in project boundary extending over to large areas. In most of the cases the soil application sites belong to a third party (farmers) and not the project proponent (compost manufacturers).

Thus inclusion of the soil application site in the project boundary leads to incorrect bundling of projects that are located at different cities.

Hence, the project participant proposes to exclude geographical locations where the residual waste from biological treatment or products from those treatments, like compost and slurry, are handled, disposed, submitted to soil application and the itineraries where the transportation of waste, wastewater, compost/slurry/products of treatment or biogas occurs, from being considered within the Project Boundary and thus Project Emission.

Emission resulting from the same can be included under leakage resulting in leakage emissions thereby not affecting the bundling aspect.

Recommendation by the SSC WG:

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

Please refer to paragraph 7 of the meeting report of the SSC WG 23
(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, as the residual methane producing capacity of the compost could be still significant; the users of the compost and the compost application sites/areas must be included in the project boundary and monitored to achieve the methane avoidance.

The SSC WG agreed to further clarify that the debundling check regarding overlap of compost application sites/areas is only necessary in case two or more SSC CDM project activities are proposed by the same project proponents (please refer to the Annex 27, EB 36: Compendium of guidance on the debundling for SSC project activities).



Signature of SSC WG Chair

(Hugh Sealy)

Date: 30/10/2009



Signature of SSC WG Vice-Chair

(Peer Stiansen)

Date: 30/10/2009

Information to be completed by the secretariat

SSC-Submission number	SSC_357
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat	30 October 2009
Date of transmission to the EB	30 October 2009
Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site	30 October 2009