


| | |
|--|---|
|  | CDM: Response form for Request for revision of approved methodologies (version 01.1) |
| Date of Meth Panel meeting: | 19 - 23 October 2009 |
| Title and number of Request for revision | <p>“Expansion of applicability conditions to AM0074 (Version 01) and modification of baseline methodology procedure”</p> <p>AM_REV_0170</p> |
| Summary of the query: Please use the space below to summarize the request for revision on the related approved methodologies. | |
| <p>The methodology AM0074, “Methodology for new grid connected power plants using permeate gas previously flared and/or vented”, is applicable to project activities where the permeate gas, previously flared and/or vented at the existing natural gas processing facility, is used as fuel in a new grid connected power plant.</p> <p>This request for revision intends:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To allow the use of back-up fuels in the project activity power plant up to 15% on energy basis; and 2. According to the project proponents due to legal restrictions, to delete the following requirement from the “<i>Procedure 1: Only the operator of the new power plant is a project participant</i>” to identify the most plausible baseline scenario: <p><i>“Project participants shall obtain a written confirmation from the natural gas processing facility that (i) the permeate gas would not have been used for productive purposes, (ii) no other potential users of the permeate gas are interested in it as feedstock or fuel, and (iii) the gas processing facility would have continued the current practice of venting and/or flaring the permeate gas in the absence of the project activity”;</i></p> <p>And it is proposed that the requirement above should be replaced by the following:</p> <p><i>“Project participants shall provide transparent evidences to confirm that (i) the permeate gas would not have been used for productive purposes, (ii) no other potential users of the permeate gas are interested in it as feedstock or fuel, and (iii) the gas processing facility would have continued the current practice of venting and/or flaring the permeate gas in the absence of the project activity”.</i></p> | |
| Recommendation by the Meth Panel: | |
| (a) Please use the space below to provide amendments /changes (in your expert view, if necessary). | |
| Not applicable. | |
| (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

The recommendation is to partially approve this request for revision as follows.

Request No. 1:

To approve. The Meth Panel considers the proposal to allow the use of back-up fuels in the project power plant as reasonable, taking into consideration that:

1. As per the approved AM0074, the emissions from back-up fuels shall be accounted for as project emission, consequently penalizing the amount of emission reductions when these back-up fuels are used; and
2. The use of back-up fuels shall be limited to 15%, ensuring that (i) the power plant is designed to run with permeate gas as fuel, where alternative fuels are only used as back-up, and (ii) the permeate gas is not the fuel used as back-up.

Request No. 2:

Not to approve. The Meth Panel considers that the proposal of deleting the mentioned requirement, in the procedure to identify the most plausible scenario, is not appropriate. The panel highlights that without this condition is quite cumbersome to ensure that,

- (i) the permeate gas was not used for other productive purposes, prior to the implementation of the project activity, and therefore no leakage emissions are attached to its use in the project power plant; and
- (ii) the permeate gas supplier would continue venting or flaring it in the absence of the project activity.

The new text proposed by the project proponents, using the term “*transparent evidences*”, neither provides clear and objective manners to prove this required condition, nor describes the type of documentation that the DOE shall validate in order to comply with this condition.



Signature of Meth Panel Chair

Date: 23/10/2009

(Philip Gwage)



Signature of Meth Panel Vice-Chair

Date: 23/10/2009

(Pedro Martins Barata)

Information to be completed by the secretariat

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| F-CDM-AM | AM_REV_0170 |
| Name of the authors of the query: | TUEV-NORD |
| Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat | 23 October 2009 |
| Date of transmission to the EB | 23 October 2009 |
| Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site | 23 October 2009 |