



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>	09–12 May 2011, SSC WG 31
<i>Title/Subject (give a small title or specify the subject of your submission, maximum 200 characters):</i>	Clarification on the applicability conditions of AMS-III.D
<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 “Methane recovery in animal manure management systems”
<i>Name of the authors of the query:</i>	Ana Paula Beber Veiga Institution: EQAO ana.veiga@eqao.com.br

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:

ISSUE 1

In the Clarification Request SSC_424 the SSC working group indicates that in the case that the majority of animal manure is removed from the animal barns before the flushing process and flushing is only carried out to remove residual manure, methodology AMS-III.H should be applied (instead of AMS III.D).

The baseline scenario treatment system of the proposed project activity consisted of a sequential treatment stages which included a solid separator followed by anaerobic lagoons. It was assumed, based on specialized literature and local measurements that the removal efficiency of the solid separator was equivalent to 40%. The clarification request mentioned above refers to manure removal before flushing process. This reduction is being considered as per the recommendations of paragraph 14 of the methodology (version 16). The recommendation is provided in paragraph 10.e) of AMS-III.D version 17.

PPs would like to clarify whether this recommendation - methodology AMS-III.H should be applied instead of AMS-III.D - is also applicable to the described scenario, even if the 40% manure separation occurs after flushing (e.g. by means of a solid separator).

ISSUE 2

PPs would also like to take the opportunity and clarify issues regarding the storage time of the manure. As per the work instructions of the farm where the project is being implemented, the barns are cleaned using the flushing process and the stream is caught in chutes. The chutes are periodically cleaned and the stream is sent to the effluent treatment system. The chutes are discharged in intervals ranging from 1 to 45 days depending on the livestock category being raised in the barn.

Once reference to project emissions from incremental transportation is made, it is PPs understanding that this methodological recommendation is applicable to cases where the manure is transported between farms considered in the same CDM Project Activity, which is not the case. It must be noted that in the project activity there is no transportation of the manure and the same is not taken from the barns, as suggested in the relevant paragraph of the methodology.

Considering this, should the accumulation of the stream from flushing process in chutes be classified as manure storage, and, as a consequence considered as a source of project emissions? Version 16 is being used, which considers that the storage time could not exceed 5 days. This time restriction was adjusted to 45 days in version 17 of the methodology.

Recommendation by the SSC WG:

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

Please refer to paragraph 21 of the meeting report of the SSC WG 31 (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.

At the outset, the SSC WG agreed to clarify that SSC_424 is concerning the treatment of animal manure residues that is left over after the solid separation process and thereafter flushed out with water. In such a context, AMS-III.H which is based on COD measurement is the applicable methodology as clarified in SSC_424.

With respect to the underlying project, the SSC WG agreed to clarify that AMS-III.D is applicable and paragraph 10 (e) of AMS-III.D version 17 regarding the sequential treatment, shall be followed. Furthermore, if any intermediate treatment stage is aerobic or a non-biological treatment step, a MCF value of 0 shall be applied, i.e. no methane emissions will be attributed to the volatile solids removed in this stage.

With respect to the second question, the SSC WG agreed to clarify that accumulation of waste stream in the animal barn chutes shall be considered as a source of project emissions, because the organic matter inside the waste stream is prone to anaerobic decomposition within a period of 1-45 days (as described in the submission). In doing so, paragraph 16 of AMS-III.D version 17 shall be followed. In addition, the maximum storage time of 5 days in version 16 is an editorial error, and had been corrected in the latest version.

Signed by the Chair, Ms. Fatou Gaye

Date: 12/05/2011

Signed by the Vice-Chair, Mr. Peer Stiansen

Date: 12/05/2011

Information to be completed by the secretariat

SSC-Submission number	SSC_526
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat	12 May 2011
Date of transmission to the EB	12 May 2011
Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site	12 May 2011