



**CDM: Response form for request for clarification on  
Approved Methodologies  
(version 01.1)**

<i>Date of Meth Panel meeting:</i>	15–19 October 2012
<i>Title and number of request for clarification</i>	Clarification for definition of term ‘output, comparable quality, properties’, all plants, similar project activities etc., in the context of common practice analysis assessment  CLA_TOOL_0017

**Summary of the query:**

Please use the space below to summarize the request for clarification on the related approved methodologies.

Clarification is sought on the “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality”(version 06.0.0). The DOE has provided two approaches, called Approach A and Approach B, to illustrate the situations that it seeks clarification on. The following clarifications are sought:

- a) The definition of “output” in particular comparable quality, properties e.g. is it appropriate to consider that electricity generation from solar, hydro, wind, biomass etc., is significantly different and therefore shall not be considered of comparable quality and property?
- b) The word(s) “all plants” used in Step 2, paragraph 47 essentially means ‘similar projects’ as indicated in paragraph 44, inter alia, the ones that are based on broadly similar technology as the proposed project activity?
- c) The essence of Step 3, paragraph 47 while determining Ndiff is identical to that of para 45 which requires the comparison among similar activities to be differentiated as per para 9?
- d) The words “all plants” in Step 4, paragraph 47 is same as in Step 2, paragraph 47?
- e) In the given case (i.e. a proposed 20 MW wind power project), is it appropriate to consider the wind power plants having capacities between 10 MW to 15 MW as different in accordance with para 9(c)(ii)?
- f) Whether Approach B, as defined in the example provided by the DOE, is in line to the requirement of common practice, assuming the use is properly validated
- g) Further, the application of para 9(a) i.e., energy source/fuel as in Approach A to rule out 182 is not appropriate as all these power plants are not similar to the project activity at first place?

**Recommendation by the Meth Panel:**

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

Not applicable.

**Answer to authors of the request for clarification by the Meth Panel :**

Please use the space below to provide an answer to the authors of the above query

The Meth Panel would like to clarify that the recently adopted guidelines “Guidelines on additionality of first-of-its-kind project activities” (version 02.0) and the “Guidelines on common practice” (version 02.0) by the CDM Executive Board at its sixty-ninth meeting have addressed the questions raised. However, please find point-wise responses to the clarifications as below:

Response to a): The definition of the revised “guidelines on common practice” has clarified that output is “goods/services produced by the project activity including, among other things, heat steam, electricity, methane, and biogas unless otherwise specified in the applied methodology”. Thus, in the example presented electricity is the output for the proposed project activity.

Response to b): The definition of ‘similar plants’ is clarified in paragraph 6, Step 2 under the “stepwise approach for common practice” of the revised “guidelines on common practice” (version 02.0). Under Step 2 of the revised guidelines it is further clarified that similar projects are, amongst other, those that use the same energy source/fuel, which in the example presented by this clarification would be wind.

Response to c):  $N_{diff}$  is determined as per the definition of “different technologies” of paragraph 4, and as described in paragraph 8, Step 4 of the revised “guidelines on common practice” (version 02.0).

Response to d): Yes, they refer to the same group of plants and the number of these plants is  $N_{all}$ .

Response to e): Technologies with capacities in a different scale compared to the project activity are considered to be different. In the case where the project activity is 20MW, i.e. large-scale, wind power plants having capacities between 10 MW to 15 MW are to be considered a different technology because they fall within the limits of small scale, as per the paragraph 4(c)(ii) under ‘size of installation (power capacity)/energy savings’ of the revised “guidelines on common practice” (version 02.0).

Response to f) and h): As clarified in the revised “guidelines on common practice” (version 02.0), Approach A is not correct, and Approach B is correct if all criteria used to define different technologies are accounted for in the determination of  $N_{diff}$ .

Signed by the Chair, Mr. Thomas Bernheim

Date: 19/10/2012

Signed by the Vice-Chair, Mr. Hugh Sealy

Date: 19/10/2012

**Information to be completed by the secretariat**

F-CDM-AM	CLA_TOOL_0017
Name of the authors of the query:	KBS Certification Services Pvt. Ltd.
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat	19 October 2012
Date of transmission to the EB	19 October 2012
Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site	19 October 2012