



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:	10–12 November 2008, SSC WG 18
Title/Subject (give a small title or specify the subject of your submission, maximum 200 characters):	Clarification regarding various baseline and project emissions parameters in AMS-III.D
Indicative methodology to which your submission relates (refer the items of Appendix B of the Simplified Modalities and Procedures), if applicable.	AMS-III.D version 14
Name of the authors of the query:	Thiago Otero Institution: Amazon Carbon S/S Ltda. thiago@amazoncarbon.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:

The project developer would appreciate some clarification on the following issues:

1. Is it necessary to monitor MS% during the crediting period in the cases where the project activity uses only one type of animal manure management system, and 100% of manure is destined to this system? How should this parameter be monitored? Could we use periodical samples to determine that all manure production is being destined to such a manure management system?
2. For the determination of $N_{LT,y}$, is it possible to consider a period of time different than 365 days? This approach might be necessary taking in consideration the management practices adopted in some farms. Choosing a fixed period of 365 days may result imprecise values in the cases where animals are produced in lots and data on the livestock is available only at the end of each lot. If lots last around 140 days, for instance, it is not possible to precisely determine the number of animals produced in one year.

To solve this issue, we have considered using the following equation, for the determination of $N_{LT,y}$:

$$N_{LT,y} = N_{da,pc} * \left(\frac{N_{p,pc}}{N_{pc}} \right)$$

Where:

$N_{da,pc}$ Number of days animal is alive in the farm in the period considered (numbers)

$N_{p,pc}$ Number of animals produced annually of type "LT" for the period considered (numbers)

N_{pc} Number of days in the period considered (numbers)

This approach would allow us to determine Baseline $N_{LT,y}$ for recent lots, based on documentation. The average of such lots is considered as the annual average number of animals, thus not affecting annual baseline emission calculation.

This approach would also allow us to determine $BE_{y,ex-post}$ and $PE_{y,ex-post}$ individually for each lot received during the crediting period.

3. Paragraph 19 of AMS-III.D informs that: “In case of flaring/combustion of biogas, project emissions are estimated using the procedures described in the “Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane”. As informed in the referenced tool, project emissions from flaring are calculated according to the mass flow rate of methane in the residual gas. How is it possible to estimate project emissions, given that no methane capture and storage takes place in the baseline scenario? Should we consider the yearly methane mass flow rate as the maximum methane producing potential of the manure fed into the anaerobic digester? This would mean that the following formula would be used to determine the yearly mass flow rate of methane:

$$\sum_{h=1}^{8760} TM_{RG,h} = D_{CH_4} * \sum_{i,LT} B_{0,LT} * N_{LT,y} * VS_{LT,y} * MS\%_{i,y}$$

In this approach, $PE_{flare,y}$ is calculated according to equation 15 of the referenced tool. Could this approach be used?

Recommendation by the SSC WG:

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

Please refer to paragraph 28 of the meeting report of the SSC WG 18 (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.

Concerning question 1, the SSC WG agreed to clarify that if there is only one type of treatment system to be employed throughout the crediting period, there is no need to monitor MS%. This factor is relevant when the quantities are fed to different systems.

With regard to question 2, the SSC WG agreed to include a formula analogous to the formula 5.b of ACM0010 Version 5 in a future revision of AMS-III.D; the project proponent might make use of this approach in the mean time.

Regarding the third question of the submission, it is clarified that equation 1 of AMS-III.D should be used to determine the yearly flow rate (methane production potential multiplied by uncertainty factor minus the estimated physical leakage, minus the estimated flare efficiency) to be used with equation 15 of the flare.



Signature of SSC WG Chair

(Ulrika Raab)

Date: 12/11/2008



Signature of SSC WG Vice-Chair

(Kamel Djemouai)

Date: 12/11/2008

Information to be completed by the secretariat

SSC-Submission number	SSC_238
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat	12 November 2008
Date of transmission to the EB	12 November 2008
Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site	12 November 2008