



**CLEAN DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM
PROJECT DESIGN DOCUMENT FORM (CDM-PDD)
Version 03 - in effect as of: 28 July 2006**

CONTENTS

- A. General description of project activity
- B. Application of a baseline and monitoring methodology
- C. Duration of the project activity / Crediting period
- D. Environmental impacts
- E. Stakeholders' comments

Annexes

- Annex 1: Contact information on participants in the project activity
- Annex 2: Information regarding public funding
- Annex 3: Baseline information
- Annex 4: Monitoring plan

**SECTION A. General description of project activity****A.1. Title of the project activity:**

>>

Project name: Wuhe Kaidi Biomass Power Project

Version: 04

Date: 31/03/2010

Version History:

Version Number	Date	Comment
Version 1	27/08/2008	Version submitted for GSP
Version 2	10/07/2009	Version submitted to DOE following Draft Validation Report
Version 3	20/10/2009	Version submitted for Registration
Version 4	31/03/2010	Version submitted after first completeness check

A.2. Description of the project activity:

>>

Wuhe Kaidi Biomass Power Project (hereafter referred to as the proposed project) is a biomass utilization project developed by Wuhe Kaidi Green Energy Development Co., Ltd. (hereafter referred to as the Project Owner) and is located in in the South of Chemical Industrial Park, Mohekou Industrial park, Wuhe Economic Development District, Bengbu City, Anhui Province, P.R. China.

The scenario existing prior to the start of implementation of the project activity is the generation of power by grid-connected power plants, generation of heat in small coal-fired boilers and the biomass residues(Rice husk, Wheat straw, Rice straw, Maize straw, Cotton straw) are dumped or left to decay under mainly aerobic conditions. The latter applies to, for example, dumping and decay of biomass residues on fields or burnt in an uncontrolled manner without utilizing it for energy purposes.

The proposed project will process about 185,700tonnes (wet) of biomass residue annually, of which rice husk and rice straw, wheat straw, maize straw and cotton straw are the main biomass fuel. 2 sets of 65t/h Circulating Fluidized Bed (CFB) boiler and 2 sets of 12MW steam turbines generator units will be installed. Therefore, the total installed capacity of the Project is 24MW. The annual equivalent operation hours at full load is estimated to be 6000 hours with a net electricity generation of 126,720MWh and a net heat generation of 541,602GJ per year.

The proposed project will not claim GHG emission reductions from displacing heat that would otherwise be produced within Mohekou Industrial Park. The estimated GHG emission reduction is 106,559CO₂e per year in the first crediting period.

The electricity generated will be transmitted through a 35kV transformer at the site to Mohekou 110kV substation and then supplied to Wuhe County power grid, which is a sub-grid of the East China Power Grid (ECPG). The proposed project will therefore replace the equivalent capacity of power plants on the ECPG, which is predominantly made up of coal fired power plants. The heat generated will be supplied to the plants in Mohekou Industrial park to meet the process heat demand and replace the heat generated by the small individual small coal-fired boilers within the independent industries.



Additionally, the proposed project will accomplish an extra benefit of greenhouse gas (GHG) mitigation derived from a reduction of methane emissions by utilizing rice husk and straws from the local area which would otherwise be dumped or left decay under mainly aerobic conditions and burned in an uncontrolled manner outside in the fields.

The baseline scenario is the same as the scenario existing prior to the starting of implementation of the project activity.

The proposed project will not only supply renewable electricity to the grid thereby generating emission reductions, but it will also contribute to sustainable development of the local community and the host country by means of:

- Supply of clean renewable energy to ECPG with improvements to the local energy structure;
- Promoting the comprehensive utilization of resources and mitigating emissions caused by decay or uncontrolled burning of the biomass residues;
- Increasing local incomes and providing 93 job opportunities;
- Decreasing the GHG emission from the fossil-fuel fired power plants and the GHG emissions from the uncontrolled burning of the biomass residues as well as the decreasing emissions of SO_x, NO_x and dust.

In order to meet the requirements in Page 6 and 7 of the applied methodology, the situation of the project activity and baseline scenario has been discussed as follows:

- *For each power plant that was operating at the project site during the most recent three years prior to the start of the project activity: the type and capacity of the power plant, types and quantities of fuels have been used in the power plant during the most recent three years prior to the start of the project activity and whether the plant continues operation after the start of the project activity;*
- ◆ The project activity is a Greenfield project and there is no power plant that was operating at the project site during the most recent three years prior to the start of the project activity.
- *For each boiler or other heat generation equipment that was operating at the project site during the most recent three years prior to the start of the project activity: the type and capacity of the boiler, types and quantities of fuels have been used in the boiler during the most recent three years prior to the start of the project activity and whether the boiler continues operation after the start of the project activity;*
- ◆ The project activity is a Greenfield project and there is no boiler or heat generation that was operating at the project site during the most recent three years prior to the start of the project activity.
- *For each boiler or power plant installed under the project activity: the type and capacity of boilers and/or power plants and which types and quantities of fuels are planned to be used;*
- ◆ The specification of the boilers and turbines installed under the project activity are described in the PDD section A.4.3. The main fuel of the project activity is biomass residues (Rice husk, Wheat straw, Rice straw, Maize straw, Cotton straw). Diesel will be used as the start-up fuel and there will be some diesel consumption for forklifts at collections sites and project site under the project activity.



- *For each new boiler or power plant that would be installed in the absence of the project activity: the type and capacity of the new boilers and/or power plants and which types and quantities of fuels would be used."*
- ◆ There are some existing off-site boilers that were operating at Mohekou Industrial park, the type, capacity and location of the boiler, type and quantities of fuels have been used in each of the boilers during the most recent three years prior to the start of the project activity have been described in detail in PDD section A 4.3.
 - ◆ There are some new off site boilers that would be installed in the absence of the project activity at Mohekou Industrial park, the type, capacity and location of the boiler, type and quantities of fuels would be used in each of the boilers have been described in detail in PDD section A 4.3.

A.3. Project participants:

>>

Name of Party involved (*) ((host) indicates a host Party)	Private and/or public entity (ies) project participants (*) (as applicable)	Kindly indicate if the Party involved wishes to be considered as project participant (Yes/No)
Peoples' Republic of China (host)	Wuhe Kaidi Green Energy Development Co., Ltd	No
United Kingdom	Camco International Limited	No
United Kingdom	Camco Carbon Limited	No

>>

See Annex 1 for details

A.4. Technical description of the project activity:**A.4.1. Location of the project activity:**

>>

A.4.1.1. Host Party(ies):

>>

People's Republic of China

A.4.1.2. Region/State/Province etc.:

>>

Anhui Province

A.4.1.3. City/Town/Community etc:

>>

Bengbu City

A.4.1.4. Detail of physical location, including information allowing the unique identification of this project activity (maximum one page):

>>

The proposed project activity is located in the South of Chemical Industrial Park, Mohekou, Bengbu City, Anhui Province, P.R. China.

The center of the plant has geographical coordinates of 117°29'42" east longitude 32°54'18" north latitude. The figureA-1 shows the location of the proposed project.




Figure A-1. The location of Wuhe Kaidi Biomass Power Project

A.4.2. Category(ies) of project activity:

>>



The proposed project falls into:

Sectoral Scope 1: energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources)

Project Activity: Grid-connected renewable power generation;

A.4.3. Technology to be employed by the project activity:

>>

Scenario prior to the start of the implementation of the project activity:

- ◆ The equivalent electricity is supplied from the ECPG which is dominated by coal-fired power plants.
- ◆ The process heat demand for each individual plant in the Mohekou Industrial park is or would be met by individual small coal-fired boilers.

The existing heat demand in the Mohekou industrial park is around 5t/h, which is met by individual small coal-fired boilers owned by each plant owner¹. The key information on each individual coal-fired boiler is detailed as below:

Table A-1 The existing off site fossil fuel-fired boilers in Mohekou Industrial park²

Owner	Rated Capacity (t/h)	Commission starting date (year)	Predicted date of replacement	Model	Fuel/ Consumption	Distance from the Project(km)	Coordinates
Anhui Juyuan Chmical Co.,Ltd.	1	1992	2017	DZL1-1.0-A II	Coal/ 600ton per year	2	E117°30'44" N32°53'59"
Bengbu Tengfei Heat Preservation Vessel Co., Ltd.	4	2003	2028	DZL4-1.25-A II	Coal/ 2400ton per year	2	E117°30'17" N32°53'39"

Note: The design lifetime for those kinds of boilers is 30 years³. The average commercial lifetime is above 25 years⁴ therefore a 25 year lifetime is used in the table above to calculate the predicted year of replacement to be conservative.

¹ “Introduction on the boilers in Mohekou industrial park”, official letter of Administration Bureau of Wuhe Economic Development District Mohekou industrial park

“Supplementary Introduction on the boilers in Wuhe Economic Development District”, official letter of Administration Bureau of Economic Development Wuhe Economic Development District Mohekou industrial park

² ibid

³ Boiler intensity calculation standards application manual, standards press of China, 1998 page 11

⁴ “Introduction on the lifetime of the boilers” by the Senior Engineer Zhu yuqing from Central Southern China Electric Power Design Institute of China Power Engineering Consulting Group



In addition, according to Mohekou Industrial park's recent plan⁵, new heat demand is estimated to be 45t/h due to new construction of new projects in Wuhe Economic Development District. The new heat demand will be also met by small coal fired boilers in the absence of the project activity⁶. Below are the identified new heat users and their information.

Table A-2 Lists of the new users off-site which would install small fossil fuel-fired boilers in the absence of the proposed project

New Users	Capacity Needed (t/h)	Fuel would use in the absence of the project/Consumption	Distance from the Project (km)	Coordinates
Bengbu Xuelang Flavor Co., Ltd	5	Coal/ 3000 ton per year	3	E117°30'36" N32°53'23"
Bengbu longmao Rubber productions Co., Ltd	7	Coal 4200 ton per year	3	E117°30'55" N32°53'55"
Bengbu Zhongheng Textile Co., Ltd	3	Coal/ 1200 ton per year	2.5	E117°30'25" N32°53'09"
Bengbu Fubang Plastic Co., Ltd	5	Coal/ 3000 ton per year	2.5	E117°29'48" N32°53'05"
Bengbu Renjie Food Co., ltd	8	Coal/ 4800 ton per year	3	E117°30'03" N32°52'56"
Bengbu Yinghuang Commodity Chemistry Co., Ltd	10	Coal/ 6000 ton per year	3.5	E117°31'06" N32°52'53"
Bengbu Package Printery Co., Ltd	3	Coal/ 1800 ton per year	4	E117°30'14" N32°52'28"
Bengbu Keling S&T Co., Ltd	2	Coal/ 1200 ton per year	2.5	E117°30'50" N32°53'29"
Bengbu Wutong Storage Battery	2	Coal/ 1200 ton per year	3.5	E117°30'42" N32°52'58"

Although coal-fired boilers for process heat supply are common practice in local area, the small coal fired boilers have a negative impact on the local environment. In consideration of the negative impact on the local environment and in order to build a green, environmental friendly industrial park, the Administration Bureau of Wuhe Economic Development District Mohekou industrial park is willing to let the proposed project to provide heat to the individual heat users within the industrial park to meet the heat demand. The official document issued by the Administration Bureau of Wuhe Economic Development District Mohekou industrial park⁷ states that the existing boilers at the consumer site should stop operation when the proposed project is supplying heat.

Additionally, in another official document issued by the Administration Bureau of Wuhe Economic

⁵ “Introduction on the boilers in Wuhe Economic Development District”, official letter of Administration Bureau of Wuhe Economic Development District Mohekou industrial park

⁶ ibid

⁷ ibid



Development District Mohekou industrial park, it also states that to provide better infrastructure for the industrial park, the local government will bear the capital cost on the heat pipeline for transporting steam to the independent heat users within the economic development park⁸.

- ◆ The biomass residues which are to be utilized in the proposed power plant are currently dumped or left decay under mainly aerobic conditions and burned in an uncontrolled outside manner in the fields.

Baseline Scenario:

The baseline scenario is the same as the scenario prior to the start of the implementation of the project activity as described above. In the absence of the proposed project, this scenario will continue.

Project Activity Scenario:

The technology employed by the proposed project is advanced domestic technology. The proposed project will install two sets of 65t/h circulating fluid bed (CFB) boilers with medium temperature and sub-high pressure. At the same time, two 12MW steam turbines and two associated generators will be applied in the proposed project. The steam turbine employed is medium temperature and sub-high pressure extraction condensing steam turbine. The total installed capacity of the proposed project is 24MW and the total efficiency of the plant is approximately 42%.

The key technical specifications of the boiler, turbine and generator are listed in the table below.

TableA-3 Key Equipments Parameters:⁹

BOILER	
Manufacturer	Jiangxi Jianglian Energy and Environmental Protection Co., Ltd
Model	KG65-450/5.29-FSWZ- I
Type	Medium temperature and sub-high pressure Circulating Fluidized Bed
Maximum evaporation volume	65t/h
Rated steam pressure	5.29MPa
Rated steam temperature	450℃
Feed water temperature	153.2℃
Feed water pressure	5.72MPa
Efficiency	≥86 %
Lifetime	30years
Quantity	2
STEAM TURBINE	
Manufacturer	NanJing Steam Turbine(Group) Co., Ltd

⁸ Clarifications on taking Wuhe Kaidi Biomass Power Generation Project as the district heating system in Mohekou Industrial Park, WuJingMoGongQu [2010] 01

⁹ Equipment purchase Agreement, Annex1, from the Project Owner



Model	C12-4.90/0.981-12/435°C.
Type	Medium temperature and sub-high pressure extraction condensing steam turbine
Rated power	12MW
Main steam pressure	4.9MPa.a
Main steam temperature	435°C
Rate extraction steam volume	15t/h
Maxium Extraction steam volume when Rate electricity capacity is 6.59MW	45t/h
Lifetime	30years
Quantity	2
GENERATOR	
Manufacturer	NanJing Steam Turbine(Group) Co.,
Model	QFJ-15-2
Rated power	15MW ¹⁰
Rated voltage	10.5KV
Power factor	0.8
Efficiency	≥97%
Rated rotating speed	3000r/min
Rated frequency	50Hz
Lifetime	30years
Quantity	2

The biomass residues utilized in this proposed project will be mainly rice husk, wheat straw, rice straw ,maize straw, and cotton straw. The rice husk will be packed and stored temporarily at the rice mills. Some collection sites will be set up near to the resources for the straws to be processed and stored, from where the straws will be transported to the plant according to the dispatch schedule. At the same time, some straws will be transported to the project plant directly.

The biomass residues are weighed by the weighbridge before being fed into the fuel entering system to the boiler for combustion or into the storehouse in the plant for future usage. The steam entered into the turbine is used for power generation and some is extracted for heat supply. The heat generated by the proposed project will be supply to the local industrial users as process heat in the industrial park.

¹⁰ The generator is sized a little bigger to allow for possible peak load demand and to avoid severe impact on the whole generation unit induced by sudden load change under abnormal situations.

The boiler smoke will be treated by a high efficiency bag filter and then carried to the ash storeroom. It is estimated that the annual ash generated from the power plant will be very limited. The ash is expected to be transported outside of the plant and dealt with by some local fertilizer company.

All of the turbine and generator system will be supplied by Chinese domestic suppliers as well as the other auxiliary equipments installed in the power plant.

A flow diagram showing the power plant operation is provided as below.




Figure A-2 Flow Diagram of the plant

A.4.4. Estimated amount of emission reductions over the chosen crediting period:

>>

A crediting period of 7 (seven) years (renewable twice) is selected for the project activity. The starting date of the crediting period for the project is 01/01/2011 or the date of registration which ever comes late. During the first crediting period, estimation of emission reductions of the project would be shown in the table below.

Years	Annual estimation of emission reductions in tonnes of CO ₂ e
2011	106,559
2012	106,559
2013	106,559
2014	106,559



2015	106,559
2016	106,559
2017	106,559
Total estimated reductions (tonnes of CO ₂ e)	745,911
Total number of crediting years	7
Annual average over the crediting period of estimated reductions (tonnes of CO ₂ e)	106,559

A.4.5. Public funding of the project activity:

>>

There is no public funding for this project.

**SECTION B. Application of a baseline and monitoring methodology:****B.1. Title and reference of the approved baseline and monitoring methodology applied to the project activity:**

>>

1. ACM0006 (Version 09) – “Consolidated methodology electricity generation from biomass residues”
2. “Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality”. (Version 02.2)
3. ACM0002 (Version 10) – “Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources”
4. “Tool to calculate project or leakage CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion” (Version 02)
5. “Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption” (Version 01)
6. “Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system” (Version 02)

For more information regarding the methodology, please refer to the link:

<http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAMethodologies/approved.html>

B.2. Justification of the choice of the methodology and why it is applicable to the project activity:

>>

ACM0006 is applicable to biomass residue fired electricity generation project activities, including cogeneration plants. The proposed project is a Greenfield power cogeneration project on the operation of an independent plant supplied by biomass residues coming from the nearby area.

The proposed project meets all applicability conditions of ACM0006 which are justified as follows:

Applicable conditions of ACM0006	Justification on the applicability of ACM0006 to the Proposed Project
No other biomass types than biomass residues, as defined in the methodology, are used in the project plant and these biomass residues are the predominant fuel used in the project plant (some fossil fuels may be co-fired);	Biomass residues (rice husk, wheat straw, rice straw, maize straw, and cotton straw) from local agriculture will be the predominant fuel at the power plant. Only a small amount of diesel will be used to for start-up of the boilers.
For projects that use biomass residues from a production process, the implementation of the project shall not result in an increase of the processing capacity of raw input or in other substantial changes in this process;	The biomass residues used by the proposed project are byproducts of agriculture crops, not from a production process.
The biomass residues used by the project facility should not be stored for more than one year;	The biomass residues are consumed on a first-come-first-used basis. According to the FSR, a regular clearance of the warehouse at the power plant will happen every four months. Thus, the biomass residues will not be stored more than one year.
No significant energy quantities, except from	The preparation of the biomass residues only



transportation or mechanical treatment of the biomass residues, are required to prepare the biomass residues for fuel combustion, i.e. projects that process the biomass residues prior to combustion (e.g. esterification of waste oils).	includes mechanical treatment or transportation. Therefore, the proposed project will not have significant consumption of fossil fuels.
--	---

Besides, the baseline scenario of the project activity corresponds to the "description of the situation" of scenario 2 -one of the scenarios described in Table 2 in the methodology which has been discussed in B.4.

Therefore, ACM0006 is applicable to the proposed project.

B.3. Description of the sources and gases included in the project boundary:

>>

Emission sources:

For the purpose of determining GHG emissions of the **project activity**, the following emission sources are included:

- CO₂ emissions from on-site fossil fuel and electricity consumption that is attributable to the project activity
- CO₂ emissions from transportation of biomass residues to the project site

For the purpose of determining **baseline emissions**, the following emission sources are included:

- CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel fired power plants connected to the electricity system
- The project participants have chosen not to claim CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel based heat generation.

According to the approved methodology ACM0006, where the most likely baseline scenario for the biomass residue use is that the biomass residues would be dumped or left to decay under aerobic or anaerobic conditions or would be burnt in an uncontrolled manner without utilizing it for energy purposes, project participants may decide whether to include CH₄ emissions in the project boundary.

For this project, CH₄ emissions are **included** and these emissions are included in both the calculations for determining project emissions and baseline emissions.

According to the approved methodology ACM0006, the emission sources and GHGs in the project boundary are listed in the following table.

Table B-1 Overview on emissions sources included in or excluded from the project boundary

	Source	Gas		Justification / Explanation
Baseline	Electricity generation	CO ₂	Included	Main emission source
		CH ₄	Excluded	Excluded for simplification. This is conservative.
		N ₂ O	Excluded	Excluded for simplification. This is conservative.
	Heat generation	CO ₂	Excluded	The project activity will not claim CO ₂ emissions from fossil fuel based heat generation.
		CH ₄	Excluded	Excluded for simplification. This is conservative.



		N ₂ O	Excluded	Excluded for simplification. This is conservative.
	Uncontrolled burning or decay of surplus biomass	CO ₂	Excluded	It is assumed that CO ₂ emissions from surplus biomass residues do not lead to changes of carbon pools in the LULUCF sector.
		CH ₄	Included	Main emission source
		N ₂ O	Excluded	Excluded for simplification. This is conservative.
Project Activity	On-site fossil fuel and electricity consumption due to the project activity	CO ₂	Included	May be an important emission source by the project activity
		CH ₄	Excluded	Excluded for simplification. This emission source is assumed to be very small.
		N ₂ O	Excluded	Excluded for simplification. This emission source is assumed to be very small.
	Off-site transportation of biomass residues	CO ₂	Included	May be an important emission source by the project activity
		CH ₄	Excluded	Excluded for simplification. This emission source is assumed to be very small.
		N ₂ O	Excluded	Excluded for simplification. This emission source is assumed to be very small.
	Combustion of biomass residues for electricity and / or heat generation	CO ₂	Excluded	It is assumed that CO ₂ emission from surplus biomass residues do not lead to changes of carbon pools in the LULUCF sector.
		CH ₄	Included	Since the CH ₄ emissions of biomass residue are included in baseline, according to the methodology, this emission is included in project scenario.
		N ₂ O	Excluded	Excluded for simplification. This emission source is assumed to be very small.
	Storage of biomass residues	CO ₂	Excluded	It is assumed that CO ₂ emissions from surplus biomass residues do not lead to changes of carbon pools in the LULUCF sector.
		CH ₄	Excluded	Excluded for simplification. Since biomass is stored for not longer than one year, this emission source is assumed to be small.
		N ₂ O	Excluded	For simplification. This emission source is assumed to be very small.
	Waste water from the treatment of biomass residues	CO ₂	Excluded	It is assumed that CO ₂ emission from surplus biomass residues do not lead to changes of carbon pools in the LULUCF sector.
		CH ₄	Excluded	The waste water generated is treated under aerobic treatment; therefore, the emission source is not included ¹¹ .

¹¹ EIA report of the project, page 18


		N ₂ O	Excluded	Excluded for simplification. This emission source is assumed to be very small.
--	--	------------------	----------	--

Spatial Extent of the Project Boundary:

The spatial extent of the project boundary encompasses

- The power plant at the project site;
- Transportation of biomass residues by trucks to the project site;
- All power plants connected physically to the East China Power Grid (ECPG). The ECPG includes Shanghai City, Jiangsu Province, Zhejiang Province, Anhui Province, and Fujian Province according to published information by the China DNA¹².
- The sites where the biomass residues would have been left for decay or dumped.
- The biomass collection sites where the straws will be pretreated

The heat users are included in the project boundary to account for revenues from selling thermal energy, but they are not considered in the determination of baseline emissions since the project participants have chosen not to claim CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel based heat generation.



FigureB-1 Project Boundary

B.4. Description of how the baseline scenario is identified and description of the identified baseline scenario:

>>

According to the latest methodology ACM0006, “Combined Tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality” (Version02.2) should be used to identify the most plausible baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality.

¹² <http://cdm.ccchina.gov.cn/web/NewsInfo.asp?NewsId=3239>



This tool applies the following four steps:
 STEP 1 Identification of alternative scenarios
 STEP 2 Barrier analysis
 STEP 3 Investment analysis (If applicable)
 STEP 4 Common practice analysis

STEP 1. Identification of alternative scenarios

This step serves to identify all alternative scenarios to the proposed CDM project activity(s) that can be the baseline scenario through the following sub-steps:

Sub-step 1a. Define alternative scenarios to the proposed CDM project activity

Realistic and credible alternatives should be separately determined regarding:

- How power would be generated in the absence of the CDM project activity;
- What would happen to the biomass residues in the absence of the project activity;
- How the heat would be generated in the absence of the project activity.

According to ACM0006, all the baseline alternatives for **power generation are listed and discussed as follows:**

Table B-2 Define alternatives for power generation

Alternatives	Realistic and credible alternative scenario? Yes/No
P1 The project not undertaken as a CDM project activity.	Yes. Despite the fact that this alternative is economically unattractive, as analysed in step3, this alternative is a plausible scenario for further analysis.
P2 The continuation of power generation in an existing biomass residue fired power plant at the project site, in the same configuration, without retrofitting and fired with the same type of biomass residues as (co-)fired in the Project.	No. Since the proposed project is a greenfield project and there is no existing biomass residues fired power plant at the project site, therefore this alternative is excluded.
P3 The generation of power in an existing captive power plant, using only fossil fuels.	No. Since there is no existing captive power plant, using fossil fuels near the project site, therefore this alternative is excluded.
P4 The generation of power in the grid	Yes. This alternative is a plausible scenario for further analysis.
P5 The installation of a new biomass residue fired power plant, fired with the same type and with the same annual amount of biomass residues as the Project, but with a lower efficiency of electricity	No. Since biomass power plants including the lower efficiency ones are not common practice in the local area. There is no on-grid installed capacity



generation (e.g. an efficiency that is common practice in the relevant industry sector) than the Project plant and therefore with a lower power output than in the Project case.	from Biomass Power plant before 2007 in Anhui Province ¹³ . Therefore, this alternative is excluded.
P6 The installation of a new biomass residue fired power plant that is fired with the same type but with a higher annual amount of biomass residues as the Project and that has a lower efficiency of electricity generation (e.g. an efficiency that is common practice in the relevant industry sector) than the Project. Therefore, the power output is the same as in the Project	No. Since biomass power plants are not common practice in the local area. There is no on-grid installed capacity from Biomass Power plant before 2007 in Anhui Province ⁸ . Therefore, this alternative is excluded.
P7 The retrofitting of an existing biomass residue fired power, fired with the same type and with the same annual amount of biomass residues as the Project, but with a lower efficiency of electricity generation (e.g. an efficiency that is common practice in the relevant industry sector) than the Project plant and therefore with a lower power output than in the Project case.	No. Since the proposed project is a greenfield project and there is no existing biomass residues fired power plant at the project site, therefore this alternative is excluded.
P8 The retrofitting of an existing biomass residue fired power that is fired with the same type but with a higher annual amount of biomass residues as the Project and that has a lower efficiency of electricity generation (e.g. an efficiency that is common practice in the relevant industry sector) than the Project.	No. Since the proposed project is a Greenfield project and there is no existing biomass residues fired power plant at the project site, therefore this alternative is excluded.
P9 The installation of a new fossil fuel fired captive power plant at the project site	Yes. This alternative is a plausible scenario for further analysis.
P10 The installation of a new single- (using only biomass residues) or co-fired (using a mix of biomass residues and fossil fuels) cogeneration plant with the same rated power capacity as the project activity power plant, but that is fired with a different type and/or quantity of fuels (biomass residues and/or fossil fuels). The annual amount of biomass residue used in the baseline scenario is lower than that used in the project activity.	No. Firstly, since biomass cogeneration plants (including single-or co-fired cogeneration plants) are not common practice in the local area. There is no on-grid installed capacity from Biomass Cogeneration plant before 2007 in Anhui Province ¹⁴ . Secondly, there are no other biomass resources identified in the biomass availability report and as such no other viable biomass fuel options available. It is financially unattractive to use some biomass types that are not identified in the biomass

¹³ China Electric Power Yearbook ,2007,2006,2005,2004,2003¹⁴ ibid



	<p>availability report.</p> <p>Thirdly, the <i>Renewable Energy Electricity Tariff and Cost Management Trial Regulations (fagaijiage [2006] 7)</i> issued by NDRC of China in 2006 stipulates that “ if the energy consumption from the fossil fuel of a co-fired(using a mix of biomass residues and fossil fuels) power plant exceeds 20% of the total energy consumption, the project should be taken as a ordinary fossil fuel fired project”, which means the tariff of the project within the first 15 years since commissioning will be only the bus-bar tariff for Anhui Province(0.371RMB/KWh including VAT)without 0.25RMB/KWh as the subsidy. Thus, it is not financially feasible to build new co-fired biomass power project in the region at present.</p> <p>Therefore this alternative is excluded.</p>
P11 The generation of power in an existing fossil fuel fired cogeneration plant co-fired with biomass residues, at the project site.	<p>No.</p> <p>Since there is no existing fossil fuel fired cogeneration plant co-fired with biomass residues near the project site, therefore this alternative is excluded.</p>

According to ACM0006, all the baseline alternatives for **Heat generation** are listed and discussed as follows:

Table B-3 Define alternatives for Heat Generation

Alternatives	Realistic and credible alternative scenario? Yes/No
H1 The Project not undertaken as a CDM project activity.	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Despite the fact that this alternative is economically unattractive, as analyzed in Step3, this alternative is a plausible scenario for further analysis.</p>
H2 The proposed project activity(installation of a cogeneration power plant), fired with the same type of biomass residues but with a different efficiency of heat generation(e.g. an efficiency that is common practice in the relevant industry sector)	<p>No.</p> <p>Since at present the technology of biomass cogeneration in China is just started and it is not common practice in China no matter lower efficiency or higher efficiency, therefore this alternative is excluded.</p>



H3 The generation of heat in an existing captive cogeneration plant, using only fossil fuels.	No. Since there is no fossil fuel fired cogeneration plant or any other cogeneration plant at or around the project site ¹⁵ .
H4 The generation of heat in boilers using the same type of biomass residues.	No. Since there is no heat boiler using biomass residues in the local area, while using small coal-fired boiler is common practice to meet the process heat demand for the plants in the Chemical Industrial Park, besides, it is not feasible for the individual enterprise to be equipped with expertise on the biomass collection or biomass-boiler operation.
H5 The continuation of heat generation in an existing biomass residue fired cogeneration plant at the project site, in the same configuration, without retrofitting and fired with the same type of biomass residues as in the Project.	No. Since there is no biomass residue fired cogeneration plant at or around the project site ⁹ . Therefore, therefore this alternative is excluded.
H6 The generation of heat in boilers using fossil fuels.	Yes. As discussed in section A4.3, existing heat demand is met by small fossil-fuel fired boilers ¹⁶ . In the absence of the proposed project, the industrial process heat will continue to be met the individual small fossil fuel fired boilers. Therefore, this alternative is a plausible scenario for further analysis.
H7 The use of heat from external sources, such as district heat.	No. Since there is no district heat supply in the local area, heat sources from external sources such as district heating do not exist. Besides, there is no plan to build district heat system in Wuhe County ¹⁷ .
H8 Other heat generation technologies (e.g. heat pumps or solar energy).	No. Since the heat consumers for the project are those enterprises located in the Chemical Industrial Park. They require a huge amount of qualified steam,

¹⁶ “Introduction on the boilers in Mohekou industrial park”, official letter of Administration Bureau of Wuhe Economic Development District Mohekou industrial park

¹⁷ At the validation site visit on Decemner 13, 2008, Wuhe County officials attended and confirmed that there are no future plans for district heating in Wuhe County.



	therefore neither solar energy nor heat pumps are feasible heat supply alternatives that could meet the quality nor the quantity of the process heat needed in the Industrial park.
H9 The installation of a new single- (using only biomass residues) or co-fired (using a mix of biomass residues and fossil fuels) cogeneration plant with the same rated power capacity as the project activity power plant, but that is fired with a different type and/or quantity of fuels (biomass residues and/or fossil fuels). The annual amount of biomass residue used in the baseline scenario is lower than that used in the project activity.	<p>No.</p> <p>Firstly, since biomass cogeneration plants (including single-or co-fired cogeneration plants) are not common practice in the local area. There is no on-grid installed capacity from Biomass Cogeneration plant before 2007 in Anhui Province¹⁸.</p> <p>Secondly, there are no other biomass resources identified in the biomass availability report and as such no other viable biomass fuel options available. It is financially unattractive to use some biomass types that are not identified in the biomass availability report.</p> <p>Thirdly, the <i>Renewable Energy Electricity Tariff and Cost Management Trial Regulations (fagaijiage [2006] 7)</i> issued by NDRC of China in 2006 stipulates that “ if the energy consumption from the fossil fuel of a co-fired(using a mix of biomass residues and fossil fuels) power plant exceeds 20% of the total energy consumption, the project should be taken as a ordinary fossil fuel fired project”, which means the tariff of the project within the first 15 years since commissioning will be only the bus-bar tariff for Anhui Province(0.371RMB/KWh including VAT)without 0.25RMB/KWh as the subsidy. Thus, it is not financially feasible to build new co-fired biomass power project in the region at present.</p> <p>Therefore this alternative is excluded.</p>
H10 The generation of power in an existing fossil fuel fired cogeneration plant co-fired with biomass residues, at the project site.	<p>No.</p> <p>Since there is no existing fossil fuel fired cogeneration plant co-fired with biomass residues near the project site, therefore this alternative is excluded.</p>

According to ACM0006, all the baseline alternatives for **the use of biomass residues** are listed and discussed as follows:

¹⁸ ibid





Table B-4 Define alternatives to each biomass type

Alternative	Realistic and credible alternative scenario? Yes/No	
	Rice Husk	Straw (Including Wheat straw, Rice straw, Cotton Straw, and Maize straw)
B1 The biomass residues are dumped or left to decay under mainly aerobic conditions. This applies, for example, to dumping and decay of biomass residues on fields.	<p>Yes. The availability of the rice husk which has been investigated by the FSR institute with support from the local authorities¹⁹ shows that 34,600tons of the rice husk are used for other purposes which only takes up 20% of the total available rice husk generated in the region (172,800tons), with the rest (80%) left to decay under mainly aerobic conditions or burnt in an uncontrolled manner without utilizing it.</p> <p>The rice mills have limited room for the rice husk and they have to burn it or dump it to leave room for the rice.</p> <p>Therefore, this alternative is a plausible scenario for further analysis.</p>	<p>Yes. The availability of the straws which has been investigated by the FSR institute with support from the local authorities²⁰ shows that 90,100 tons of the straws were used for other purposes which only takes up 13% of the total available straws generated in the region (716,400tons), with the rest (87%) left to decay under mainly aerobic conditions or burnt in an uncontrolled manner without utilizing it.</p> <p>The local farmers have to get rid of a huge amount of straws in order to keep the land free for the next season's planting, so they burn the straw in the field.</p> <p>Therefore, this alternative is a plausible scenario for further analysis.</p>
B2 The biomass residues are dumped or left to decay under clearly anaerobic conditions. This applies, for example, to deep landfills with more than 5 meters. This does not apply to biomass residues that are stock-piled or left to decay on fields.	<p>No. It is common that the biomass residues are dumped or left to decay under mainly aerobic conditions and burned in an uncontrolled way outside in the fields. In China, landfill plant only collects and processes the residential waste which does not cover the waste from agricultural and industrial sector, like the rice</p>	<p>No. It is common that the biomass residues are dumped or left to decay under mainly aerobic conditions and burned in an uncontrolled way outside in the fields. In China, landfill plant only collects and processes the residential waste which does not cover the waste from agricultural and industrial sector, like the</p>

¹⁹ Biomass Availability Report of the proposed project, Wuhan Kaidi Electric Power Engineering Co., Ltd., October 2007

²⁰ Biomass Availability Report of the proposed project, Wuhan Kaidi Electric Power Engineering Co., Ltd., October 2007



	husk.	straws.
B3 The biomass residues are burnt in an uncontrolled manner without utilizing it for energy purposes.	Yes. As for Alternative B1. This alternative is a plausible scenario for further analysis.	Yes. As for Alternative B1. This alternative is a plausible scenario for further analysis.
B4 The biomass residues are used for heat and/or electricity generation at the Project site	Yes. This alternative is a plausible scenario for further analysis.	Yes. This alternative is a plausible scenario for further analysis.
B5 The biomass residues are used for power generation, including cogeneration, in other existing or new grid-connected power plants	No. Using biomass to generate electricity or heat is not common practice in this region: near the project site, there are no existing power plants (including) cogeneration projects or boilers which are using rice husks to generate energy. Besides, confirmed by Wuhe Investment Promotion Bureau, there will be no other biomass power plant except the proposed project and there will be no other biomass energy projects in Wuhe ²¹ .	No. Using biomass to generate electricity or heat is not common practice in this region: near the project site, there are no existing power plants (including) cogeneration projects or boilers which are using straws to generate energy. Besides, confirmed by Wuhe Investment Promotion Bureau, there will be no other biomass power plant except the proposed project and there will be no other biomass energy projects in Wuhe ²² .
B6 The biomass residues are used for heat generation in other existing or new boilers at other sites.	No. As for Alternative B5.	No. As for Alternative B5.
B7 The biomass residues are used for other energy purposes, such as the generation of biofuels	No. There are no projects using biomass residues like rice husk for other energy purposes at the project site now or in Wuhe's development plan ²³ . Besides, due to the high cost in the biofuels projects, the biofuel industry	No. There are no projects using biomass residues like straws for other energy purposes at the project site now or in Wuhe's development plan ²⁵ . Besides, due to the high cost in the biofuels projects, the biofuel

²¹ A letter from Wuhe Investment Promotion Bureau about the clarification on no existing biomass power plant or underway except the proposed project or biomass energy project in Wuhe County

²² ibid

²³ ibid



	in China just started development and the biomass used for the biofuels are crops or non-crops plants mainly including the broomcorn Maize, cassavas, sweet potato, Coptis chinensis, hairy chestnut, tung tree, palm oil or waste cooking oil and/or waste fat from biogenic origin ²⁴ . The biomass residues used in the proposed project are not common raw material to produce biofuel.	industry in China just started development and the biomass used for the biofuels are crops or non-crops plants mainly including the broomcorn Maize, cassavas, sweet potato, Coptis chinensis, hairy chestnut, tung tree, palm oil or waste cooking oil and/or waste fat from biogenic origin ²⁶ . The biomass residues used in the proposed project are not common raw material to produce biofuel.
B8 The biomass residues are used for non-energy purposes, e.g. as fertilizer or as feedstock in processes (e.g. in the pulp and paper industry)	No. Around 34,600 tons of rice husk within the collection radius are used as feedstuff, which only accounts for 20% of the total rice husk availability and according to the leakage analysis in Section B.6.1, the rice husk is quite abundant surplus, the project will not change the use of rice husk as feedstuff.	No. Around 91,000 tons of the straws within the collection radius are used as household fuel, feedstuff and fertilizer which only accounts for 13% of the total straws availability and according to the leakage analysis in Section B.6.1, the straws are quite abundant surplus, the project will not change the use of straws as their non-energy uses as

²⁴Interim Rules on management on demonstration non-food biofuels projects (Consultative Draft) Dated in 2007 issued by NDRC of China

²⁵ A letter from Wuhe Investment Promotion Bureau about the clarification on no existing biomass power plant or underway except the proposed project or biomass energy project in Wuhe County

²⁶Interim Rules on management on demonstration non-food biofuels projects (Consultative Draft) Dated in 2007 issued by NDRC of China



		household fuel, feedstuff and fertilizer.
--	--	---

To summarize, alternatives **P1, P4, P9,H1 ,H6 ,B1,B3 and B4** are plausible alternatives for further analysis both for rice husk and straws.

.

**Outcome of Step 1a:**

As described above, the plausible alternative alternatives for the proposed project are **P1, P4** and **P9** for power generation, **H1** and **H6** for heat generation and **B1,B3 and B4** for the biomass residues

Sub-step 1b. Consistency with mandatory applicable laws and regulations:

In this sub step, alternatives which are not compliance with laws and regulations will be eliminated:

Alternatives P9 is not consistent with mandatory applicable laws and regulations. In 2006, the average annual utilization hour of Chinese fuel-fired power equipments is 5612 hours²⁷. Considering the same annual electricity generation, the alternative baseline scenario for the proposed project should be a fuel-fired power plant with installed capacity of 26 MW. Furthermore, given that the proposed project is a grid-connected project, the alternative baseline scenario must be a grid-connected fuel-fired power project. According to Chinese power regulations, it is prohibited to construct fuel-fired power plants of less than 135MW²⁸ are prohibited to construct in the areas covered by large grids. The alternative of building a fossil fuel-fired power plant with installed capacity of 26MW conflicts with Chinese regulations. Therefore, **P9** is excluded.

Outcome of Step 1b:

The plausible alternative scenarios are compliance with laws and regulations: **P1** and **P4** for power generation; **H1** and **H6** for heat generation and **B1,B3 and B4** for biomass residues. Namely, two plausible combined scenarios are left after Step 1:

- a) The Project not undertaken as a CDM project activity. (P1,H1,B4)
- b) The generation of power in the grid; the generation of heat in boilers using fossil fuels; the biomass residues are dumped or left to decay under mainly aerobic conditions or are burnt in an uncontrolled manner without utilizing it for energy purposes. (P4,H6,B1 or B3, which is Scenario 2 in ACM0006)

STEP 2. Barrier analysis

There are no barriers identified that would prevent the implementation of either of the two alternative scenarios above. Therefore, neither of the two combined scenarios is eliminated by the step2. The two combined scenarios need to be further discussed in Step 3.

STEP 3. Investment analysis

According to the ACM0006 (Version 09), project participants shall identify the most plausible baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality using the latest approved version of the “Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality”.

However, Version 02.2 of the aforementioned tool establishes in footnote 1 (on the first page) that for project activities in which one or more alternatives are not available options to project participants (such as grid-connected power projects), a different procedure to demonstrate additionality and identify the baseline scenario must be followed. For example, methodologies that involve alternatives that is not under the control of project participants can continue to use, if desired, the additionality tool (provides benchmark and other tools that utilize information about the markets in which such projects might compete), and provide their own methods to develop and/or assess baseline scenario. Besides, “Guidance

²⁷ China Electric Power Yearbook 2007

²⁸ Notice on Strictly Prohibiting the Illegal Installation of coal-fired Generators with the Capacity of 135MW or below issued by the General Office of the State Council, Guo Ban Fa Ming Dian decree No. 2002-6



on the Assessment of Investment Analysis” issued in EB51 has clearly pointed that if the alternative to the project activity is the supply of electricity from a grid this is not to be considered an investment and a benchmark approach is considered appropriate.

According to the above, this PDD will use the Benchmark to analyze whether the proposed project activity is less economically or financially attractive than the alternatives without the revenue from CERs. The investment analysis is conducted in the following steps:

Sub-step 3a. Apply benchmark analysis.

The project IRR benchmark for this project is 8%. This was set by the Department of Power Generation & Transmission Operations of the former State Power Corporation of China, in the “Interim Rules on Economic Assessment of Electrical Engineering Retrofit Projects”²⁹. This organization was responsible for carrying out government policies relating to new and retrofit power projects and for issuing rules such as IRR benchmark. Following re-organization, the functions of the State Power Corporation were transferred to the National Development and Reform Committee.

The Interim Rules were issued based on “The Methodology and Parameters for Financial Evaluation of Construction projects (Chapter 1 General, Section 1.1)” edited by the National Development and Reform Committee and Construction Ministry. The 8% project IRR benchmark listed in the Interim Rules is still valid and is applicable to new and retrofit power projects including cogeneration power projects, and is accepted as the benchmark of CDM projects in the power sector which has been used widely for the Feasibility Studies Reports of those projects. Hence, the proposed project adopts this benchmark.

In addition, the 8% project IRR benchmark used in the PDD is an important index that is adopted in the benchmark investment analysis of Feasibility Study Report (FSR). The project FSR was approved by DRC of Anhui Province in December 2007.

Sub-step 3b. Calculation and comparison of financial indicators.

1) Key parameters needed for calculation of IRR

All input values in the investment analysis used in the PDD are derived from the FSR which was undertaken by Wu Han Kaidi Electric Power Engineering Company Limited, a qualified design institute and an independent party. (Qualification rank: Grade A for power sector, No.170606-sj issued by Ministry of Construction of P.R. China). The FSR was approved by Anhui Province Development and Reform Commission. In this context, the FSR should be deemed as credible and reliable source to be applied in the investment analysis.

The FSR of the project activity was completed in November 2007. Although the completion of FSR was later than the investment decision, the input values from the FSR of the proposed project is still deemed to be suitable to be applied in the investment analysis due to the reasons addressed below:

- i. The assumptions of input value from the FSR of proposed project are the same/similar as those in the FSRs of three similar pilot projects using for investment decision.**

²⁹ State Power Corporation of China. Interim Rules on Economic Assessment of Electrical Engineering Retrofit Projects. Beijing: China Electric Power Press, 2003.



The proposed project is applying exactly the same equipment and technology provided by the same supplier and therefore the key financial parameters are assumed to be the similar to the three pilot projects. The projects are also all located in industrial parks with the intention of supplying heat to industrial users. They all use the same types of biomass, which are straws and rice husks with rice husk being given priority. The FSRs are all written by the same FSR institute and the projects are all invested by the same company. The CDM revenues are also included in the three pilot projects' FSRs. As such any differences in assumptions are minor and each project can be assumed to be similar to another for the purposes of the investment decision.

The table below shows a comparison of input values in the FSRs for proposed project and three similar pilot projects:

Table B-5 Comparison of the input value for proposed project and pilot projects.

		Proposed Project	Jianli Kaidi Biomass Power Project (Registered; Ref No.3044; in the following: Jianli)³⁰	Hunan Yueyang Kaidi Biomass Power Project (Ref No.3065; in the following Yueyang)³¹	Hunan Yiyang Kaidi Biomass Power Project (Ref No.3072; in the following: Yiyang)³²
Parameter	Unit	Value	Value	Value	Value
Installed capacity	MW	24	24	48	48
Project Lifetime (operational period)	Years	20	20	20	20
Operation hours	Hour	6000	6000	6000	6000
Gross power generation	MWh	144000	144000	288000	288000
Self-consumption rate	%	12	12	12	12
Net Power Generation output	MWh	126,720	126,720	253,440	253,440
Net Heat Generation output	GJ	541,600	541,602	1,083,204	1,083,204
Static total investment	RMB	238,280,000	264,770,000	438,720,000	444,800,000
Tariff (incl. VAT) in first 15 years	RMB/MWh	621	632	653	653
Tariff (incl. VAT) after the 15 years	RMB/MWh	371	382	403	403
Heat price (excl. VAT)	RMB/GJ	29.85	29.85	29.85	29.85

³⁰ Jianli FSR

³¹ Yueyang FSR

³² Yiyang FSR



Annual O&M cost (including the fuel cost)	RMB	59,096,680	59,868,380	125,567,841	124,017,274
Unit O&M	RMB/KWh	0.41	0.42	0.44	0.43
Biomass Cost	RMB/t	240	241	275	270
Income tax	%	25%	25%	25%	25%
VAT for Electricity	%	17%	17%	17%	17%
VAT for Heat	%	13%	13%	13%	13%
Depreciation period	Years	15	15	15	15
Residual Rate	%	4	4	4	4
Benchmark	%	8	8	8	8
IRR without CDM revenue	%	4.16	3.03	4.83	5.28

From the table above, it is clear that all input values for the proposed project and pilot projects are similar. Based on the assumptions of the input value above, the project IRR of proposed project without CDM revenue is 4.16% , while the project IRRs without CDM revenue for three pilot projects i.e Jianli, Yueyang, Yiyang are 3.03%, 4.83%,5.28% respectively. Yueyang and Yiyang are twice the size and there is therefore a lower unit capital cost due to economies of scale. Furthermore they have a higher tariff as they are located in a different province (Hunan). Jianli is therefore a more appropriate comparison. The Jianli project has a slightly lower IRR and therefore the IRR calculation of the proposed project is conservative. This demonstrates that the applied input values from the FSR will not modify the additionality of the proposed project.

ii. The valid of the input values from the FSRs of the pilots projects at time of investment decision

The period between the completion of the three pilot project FSRs (June, August, September 2007 respectively) and the investment decision (21 September 2007; date of Board Resolution) is less than 1 year and as such the assumptions in the FSRs of the three pilot projects are considered to be valid at the time of the investment decision.

iii. The period between the investment decision and the FSR completion is short enough that the input values for investment analysis can't be changed materially

The period between the completion of the FSR of the proposed project (November 2007) and the investment decision (21 September 2007; date of Board Resolution) is less than 1 year, thus there is no material changes of the input values assumed.

- The applied relevant sector and national standards in the FSR have not been changed.

The FSR of proposed project was designed complying with the Budgetary Estimation and Calculation Standard for Engineering Construction of Fuel-fired Power Sector, the Band Calculation of Budget for Engineering Construction of Power Sector, Interim Rules on Economic Assessment of Electrical Engineering Retrofit Projects, The Methodology and Parameters for Financial Evaluation of Construction projects which were also applied in the FSRs of pilot projects in the time of investment decision. It is also currently required to be complied with and applied in the Feasibility study for the power generation and cogeneration project hence is valid and applicable whenever at the time of the investment decision



and the time of the FSR of the project.

- The applied benchmark has not been changed.

The sector benchmark 8% for power generation and cogeneration has been required. The applied benchmark of proposed project in the FSR is the same one using in the time of investment decision.

In conclusion, above the arguments fully substantiate the input value in the investment analysis is valid and applicable, appropriate at the time of the investment decision. The applied input values from FSR of the proposed project can completely represent the information and data available at the time of the investment decision and hence is appropriate to be used for the investment analysis.

According to the Feasibility Study Report (FSR) of the proposed project, key parameters needed for calculation of IRR are as follows:

Table B-6 Parameters for calculation of IRR

Parameter	Value	Unit	Source
Installed capacity	24	MW	FSR Vol.01 P20
Project Lifetime (operational period)	20	years	FSR Vol.03 P5
Net Power Generation output	126,720	MWh	FSR Vol.01 P20
Net Heat Generation output	541, 600	GJ	FSR Vol.01 P20
Static total investment	238,280,000	RMB	FSR Vol.03 P4
Tariff(incl. VAT) in first 15 years	621	RMB/MWh	FSR Vol.03 P6
Tariff(incl. VAT) after the 15 years	371	RMB/MWh	FSR Vol.03 P6
Annual O&M cost(including the fuel cost)	59,096,680	RMB	FSR Vol.03 P43
Heat price(excl. VAT)	29.85	RMB/GJ	FSR Vol.01 P88
Biomass Cost	240	RMB/t	FSR Vol.03 P5
Income tax	25%		FSR Vol.03 P6
VAT for Electricity	17%		FSR Vol.03 P6
VAT for Heat	13%		FSR Vol.03 P6
Depreciation period	15	years	FSR Vol.03 P6
Residual Rate	4%		FSR Vol.03 P6
Expected CER price	8	EUR	FSR Vol.03 P7

The project owner made the investment decision based on the FSR and all the input values used in the investment analysis were taken from the FSR for the project carried out by the FSR Institute, which is certified to compile design reports for power projects with the highest grade A issued by Ministry of Construction P.R.China. In accordance to Chinese procedures, assumptions and data sources for the economic evaluation are based on relevant national standards and criteria. Furthermore, all the data in the FSR was assessed by designated independent experts and finally approved by the DRC of Anhui Province. Therefore, the values are considered to be reliable and suitable.

In addition, the rationality of the main assumptions are justified as follows:

Static total investment

The static total investment does not include investment on heat pipelines, since there is no agreement yet with the industrial park whether the industrial park or the project owner should pay for it, but the heat



revenues are definitely included in the IRR calculation and therefore the investment analysis is conservative. The static total investment is broken down as follows:

Civil Works	59.79 Million RMB
Equipment Purchasing t Fees	76.20 Million RMB
Equipment Installation Fees	43.73 Million RMB
Other expenditure	58.56 Million RMB
Sub-Total	238.28 Million RMB

Considering that the static total investment per kW of biomass power projects in China are generally around 10,000-13,000 RMB/kW³³, the static total investment of the proposed project of 9,928RMB/kW, which can be considered to be appropriate.

Additionally, the proposed project started construction in 2008, which is much later than the registered projects, it is reasonable to assume that costs would have risen since the other project were constructed. Specifically inflation for the main raw materials would need to be considered in the comparison. The national Pricing Indices of raw materials and power in year 2003,2004,2005,2006,2007(which are 104.8,111.4,108.3,106,104.4 respectively³⁴) and the national Pricing Indices of investment in fixed assets in year 2003,2004,2005,2006,2007 (which are 102.2,105.6,101.6,101.5,103.9³⁵) are representing an average increase of 3% per year both show a general increasing trend of investment cost in China prior to the investment decision.

Given that the project total investment is both consistent with industry standards and with other projects registered with the CDM Executive Board, it is reasonable to conclude that the static total investment of the project in the FSR is justified.

O&M Costs

The O&M costs include the fuel expenditure (biomass residues cost), Material expenditure, Water expenditure, Employee expenditure, Repairs and maintenance, Insurance fee and other O&M expenditure. Of these, the fuel expenditure represents 76% of the total O&M cost.

The biomass cost is estimated based on investigation on the local labour cost, collection cost, transportation cost and pre-treatment cost by the FSR writing institute and the project owner with the support from the local authorities.

The project owner does not own the biomass residues as they belong to individual farmers. The project owner procures the biomass from the agent who organizes the collection and the transportation of biomass from the field to the power plant. Therefore there are many associated costs with the procurement of biomass residue for the power plant. The project business model for biomass procurement is showed as below:

³³ <http://www.newenergy.org.cn/Html/0084/4100816608.html>

³⁴ Data source: China Statistical Yearbook 2004-2008; <http://www.stats.gov.cn/tjsj/ndsj/2008/indexch.htm>

³⁵ *ibid*




Figure B-2 Project Business Model for Biomass Procurement

The value applied in the investment analysis is a reflection of the fact that in order to get the biomass from the fields to the power plant there are associated costs with collection cost particularly agent cost for collection, transportation, handling and storage. This is clearly described in the FSR and Biomass Availability Report of the project. According to the FSR and the Biomass Availability Report, the work flow for the biomass supply chain is as shown in Figure B-3 below.




Figure B-3 Work flow for biomass collection and transportation

The above work flow clearly shows that there are costs incurred in two stages. Firstly, the cost incurred from the fields to the collection sites and then secondly, the cost incurred from the collection sites to the power plant.

The cost incurred from the fields to the collection sites includes the biomass collection cost from the individual farmers to the collection site (1), then transport to the collection sites and storage at the collection site (2) and then pre-treatment cost of biomass incurred at the collection sites (3).

The costs incurred to get the biomass from the collection sites to the power plant again include vehicles and labor (4). There will also be an overhead cost and margin associated with the third party agent that supplies the biomass from the local farmers (5).



The business model applied in the project is common practice according to the research report from the Chinese Journal, Renewable Energy Resources³⁶ which also illustrates the same work flow for collection, transportation, handling and storage, agent's overhead and margin as the project activity.

Breakdown of Biomass Costs for the proposed project

The breakdown of the biomass cost (delivered to the plant) for the proposed project has been estimated and provided by the FSR design institute³⁷ and this breakdown is as follows (in accordance with the work flow in Figure B-3 above):

- i. ***Cost from farmers/field to the collection site (1+2): 100RMB/ton***, including the collection cost at the field (labor cost) and transportation cost from field to the collection sites and storage.
- ii. ***Cost incurred at the collection site (3+5): 70RMB/ton***, including the land utilization cost, pre treatment cost, labor cost, biomass residues loss, agent margin/agent cost
- iii. ***Cost from the collection site to the power plant for power generation (4): 70RMB/ton***, including the transportation cost, the labor cost (loading and unloading), and the biomass loss.

The total purchase cost of 240RMB/tonne in the IRR calculation is derived from the cost breakdown above and therefore does not represent a market value. The cost breakdown does include a margin for the agent to undertake the role as intermediary, but this is considered to be reasonable given the costs that the agent incurs.

It is reported that the typical biomass cost in the ECPG area where the project located was already 300-350 RMB/ton in 2006³⁸.

Therefore, the biomass cost in the FSR should be considered to be appropriate .

Power and Heat Generation:

The Net Power Generation of the project in the FSR is calculated as follows:

Net Power Generation

$$\begin{aligned} &= \text{Installed Capacity} \times \text{Equivalent Operational Hours at full load} \times (1 - \text{auxiliary consumption rate}) \\ &= 24\text{MW} \times 6000\text{h} \times (1 - 12\%) \\ &= 126,720\text{MWh} \end{aligned}$$

Installed Capacity³⁹

The rated installed capacity of the steam turbines is 2 x 12MW. The rated steam extraction of the proposed project is 2 x 15t/h, with power generation capacity of 2 x 12MW. The power output, heat output and IRR calculation in the FSR is based on this operational condition.

³⁶ The operating model, existing problems and development strategies for China's straw storage and transportation system, Renewable Energy Resources, Vol.27 No.1, Feb. 2009

³⁷ Clarification on the biomass cost assumption in the FSR, KaiDiGongChengHan[2009]002, February 7th, 2009

³⁸ Related Questions Research on Biomass Generation Using Agriculture and Forest Residue in China, HUANGJintao, Journal of Shenyang Institute of Engineering (Natural Science), Vol14 No11, Jan. 2008

³⁹ Technical specification of the steam turbine



Under conditions where there is no steam extraction the steam turbines can theoretically generate at 2 x 15MW. This situation would be applicable to a scenario where there is no heat generation. However, as described above the intention of the project is to generate power and provide heat to the industrial park.

Nonetheless, in order to demonstrate the continued additionality if the project were to generate power at 15MW, a separate investment analysis has been completed. It shows an IRR of 2.86%, which is both below benchmark and below the IRR when a capacity of 2 x 12MW power generation and rated heat generation is assumed⁴⁰. The reason why the IRR is lower than the rated scenario is because the efficiency of the plant is higher when operating in cogeneration mode⁴¹.

The opposite extreme scenario would be applicable to a scenario when the maximum steam is extracted. The IRR of this scenario is 7.17%⁴², which is still far below the benchmark and higher than the rated scenario. The reason the IRR is higher than the rated scenario is because the fixed tariff of electricity by the government is not financially attractive than the heat price assumed in the FSR. The table below shows that the key elements in the three operational conditions:

Operational Conditions	Power Capacity	Steam Extracted	Annual Revenue in the first 15 years	Annual Revenue in the last 5 years	IRR
Rated Scenario	2 x 12MW	2 x 15t/h	83.21 million RMB	56.35 million RMB	4.16%
Condensing Scenario	2 x 15MW	0t/h	83.85 million RMB	50.23 million RMB	2.86%
Maximum Extraction Scenario	2 x 6.59MW	2 x 45t/h	85.21 million RMB	70.57 million RMB	7.17%

From above, we can conclude that the different operational conditions of the project will not change the additionality status of the project.

Equivalent Operational Hours at full Load

The investment analysis assumes 6000 hours as the equivalent operational hours at full load. It does not assume that the plant will only operate for 6000 hours, but rather that the project will not run at full capacity for 100% of the time.

The following bullet points provide a technical explanation of the 6000 operational hours⁴³.

- Risk on the Reliability of the CFB boiler
The CFB boiler is designed by the project owner and manufactured by domestic manufacturer. All the facilities in fuel feeding system are also domestic equipments. Although Wuhan Kaidi Power Engineer Co. Ltd has done a lot of research on the CFB biomass fired boiler, this new technology still needs to be tested and debugged during a long-term operation, and there's still relatively great

⁴⁰ IRR spreadsheet when no steam is extracted from the steam turbines

⁴¹ http://www.newenergy.org.cn/html/0079/200796_14310_1.html

⁴² IRR spreadsheet when maximum steam is extracted from the steam turbines

⁴³ Introduction on the operational hour 's calculation and assumption for Kaidi Biomass Power projects



potential technology risks, like inadequate steam output, dust depositing, unbalanced fluidization, serious corrosion of heating surfaces etc.

- Risk on the fuel quality
The straws contain considerable elements of K, Na, and Cl, resulting in a high risk of dust depositing, blockages and erosion. Moreover, the content of SiO₂ in rice husk ash is higher than 85%, which will cause serious wear and tear of heating surface. Although some mitigation measures are taken, potential risks still exist. Besides, biomass residues are seasonal fuels, not only the amount but also some characteristics (such as water content) always fluctuate seasonally. Additionally, the residues may rot during storage and the calorific value will decrease. Any changes in the quantity and quality of biomass could lower the generator operating hour, or even stop production.
- Maintenance
The technology is relatively new to the project owner. Having no experience in operation and maintenance and thus no skilled workers will affect the efficiency and smooth operation of the plant. Also, because the feeding system of biomass power plants is much more complicated than that of normal coal-fired power plants, there are a number of resulting technology difficulties. Until now, nearly all relevant equipment in the operating biomass power plants in China are imported. However, all the devices of feeding system employed in this project are domestically manufactured. Considering that there's no mature Industrial and market of supporting devices and service, a higher frequency of incidents that require maintenance as well as longer maintenance periods would be expected.

In addition to the explanations above, the project owner has made a comparison of similar biomass projects in operation⁴⁴. Zhongjieneng Suqian Biomass project is considered as a comparable project since it is a publicly available grid connected biomass residues project using CFB boilers and it is located in the southern area of China. The monitoring reports of this project covering almost 1.5 years shows that its operational hours are considerably less than 6000 hours⁴⁵. Thus, 6,000 hours can be considered to be reasonable.

Table B-7 Actual operational Hour for Similar project-Zhongjieneng Suqian Biomass Power Plant

⁴⁴ <http://www.ccchina.gov.cn/WebSite/CCChina/UpFile/2008/2008121111144663.pdf>
<http://www.sdpc.gov.cn/jggl/zcfg/W020080407569102971887.pdf>

⁴⁵ <http://cdm.unfccc.int/UserManagement/FileStorage/5F90E9FXXPZN54ANH8ERHI56PZNR8A>
<http://cdm.unfccc.int/UserManagement/FileStorage/OF2X17HG0DRAQMV8IZS9BL6YN4ETJW>



Monitoring period	Exported Power from the two monitoring reports	Power Generated(Assuming 12% is the self consumption rate)
Apr-07	710	807
May-07	3290	3739
Jun-07	3800	4318
Jul-07	1960	2227
Aug-07	4250	4830
Sep-07	5240	5955
Oct-07	7410	8420
Nov-07	12930	14693
Dec-07	11440	13000
Jan-08	6570	7466
Feb-08	9110	10352
Mar-08	13490	15330
Apr-08	13640	15500
May-08	13950	15852
Jun-08	6200	7045
Jul-08	5530	6284
Total Electricity Generated		135818
Operational hour from April 2007 to July 2008		4244
Operational hour from July 2007 to July 2008		5197

Heat Generation

The rated steam generation of the project is 30t/h with a temperature of 296.5°C a pressure of 1.27Mpa, thus an enthalpy of 3.0089GJ/t. Therefore, the Heat Generation in the FSR is calculated as follows:

$$\text{Heat Generation} = 30\text{t/h} \times 6000\text{h} \times 3.0089 \text{ GJ/t} = 541,602 \text{ GJ}$$

Auxiliary consumption rate

The auxiliary consumption rate of the project plant in the FSR is assumed as 12%.

The in house loads of the project (including both the high voltage facilities and low voltage facilities) are totally 4909.8KW⁴⁶, based on which, the calculated auxiliary consumption rate of the power plant is 16.3%⁴⁷, higher than 12%, which shows that the 12% used in the IRR calculation is conservative.

Besides, , according to an investigation report from Kushan Municipal Development and Reform Commission, the auxiliary consumption rate of the operational biomass power generation projects in China is 12%⁴⁸. Therefore, the auxiliary consumption rate for the project is reasonable.

⁴⁶ Log books of the in-house load facilities, referred by the purchase contracts, provided by the project owner

⁴⁷ Power Industrial Standards of People's republic of China, Technical Rule for Designing auxiliary power system of fossil fuel power plant issued in year 2002; Standard Code: DL/T 5153-2002

Calculation of the auxiliary rate spreadsheet

⁴⁸ Energetically facilitate the development of biomass power generation industry to actively explore new ways of ecological civilization-building, Kushan Municipal Development and Reform Commission.

<http://www.dpc.ks.gov.cn/xxnr.jsp?ID=884>

**Power tariff**

According to *Renewable Energy Electricity Tariff and Cost Management Trial Regulations (fagaijiage [2006] 7)* issued by NDRC of China in 2006, for biomass power plant, the tariff within the first 15 years since commissioning is calculated by 0.25RMB/KWh plus the benchmark for the on-grid tariff of coal-fired power plants with de-sulphurisation units installed in year 2005. After 15 years' operation, the tariff would be cancelled.

The tariff of 0.621RMB/KWh including VAT used in the investment analysis is consistent with the FSR which is approved by the government. This tariff used in the FSR was estimated by taking the basic tariff rate for de-sulphurisation coal fired generator units in year 2007&2006 in Anhui province and applying the subsidy of 0.25RMB/kwh for first 15 years. In year 2007&2006, the basic tariff rate for de-sulphurisation coal fired generator units is 0.371RMB/KWh including VAT in Anhui province⁴⁹. The tariff 0.371RMB/KWh including VAT is used after 15 years' operation.

The approved FSR of the project was finalized in November 2007. The FSR uses the most recent tariff for on-grid coal-fired power plants with de-sulphurisation units installed in Anhui province available at that time.

The tariff approved by the Pricing Bureau of Anhui Province for the project is 0.619RMB/KWh (0.369RMB/KWh as the basic tariff rate for de-sulphurisation coal fired generator units in year 2005 in Anhui province +0.250 RMB/KWh as the subsidy) for the first 15 years and without the 0.250RMB/KWh subsidy after the 15 years⁵⁰. This is the actual tariff obtained by the project, which is consistent with the regulation and lower than the one estimated in the FSR.

Thus, the tariff used in the investment analysis is conservative.

Heat price

The heat price in the FSR is 29.85 RMB/GJ excluding VAT, which is determined after a investigation of the heat demand, local market price of heat supply during the FSR period and a fully discussion with the Administration Bureau of Industrial Park by the FSR writing Institute and the project owner.

This price is the price at the generation site and does not include the pipeline cost and the transmission losses. The heat pipeline capital cost is borne by the local government.

In order to provide additional substantiation as to the heat price applied in the investment analysis, a levelized cost analysis for the independent small coal fired boiler heat generation has been done to illustrate whether or not it is feasible to purchase heat from the proposed project from the heat users' point of view. If the purchase price of heat is higher than the levelised cost of generation heat, the existing heat users will continue to run their own small coal-fired boilers to meet their heat demand.

⁴⁹ http://www.gov.cn/gzdt/2006-07/01/content_325201.htm

http://www.ndrc.gov.cn/zcfb/zcfbtz/2008tongzhi/t20080702_222226.htm

⁵⁰ The tariff approval of Tongcheng Kaidi Biomass Power Generation Project, Pricing Bureau of Anhui Province, WanJiaShangHan[2009]41, March 19th 2009



The levelised cost was calculated based on 6 t/h coal-fired boilers as these are common practice boilers for heat generation in China⁵¹. The key assumptions are described below.

i Capital cost

The capital cost of 665,000 RMB used in the levelised cost is an average capital cost of a 6t/h coal-fired boiler which is from publicly available reference⁵² and is therefore deemed reliable and credible.

ii Coal cost (Fuel cost)

- Coal consumption: 7,387 tonne/year

The coal consumption is calculated by considering the boiler efficiency, and heat value of purchased coal, heat generation, heat enthalpy of the rated steam from the boiler. This is taken from publicly available data which are listed in the table below. Therefore the input value is appropriate for the levelised cost calculation. The audit team has recalculated the coal consumption by using the same data input.

- Coal price: 550RMB/tonne was based on the published market price in 2009 and the reference can be seen in the table below.

iii. O&M cost (excluding fuel cost)

For a typical 6 t/h coal-fired boiler, annual O&M cost is 422,625RMB (excluding fuel cost) which includes desulfurization expenditure, electricity consumption cost, labor cost, overhaul, ash and sediments treatment fees etc. Each component of O&M cost was rated in terms of the relevant sector standard and published market rate. Each component of O&M was justified as below:

- Labor cost: 140,000 RMB
 - Employee number: 7 people
 - Salary: 20,000RMB/employee/year

- Overhaul cost: 2.5% of capital cost

The overhaul cost is calculated by 1.5% to 5% of fixed assets investment⁵³.

- Ash and sediments treatment fees: 50,000 RMB/year⁵⁴
- Desulfurization expenditure: 72,000 RMB/year⁵⁵
- Electricity cost: 140,000RMB/year⁵⁶

⁵¹ FANLing, CAO Qin, GUTao, YUQian, Comparison of Environmental Impact and Operation Cost of Mini Type Gas-fired Boiler(Oil-fired Boiler) with Coal-fired boilers,[J] Arid Environmental Monitoring, 2004(03)

⁵² FANLing, CAO Qin, GUTao, YUQian, Comparison of Environmental Impact and Operation Cost of Mini Type Gas-fired Boiler(Oil-fired Boiler) with Coal-fired boilers,[J] Arid Environmental Monitoring, 2004(03)

⁵³ Financial evaluation and difficult question analysis for FSR research and bank loan project, Chen Pucai, China Planning Publishing Company, 2007

⁵⁴ WU Xihuan. Inner Mongolia Oil and Chemistry, Investigation on retrofitting the coal-fired boiler to gas-fired boiler, 2008 (10)

⁵⁵ WU Xihuan. Inner Mongolia Oil and Chemistry, Investigation on retrofitting the coal-fired boiler to gas-fired boiler, 2008 (10)

⁵⁶ WU Xihuan. Inner Mongolia Oil and Chemistry, Investigation on retrofitting the coal-fired boiler to gas-fired boiler, 2008 (10)



The input parameters and reference were listed in the table below. Furthermore, the levelised cost spreadsheet was provided and the correctness of the calculations has been checked.

Table B-8 Input parameter for levelised cost and reference table

Parameter	Value	Unit	Reference
Construction period	1	year	Experienced data
Lifetime	25	years	“Introduction on the lifetime of the boilers” by the Senior Engineer Zhu yuqing from Central Southern China Electric Power Design Institute of China Power Engineering Consulting Group
Boiler efficiency	85%		AM0058, Page26
Capacity	6	t/h	Taking it as example for the calculation
Capital Cost	665,000	RMB	FANLing, CAO Qin, GUTao, YUQian, Comparison of Environmental Impact and Operation Cost of Mini Type Gas-fired Boiler(Oil-fired Boiler) with Coal-fired boilers,[J] Arid Environmental Monitoring, 2004(03);
Coal Price	550	RMB/tonne	http://news.stockstar.com/info/darticle.aspx?id=JL_20090707_00001411&columnid=2921
Heat Value of the Coal	5,500	Kcal/tonne	Ibid
Unit conversion from Kcal to KJ	4.182		
Operational Hour	8,000	hours	Information obtained from the owners of the existing mini type coal-fired boilers
Assumed enthalpy of the rated Steam from the boiler	3,009	KJ/kg	Same data from the biomass fired boiler in the proposed project
Discount Rate -(r)	0.08		Benchmark used in power industry
Labor Number	7		WU Xihuan. Inner Mongolia Oil and Chemistry, Investigation on retrofitting the coal-fired boiler to gas-fired boiler, 2008(10)
Salary of the labor	20,000	RMB/year	Information obtained from the owners of the existing mini type coal-fired boilers



Electricity Cost	144,000	RMB	WU Xihuan. Inner Mongolia Oil and Chemistry, Investigation on retrofitting the coal-fired boiler to gas-fired boiler, 2008(10)
Desulfurisation Cost	50,000	RMB	Ibid
Ash and sediments treatment fees	72,000	RMB	Ibid
Employee Cost	140,000	RMB	Calculated
Overhaul	16,625	RMB	Calculated using the experienced overhaul rate as 2.5% and cross checked with the Chinese standard of overhaul rate range ⁵⁷
Coal consumption	7,387	tonne	Calculated
Fuel Cost	4,062,993	RMB	Calculated
Total heat generation	144,427	GJ	Calculated
O&M Cost excluding the fuel cost	422,625	RMB	Calculated

The levelized cost of a coal fired boiler for the heat user to supply heat to themselves independently is 31.5RMB/GJ⁵⁸. This demonstrates that the heat price for the project activity of 29.85RMB/GJ is reasonable.

The heat price is confirmed by an official document which was issued by the Administration Bureau of Wuhe Economic Development District Mohekou industrial park on February 24th, 2010⁵⁹, the heat selling price for the Wuhe Kaidi biomass power project should not be higher than 30RMB/GJ (excluding VAT) in consideration of the consumer's procurement cost of heat.

Income Tax

The EB51 Annex 58 –Guidance on the assessment of investment analysis (Version 03) indicates that “ *In cases where a post-tax benchmark is applied the DOE shall ensure that actual interest payable is taken into account in the calculation of income tax. In such situations interest should be calculated according to the prevailing commercial interest rates in the region, preferably by assessing the cost of other debt recently acquired by the project developer and by applying a debt-equity ratio used by the project developer for investments taken in the previous three years.*”

⁵⁷ Financial evaluation and difficult question analysis for FSR research and bank loan project, Chen Pucal, China Planning Publishing Company, 2007

⁵⁸ Spreadsheet of the Levelized cost of a new coal fired boiler to supply heat to the heat users itself, provided to the auditor

⁵⁹ Clarifications on taking Wuhe Kaidi Biomass Power Generation Project as the district heating system in Mohekou Industrial Park, WuJingMoGongQu [2010] 01



The benchmark used for the proposed project is a post-tax benchmark. Therefore, according to the guidance mentioned above, the income tax after interest is used for IRR calculation for the proposed project.

The interest rate, pay back period and debt ratio are taken from the FSR and applied in the IRR calculation.

No ash revenue is predicted

✧ *The ash revenue is not considered in the financial analysis in the FSR*

According to the FSR, there is expected to be 18.9 thousand ton ash per year generated by the project.

According to the EIA report, the ash is considered as solid residues which will lead to field occupation and pollutions to the soil and air, thus needs to be treated or utilized.

Although the ash is considered as a solid residues generated from the project, it could be utilized as fertilizer for the local farmers to improve the soil condition because it contains nutrient elements as K and P elements.

However, considering that the fuels utilized in the project is a mixed of biomass residues, the effective component in the ash would be low and not homogenous in nature. The ash is also alkali which means it is only good for the acidic soil, thus the local farmers are not interested in purchasing the ash as fertilizer at all.

Therefore, the project is designed not to build storeroom (there will be a temporary space) for the ash but to ask some local fertilizer company to transport it outside of the power plant and deal it on its own expense with no transaction between the two parties. Through this, the field occupied in the project site by the ash is saved and the project owner will realize the utilization of the ash required by the EIA report.

Therefore, there is no revenue from ash for the project and there is no ash revenue in the IRR calculation in the FSR.

✧ *There is no market for the ash based on experience from other operational biomass power plants*

The experience from the already commissioned biomass projects which belong to the project owner's parent company shows that the ash is in fact a "cost" instead of a "revenue". Due to the EIA requirements as mentioned above, those projects have had to pay the local farmers to transport the ash outside of the power plant. The local farmers may bring it to the refuse dump or use it as additive to the construction material. Therefore, it is reasonable to predict that no revenue will be obtained from ash, but rather additional expenditure will be required.

However, to be conservative and to demonstrate that the ash revenue (if any) will not influence the additionality of the project, the ash price at which the revenues would bring the IRR over the benchmark has been calculated. The results show that the ash price should be higher than 355RMB/ton⁶⁰ to increase the IRR to 8%. Given that the market price for cement is only around 300RMB/ton in China at the time

⁶⁰ IRR spreadsheet, it is provided to the Auditor.



of investment decision of the project⁶¹, 355RMB for waste ash is not plausible and as such ash revenues cannot impact the additionality of this project.

2) Comparison of the project IRR and the financial benchmark

In the IRR calculation, the fixed input values were used by the project owner for the electricity tariff and O&M costs for the whole operation period. This is required by the national criteria. According to <Methods and Parameters> which is the national guidance for evaluation of new investments and is also the guidance for Design Institute to conduct the FSR⁶², the tariff rates for both output and input values should be predicted at the beginning of the operation period and that these predictable tariff rates will be fixed and applied throughout the operation period. This is due to the fact that the operation period is long and it is difficult to predict the inflation rate and the outcome of that rate⁶³.

Furthermore, the tariff rates at the beginning of the project for both electricity and O&M also represent the rates which project owner can obtain and ensure to use for the investment analysis at the time of decision-making in the project. Accordingly, the decision to go ahead with the project is based on the assumptions of fixed O&M and electricity tariff rates.

Moreover, the published sector benchmark is based on the assumption of application of fixed input value. Compared to such a benchmark, the same assumption in the IRR calculation should be applied.

As such fixed input values were applied by the project owner for the electricity tariff and O&M costs. These were applied in the calculation of the IRR over the whole operation period in FSR by the Design Institute. Accordingly, these fixed input values from FSR were applied in IRR calculation. Any change in the electricity tariff is uncertain and this is dealt with by analysis of the IRR in the sensitivity analysis, where the robustness and the likelihood of the project exceeding the benchmark is dealt with.

TableB-9 shows the project IRR with and without the income from CERs sale. Without the sales of CERs, the project IRR is 4.16% which is lower than the financial benchmark. Thus the proposed project is not financially acceptable. Taking into account the CDM revenues, the project IRR is 11.00% and higher than the financial benchmark. Therefore, the CDM revenues enable the project to overcome the investment barriers.

Table B-9 Comparison of IRR with and without the income from CERs sale

Item	Without CDM	Benchmark	With CDM
IRR	4.16%	8%	11.00%

Sub-step 2d. Sensitivity analysis

For the proposed project, six parameters were selected as sensitive factors to check out the financial attractiveness:

- 1) Static total investment
- 2) Equivalent operation hour at full load

⁶¹ <http://www.m188.com/newsinfo/2008-1-4/200814-1627355472.html>

⁶² P84 Method and Parameters (Version 3), published by the NDRC and the Ministry of Construction of China, 2006


⁶³ P84 Method and Parameters (Version 3)

- 3) Electricity tariff
- 4) Heat Price
- 5) Biomass Cost
- 6) Total O&M Cost

Assuming the above six factors vary in the range of -10% to 10%, the project IRR (without the income from CERs sales) varies to different extents as shown in Table B-10 and Figure B-4 below.

TableB-10 Sensitivity analysis of the proposed project

	-10%	-5%	0	5%	10%
Static total investment	5.63%	4.87%	4.16%	3.50%	2.88%
Equivalent Operational Hour	1.60%	2.93%	4.16%	5.14%	6.07%
Biomass Cost	6.85%	5.59%	4.16%	2.27%	-0.03%
Electriciy Tariff	0.47%	2.48%	4.16%	5.45%	6.62%
Heat Price	2.83%	3.52%	4.16%	4.69%	5.21%
Total O&M cost	7.60%	6.03%	4.16%	1.57%	-1.97%



FigureB-4 Sensitivity analysis of the proposed project

When the Static total investment, Equivalent Operational Hour at full load , Tariff, Heat Price ,Biomass Cost , Total O&M Cost are changing within the range of -10% to 10%, the IRR of the proposed project is always lower than the investment benchmark, and lacking of financial attractiveness. Nonetheless, the following text gives further discussion on the sensitivity of the input values.

Biomass Cost

It can be seen that the total O&M Cost is the most sensitive indicator. When it was decreased by 11%, the IRR would reach 8%. Of the total O&M Cost, biomass cost account for 76%, when the biomass cost



dropped by 15%, the IRR will reach 8%. However, it is not possible for the biomass cost to decrease, and certainly not by 15%. This is because the biomass purchase price is determined based on actual costs for collection, transportation, and pretreatment. From 2002 to 2006, the general pricing index of the Anhui Labor cost, the transportation cost, the fuel and power cost are listed as follows⁶⁴:

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Average Wages Index	117.5	113.8	122.2	118.6	117.1
Transportation Cost for Consumer Price Indices	100.5	99.8	102.7	102.5	104.4
Raw material, Fuel, Power Purchasing Index	98.2	106.7	115.0	107.1	103.9

This table clearly shows an upward trend over last five years. Therefore the biomass price is not likely to decrease.

Besides, the experience from the other early biomass projects in China shows that when the farmers realize the biomass residues could be a product, they would start to bargain fiercely and even when there is a surplus in supply it has been shown that the price will increase dramatically.

For example, the first biomass co-firing project in China, Shiliquan Biomass co-firing power plant, which was put into commission on December 2005 in Shandong Province, a biomass cost of 100RMB per tonne was assumed in the FSR. After commissioning, the price rose to 400RMB⁶⁵.

What is more, the purchase statements as well as the settlement log book shows that rice husks and maize straws were between 270RMB/t and 315RMB/t (delivered price to plant) in January 2010⁶⁶, which confirms that the increasing trend rather than decreasing trend of the biomass cost.

Power Tariff

When the power tariff is increased by 17%, the IRR reaches the benchmark. This is not possible because in China, the tariff is strictly regulated by the Chinese Government and it is established according to strict regulations rather than by a market mechanism. Also at no point in history has the tariff changed so dramatically⁶⁷. The tariff only changes when the costs of power production have increased sufficiently to justify an increase so as to limit inflation. The power tariff is therefore only increased by Government due to a rise in operation costs (such as coal price, labour, transportation and interest rates) of the power generators.

Additionally, according to *Renewable Energy Electricity Tariff and Cost Management Trial Regulations (fagaijiage [2006] 7)*, from year 2010, the subsidy for the newly approved biomass power projects in any given year will be reduced by 2% compared to the subsidy for the projects approved in the previous year. Therefore, there is very likely a decreasing trend on subsidy in the coming years for the biomass power projects in China.

Total Investment Cost

⁶⁴ <http://www.stats.gov.cn/tjsj/ndsj/>

⁶⁵ http://www.sdpc.gov.cn/zdxm/t20051229_55135.htm

⁶⁶ Statement Bills and log books of the fuel purchasing of Wuhe Kaidi biomass power generation project in from 21/1/2010 to 4/2/2010/

⁶⁷ <http://www.stats.gov.cn/tjsj/ndsj/>



When the static total investment was reduced by 23%, the IRR would reach the benchmark. However, this is not a possible situation, given that in year 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006 and 2007, the national pricing index of purchasing prices of raw materials, fuels and power are 104.8, 111.4, 108.3, 106, 104.4 respectively. Also in 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006 and 2007 the national total price index of investment in fixed assets are 102.2, 105.6, 101.6, 101.5, 103.9 respectively⁶⁸. There is clearly an increasing trend on investment costs.

Operational Hours

When the operational hours at full load was increased by 21%, reaching almost 7,274 hours, the IRR would reach the benchmark. However, based on the specific conditions of the proposed project, considering the technical risk of the domestic biomass fired boiler, the biomass transmission system risk, biomass characteristics risk and the real operation conditions from the similar biomass power plant that are in operation, which have been mentioned above, it is practically impossible to happen⁶⁹.

Heat Price

When the heat price was increased by 42% and reaching 42RMB/GJ (excluding VAT), the IRR would reach benchmark. This is not possible.

It is a fact that for most of the cogeneration plants in China, the heat selling price is regulated by the local government. Generally, the profit rate for selling heat cannot be greater than 5% of the cost of producing the heat⁷⁰. This is because heat is a basic service to people and Industrial and therefore the government of China regulates the price very closely to avoid inflation of the heat price which would be damaging to Chinese society.

In summary, the project would be lacking of financial attractiveness without CER revenues.

Outcome of Step 3:

Based on the Investment Analysis above, the proposed project is not financially attractive without consideration of CERs sales revenues. The Combined Scenario a) *the proposed project not undertaken as a CDM project activity* is not feasible thus is eliminated.

So, the baseline scenario combination of the proposed project is Combined Scenario b) (which belongs to Scenario 2 in the methodology).

Scenario	Power generation	Heat generation	Use of biomass residues
2	P4	H6	B1 or B3

STEP 4. Common practice analysis

Sub-step 4a. Analyze other activities similar to the proposed project activity

ECPG is selected as the relevant geographical boundary of the project activity, which covers Shanghai City, Jiangsu Province, Zhejiang Province, Anhui Province and Fujian Province and includes more than 10 biomass residues power plants that are implemented or underway.

⁶⁸ China Statistic Year Book, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008

⁶⁹ Introduction on the operational hour 's calculation and assumption for Kaidi Biomass Power projects

⁷⁰ <http://www.chinapower.com.cn/articleattachment/1000/art1029355.pdf>



In China, the investment environment for each region is different. Specifically in terms of available resources, labor costs and electricity tariffs, these can vary significantly in different parts of China, even different province of China. Please see the table below including some typical indicators in different province of China in 2006, which shows that there is significant difference among different regions in China. Therefore, it is not appropriate to consider activities in the whole of China and ECPG is selected as the appropriate geographical scope for the common practice analysis.

Power Grid	Province	Average Wage(Yuan/year) ⁷¹	Sales Price of electricity(RMB/MWh) ⁷²	Trasimission and Distribution Price(RMB/MWh) ⁷³	Water Prices (RMB/t) ⁷⁴
North China Power Grid	Beijing	40117	525.32	156.18	2.8
	Tianjin	28682	525.32	156.18	3.4
	Shanxi	18300	408.63	123.47	2.1
	Hebei	18469	440.92	95.28	2
	Shandong	19228	478.48	90.59	N/A
	Inner Mongolia	18469	352.61	97.68	1.95
East China Power Grid	Shanghai	41188	649.6	196.76	1.03
	Zhejiang	27820	569.28	111.52	N/A
	Jiangsu	23782	590.13	160.75	N/A
	Anhui	17949	503.37	126.54	N/A
	Fujian	19318	490.13	113.65	1.3
Center China Power Grid	Hubei	16048	516.75	154.25	N/A
	Henan	16981	429.24	82.7	1.6
	Hunan	17850	496.41	149.6	1.02
	Jiangxi	15590	506.82	126.29	N/A
	Sichuan	17852	465.76	147.08	1.35
	Chongqing	19215	507.04	173.8	2.1
Northwest Power Grid	Shaanxi	16918	420.74	123.8	N/A
	Gansu	17246	356.65	129.22	0.9
	Qinghai	22679	291.43	108.75	1.3
	Ningxia	21239	358.72	130.83	1.15
	Xinjiang	17819	417.13	193.58	1.36
Northeast Power Grid	Heilongjiang	16505	482.22	160.78	N/A
	Jinlin	16583	485.62	136.24	2.5
	Liaoning	19624	508.55	151.05	1.6
South Power	Guangdong	26186	681.9	180.93	N/A

⁷¹ <http://www.stats.gov.cn/tjsj/ndsj/2007/indexch.htm>

⁷² http://www.sdpc.gov.cn/zjgx/t20070716_148654.htm

⁷³ ibid

⁷⁴ <http://price.h2o-china.com>



Grid	Guangxi	18064	449.7	111.57	N/A
	Yunan	18711	392.33	140.36	2.05
	Guizhou	16815	377.29	95.01	1.32
	Tibet	31518	N/A	N/A	0.6
Hainan Power Grid	Hainan	15890	615.23	215.44	1.06
	Mean	21053	476.44	138.00	1.64
	Max	41188	681.90	215.44	3.40
	Min	15590	291.43	82.70	0.60
	STDEV	6570	89.82	33.37	0.69

The biomass combustion power generation Industrial in China is quite new. Until 2006, no grid-connected biomass combustion power generation or cogeneration project with similar installed capacity (15-100MW) as the proposed project has been developed in China⁷⁵ and the first similar biomass combustion generation power plant in China is the Shandong Shanxian Biomass Power Plant Project which was registered as CDM projects in year 2007⁷⁶.

Below are the similar and operational projects in the ECPG⁷⁷: This list represents the full list of projects operational at the time of the investment decision and may be considered to be complete since it has been obtained by the NDRC.

Table B-11 Similar Project Activity in operation

Project	Capacity	Comment
Zhongjieneng Suqian 2*12MW Biomass Direct Burning Power Plant Project	24MW	Registered as a CDM project ⁷⁸
Zhongjieneng Jurong 2*12MW Biomass Direct Burning Power Plant Project	24MW	Registered as a CDM project ⁷⁹
Biomass generation project, in Sheyang county, Jiangsu province, P.R. China	25MW	Registered as a CDM project ⁸⁰

⁷⁵ <http://energy.people.com.cn/GB/71890/5116814.html>

⁷⁶ <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/TUEV-SUED1175012571.81/view>

⁷⁷ Subsidies for Renewable Project commissioned between January and September 2007 issued by NDRC and SERC: <http://www.ccchina.gov.cn/WebSite/CCChina/UpFile/2008/2008121111144663.pdf>

Subsidies for Renewable Project commissioned between October 2007 and June 2008 issued by NDRC and SERC: <http://www.sdpc.gov.cn/jggl/zcfg/W020080407569102971887.pdf>

⁷⁸ <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/TUEV-SUED1166630587.15/view>

⁷⁹ <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/TUEV-SUED1166632076.5/view>

⁸⁰ <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/TUEV-SUED1190986543.01/view>



Straw-fired Power Generation Project in Chuzhou District, Huaian City, Jiangsu Province	33MW	Applying for CDM registration ⁸¹
Jiangsu Longyuan Donghai Biomass Power	24MW	Applying for CDM registration ⁸²
Baoying Xiexin Cogeneration Plant	15	Pursuing Carbon Revenue by VER registration ⁸³
Lianyungang Xiexin Cogeneration Plant	15	Pursuing Carbon Revenue by VER registration ⁸⁴

Below are the similar projects that are currently under construction, but not operational. These projects have been found through internet searches as well as checking the UNFCCC and China DNA website.

Table B-12 Similar Projects in ECPG under construction

Project	Capacity	Comment
Jiangsu Rudong Biomass Power Generation Project	25MW	Applying for CDM registration ⁸⁵
Jiangsu Lisen Biomass Power Project	20MW	Applying for CDM registration ⁸⁶
Jiangsu Nantong Sungreen Co., Ltd 2×15MW Biomass Power Generation Project	30MW	Applying for CDM registration ⁸⁷
Yancheng Fengji Biomass Cogeneration Project	30MW	Applying for CDM registration ⁸⁸
Zhejiang Longyou 18MW biomass cogeneration project	18MW	Applying for CDM registration ⁸⁹

⁸¹ <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/DNV-CUK1218633290.89/view>

⁸² <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/DNV-CUK1214576941.88/view>

⁸³ http://www.gcl-poly.com.hk/attachment/2009060319223917_en.pdf

http://www.gcl-poly.com.hk/s/ir_annouce.php

http://caihuanet.com/hkstock/gonggao/200906/t20090603_798533.shtml

⁸⁴ *ibid*

⁸⁵ <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/DNV-CUK1220516280.01/view>

⁸⁶ http://cdm.ccchina.gov.cn/website/CDM/pdf/Item_new/Item_new269.pdf

⁸⁷ http://cdm.ccchina.gov.cn/website/CDM/pdf/Item_new/Item_new3368.pdf

⁸⁸ http://cdm.ccchina.gov.cn/website/CDM/pdf/Item_new/Item_new1904.pdf

⁸⁹ http://cdm.ccchina.gov.cn/website/CDM/pdf/Item_new/Item_new2615.pdf



Anhui Anqing biomass power generation project	30MW	Applying for CDM registration ⁹⁰
Anhui Suzhou 2×12.5MW straw power generation project	25MW	Applying for CDM registration ⁹¹
Anhui Hanshan biomass power generation project	30MW	Applying for CDM registration ⁹²
Anhui Shucheng biomass power generation project	30MW	Applying for CDM registration ⁹³
Suqian Kaidi Biomass Co-generation Project	24MW	Applying for CDM registration ⁹⁴
Wangjiang Kaidi Biomass Power Project	24MW	Applying for CDM registration ⁹⁵
Wuhe Kaidi biomass power project	24MW	Applying for CDM registration ⁹⁶
Fujian Kaisheng biomass cogeneration project	24MW	Applying for CDM registration ⁹⁷
Jiangsu Guannan biomass cogeneration project	30MW	Applying for CDM registration ⁹⁸
Jiangsu Funing biomass cogeneration project	30MW	Applying for CDM registration ⁹⁹

Sub-step 4b. Discuss any similar options that accruing.

⁹⁰ <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/DNV-CUK1237358274.02/view>

⁹¹ http://cdm.ccchina.gov.cn/website/CDM/pdf/Item_new/Item_new2109.pdf

⁹² http://cdm.ccchina.gov.cn/website/CDM/pdf/Item_new/Item_new3546.pdf

⁹³ http://cdm.ccchina.gov.cn/web/item_new.asp

⁹⁴ <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/Validation/DB/JZP7ZODN40A80ZIPR06CCC8ATVSVW1/view.html>

⁹⁵ <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/Validation/DB/JZ58YKI9PB0HULLK2A6G5XPEX42DNC/view.html>

⁹⁶ <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/Validation/DB/GQ3N0CZV65YZWUQZSEQB999VV3FOKO/view.html>

⁹⁷ <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/Validation/DB/8OOKCARK08H0P57J6FUEIHOVM382UL/view.html>

⁹⁸ http://cdm.ccchina.gov.cn/website/CDM/pdf/Item_new/Item_new2483.pdf

⁹⁹ http://cdm.ccchina.gov.cn/website/CDM/pdf/Item_new/Item_new2481.pdf



Based on the above information, we can see that all operational and underway grid-connected biomass power projects (15-100MW) are applying for CDM or pursuing VER revenues in ECPG, therefore, the proposed project is not common practice and it is additional.

In conclusion, the proposed project activity passed all criteria of the “combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality”. The baseline scenario 2 in the methodology is the realistic and credible baseline scenario and the proposed project is additional.

B.5. Description of how the anthropogenic emissions of GHG by sources are reduced below those that would have occurred in the absence of the registered CDM project activity (assessment and demonstration of additionality):

>>

ACM0006 requires that the “Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality” is used. Therefore, please refer to the section above where the additionality has been determined.

The CDM consideration and decision making process is presented as follows:

The proposed project is one of the 12 projects that are developed by Wuhan Kaidi Investment Holding Ltd (the parent company of the project owner). In March 2007, the parent company commissioned Wuhan Kaidi Electric Engineering Limited to conduct a research on development prospect of biomass power plant. The focus of the research includes operation of existing biomass power plants, biomass material supply, construction condition, available technology, investment cost in seven provinces including Hunan, Hubei, Anhui, Jiangsu, Jiangxi, Sichuan, Guangxi, etc.¹⁰⁰.

Based on the findings of the research report, the board of the parent company proposed an initial plan to develop a batch of biomass power projects in 12 counties. The 12 projects were planned to develop by using exactly the same equipments and technology¹⁰¹. According to the board decision, the feasibility studies of the 12 projects were carried out in phases. In the phase I, the feasibility studies of three pilot projects, Jianli, Yueyang, and Yiyang Biomass power plants were carried out.

The results of the financial analysis from 3 pilot projects of the batch, Jianli, Yueyang, and Yiyang Biomass power plants (FSR date respectively: September 2007, June 2007 and August 2007) shows that the IRRs without CDM revenues of those projects (Jianli 3.03%, Yueyang 4.83%, Yiyang 5.28%)¹⁰² are all lower than the sector's benchmark. Given that 12 projects apply the same technology provided by the same supplier, this kind of projects is obviously not financially attractiveness without CDM finance or other supports.

Knowing that similar biomass projects are seeking CDM finance, the management board considered CDM could be also a finance channel to improve the financial position of the projects. The financial analysis showed that with CDM revenue included, those projects are financially feasible and carbon finance is strongly suggested in their FSRs. Therefore, the management board decided to develop the 12 projects in the batch all as CDM projects. Accordingly, the company signed the batch of equipments purchase

¹⁰⁰ A research report on the analysis to current situation of biomass power plants and development prospect, Wuhan Kaidi Electric Engineering Limited

¹⁰¹ Board meeting minutes, 5th April 2007

¹⁰² Jianli FSR, Yueyang FSR, Yiyang FSR



agreement with the same the supplier in order to reduce the procurement cost of equipments on 6th November 2007.

Based on the same assumption in investment analysis, the outcome of the project FSR also reconfirms that CDM revenue is necessary for the proposed project by showing that without CER revenue the project is not feasible and pointed out clearly to implement the project as CDM project can make the project financially attractive.

TableB-13 Timelines in Project Implementation and CDM application activities

Time	Project Implementation Activities	CDM Application Activities
March 2007	A research report on the analysis to current situation of biomass power plants and development prospect was conducted	
April 2007	The management board proposed to initiate development plan of 12 biomass power generation projects based on the findings of research report	
September 2007		Based on financial results of the internal similar projects included in the same batch in the developing plan of the holding company, the management board's decision was made and issued to undertake the proposed project as CDM project ¹⁰³
October 2007	EIA was finished	
November 2007	FSR was finished, which reconfirms that without CER revenue, the project is not feasible and pointed out clearly to implement the project as CDM project can make the project financially attractive ¹⁰⁴ .	
November 2007		Carbon Assets Development Agreement was signed with CAMCO ¹⁰⁵
November 2007	Turbine Purchase agreement signed for all the projects in the same batch including the proposed project ¹⁰⁶	Project Starting Date in the PDD
December 2007	Project was approved by DRC of Anhui Province	

¹⁰³ Boarding minutes

¹⁰⁴ FSR Volume 3 Page 7,-9

¹⁰⁵ Signature pages of the Carbon Assets Development Agreement

¹⁰⁶ Signature pages of the equipment purchase agreement



March 2008	Construction started	
December 2007- July 2008		PDD writing, Emission Reduction Purchase Agreement negotiating and DOE selecting
August 2008		Validation Contract was signed with DOE
September 2008		Application documents were submitted to NDRC
September 2008		PDD was published on UNFCCC website for Global stakeholder consultation
October 2008		Global stakeholder consultation finished, no comments were received
October 2008		Validation Site Visit
December 2008		CDM application is approved by NDRC of China

Based on the analysis in B.4 and the above description, the CDM was a serious consideration in the decision to proceed with the project and the proposed project is additional.

B.6. Emission reductions:

B.6.1. Explanation of methodological choices:

EMISSION REDUCTION

The Project reduces CO₂ emissions through substitution of power and heat generation with fossil fuels by energy generation with biomass residues. The emission reduction ER_y by the project during a given year y is the difference between the emission reductions through substitution of electricity generation with fossil fuels (ER_{electricity,y}), the emission reductions through substitution of heat generation with fossil fuels (ER_{heat,y}), project emissions (PE_y), emissions due to leakage (L_y) and, where this emission source is included in the project boundary and relevant, baseline emissions due to the natural decay or burning of anthropogenic sources of biomass residues (BE_{biomass,y}), as equation (1):

$$ER_y = ER_{heat,y} + ER_{electricity,y} + BE_{biomass,y} - PE_y - L_y \quad (1)$$

Where,

ER_y = Emissions reductions of the Project during the year y (tCO₂/yr)

ER_{heat,y} = Emission reductions due to displacement of heat during the year y (tCO₂/yr)

ER_{electricity,y} = Emission reductions due to displacement of electricity during the year y (tCO₂/yr)

BE_{biomass,y} = Baseline emissions due to natural decay or burning of anthropogenic source of biomass residues during the year y (tCO₂/yr)

PE_y = Project emissions during the year y (tCO₂/yr)



L_y = Leakage emissions during the year y (tCO_2/yr)

The baseline, project, and leakage emissions are calculated respectively as following:

A. PROJECT EMISSIONS

According the Table in B.3, the project emissions include:

- CO_2 emissions from transportation of biomass residues to the project site (PET_y),
- CO_2 emissions from on-site consumption of fossil fuels due to the project ($PEFF_y$),
- CO_2 emissions from consumption of electricity ($PE_{EC,y}$)
- Where this emission source is included in the project boundary and relevant: CH_4 emissions from the combustion of biomass residues ($PE_{biomass,CH_4,y}$)

Project emissions are calculated as follows:

$$PE_y = PET_y + PEFF_y + PE_{EC,y} + GWP_{CH_4} \times PE_{Biomass,CH_4,y} \quad (2)$$

Where,

PET_y = CO_2 emissions during the year y due to transportation of the biomass residues to the project site (tCO_2/yr)

$PEFF_y$ = CO_2 emissions during the year y due to fossil fuel consumption at the project site that is attributable to the project (tCO_2/yr)

$PE_{EC,y}$ = CO_2 emissions during the year y due to electricity consumption at the project site that is attributable to the project (tCO_2/yr)

GWP_{CH_4} = Global Warming Potential for methane valid for the relevant commitment period

$PE_{biomass,CH_4,y}$ = CH_4 emissions from the combustion of biomass residues during the year y (tCH_4/yr)

a) Carbon dioxide emissions from combustion of fossil fuels for transportation of biomass residues to the project plant (PET_y)

Because the biomass residues will be transported to the power plant around the project site by trucks, CO_2 emissions from vehicles should be determined. According to the methodology ACM0006, it could be calculated by the following formula based on the distance and vehicle type (option 1):

$$PET_y = N_y \times AVD_y \times EF_{km,CO_2,y} \quad (3)$$

Where,

PET_y = CO_2 emissions during year y due to transport of the biomass residues to the project plant (tCO_2/yr)

N_y = Number of truck trips during the year y

AVD_y = Average round trip distance (from and to) between the biomass residue fuel supply sites and the site of the Project plant during the year y (km)



$EF_{km,CO_2,y}$ = Average CO₂ emission factor for the trucks measured during the year y (tCO₂/km);

b) Carbon dioxide emissions from on-site consumption of fossil fuels (PEFF_y)

According to the Feasibility Study Report, the fossil fuels (diesel oil) are only used for boiler start-up, the emissions from combusting fossil fuels are calculated as “Tool to calculate project or leakage CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion” as following:

$$PEFF_y = PE_{FC,j,y} = \sum_i FC_{i,j,y} \times COEF_{i,y}$$

$$= \sum_i (FF_{projectplant,i,y} + FF_{projectsite,i,y}) \times COEF_{i,y} \quad (4)$$

Where,

$PE_{FC,j,y}$ = CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion in process j during the year y (tCO₂ / yr);

$FC_{i,j,y}$ = Quantity of fossil fuel type i combusted at the project site that are attributable to the project activity during the year y (mass or volume unit per year)

$FF_{projectplant,i,y}$ = Quantity of fossil fuel type i combusted in the biomass residue fired power plant during the year y (mass or volume unit per year)

$FF_{projectsite,i,y}$ = Quantity of fossil fuel type i combusted at the project site for other purposes that are attributable to the project activity during the year y (mass or volume unit per year)

$COEF_{i,y}$ = CO₂ emission coefficient of fuel type i in year y (tCO₂ / mass or volume unit);

i = fuel types combusted in process j during the year y.

The “Tool to calculate project or leakage CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion” provides two procedures to determine $COEF_{i,y}$.

Option A: The CO₂ emission coefficient $COEF_{i,y}$ is calculated based on the chemical composition of the fossil fuel type i, using the following approach:

If $FC_{i,j,y}$ is measured in a mass unit: $COEF_{i,y} = w_{C,i,y} \times 44 / 12$ (5)

If $FC_{i,j,y}$ is measured in a volume unit: $COEF_{i,y} = w_{C,i,y} \times \rho_{i,y} \times 44 / 12$ (6)

Where:

$COEF_{i,y}$ = Is the CO₂ emission coefficient of fuel type i (tCO₂/mass or volume unit);

$w_{C,i,y}$ = Is the weighted average mass fraction of carbon in fuel type i in year y (tC/mass unit of the fuel);

$\rho_{i,y}$ = Is the weighted average density of fuel type i in year y (mass unit/volume unit of the fuel)

i = Are the fuel types combusted in process j during the year y

Option B: The CO₂ emission coefficient $COEF_{i,y}$ is calculated based on net calorific value and CO₂ emission factor of the fuel type i, as follows:



$$COEF_{i,y} = NCV_{i,y} \times EF_{CO2,i,y} \quad (7)$$

Where,

$NCV_{i,y}$ = weighted average net calorific value of the fuel type i in year y (GJ/mass or volume unit);

$EF_{CO2,i,y}$ = weighted average CO₂ emission factor of fuel type i in year y (tCO₂/GJ);

Since there is no information of the carbon volume of the fuel provided by the fuel supplier in the invoices and it will cost the project owner a plenty of money to do the measurements by some laboratories having ISO17025 accreditation for each fuel delivery according to the methodology, which is not economically practical to such a small amount of uncontinuous consumption for the project owner, therefore, carbon volume of the fuel is not practically available and Option A is not chosen here and Option B is chosen for the project.

c) CO₂ emissions from electricity consumption ($PE_{EC,y}$)

CO₂ emissions from on-site electricity consumption ($PE_{EC,y}$) should be calculated using the latest approved version of the “Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption”. Little electricity will be consumed for the biomass residues mechanical treatment by the project plant. The emissions are calculated as Scenario A in Generic approach of the “Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption” as follows:

$$PE_{EC,y} = \sum_j EC_{PJ,j,y} \cdot EF_{EL,j,y} \cdot (1 + TDL_{j,y}) \quad (8)$$

Where,

$PE_{EC,y}$ = project emissions from electricity consumption in year y (tCO₂ / yr);

$EC_{PJ,j,y}$ = quantity of electricity consumed by the Project electricity consumption source j in year y (MWh);

$EF_{EL,j,y}$ = emission factor for electricity generation for source j in year y. (tCO₂/MWh)

$TDL_{j,y}$ = average technical transmission and distribution losses for providing electricity to source j in year y. The default value of 20% is used here.

j = source of electricity consumption in the Project.

In this case, refer to the description of project boundary; the only source of j is the ECPG

According to the “Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption”(Version 01), the proposed project belongs to Scenario A: Electricity consumption from the grid, so, we choose Option A1: Calculate the combined margin emission factor of the applicable electricity system, using the procedures in the latest approved version of the “Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system” ($EF_{EL,j/k/1,y} = EF_{grid,CM,y}$).

d) Methane emissions from Biomass residues combustion

Emissions from this source are calculated as follows:



$$PE_{Biomass,CH_4,y} = EF_{CH_4,BF} \cdot \sum_k BF_{k,y} \cdot NCV_k \quad (9)$$

where:

$PE_{biomass,CH_4,y}$: Project emissions from biomass controlled burning (tCH₄/yr)

$BF_{k,y}$: Quantity of biomass residue type k combusted in the project plant during the year y (ton of dry matter or litter)

NCV_k : Net calorific value of the biomass residue type k (GJ/ton of dry matter or GJ/liter)

$EF_{CH_4,BF}$: CH₄ emission factor for the combustion of biomass residues in the project plant (tCH₄/GJ)

This PDD calculates EF_{CH_4} using the following IPCC default data from Table4 and Table5 of the methodology. The biomass residues used in the proposed project are rice husk and straws which can be the best characterized as other solid biomass residues in line with relevant decisions by the Executive Board:

A	B	C	D	E
Waste type	Default emission factor(kg CH ₄ /TJ)	Assumed uncertainty	Conservativeness factor	Conservative EF,BxD(kg CH ₄ /TJ)
Other solid biomass residues	30	300%	1.37	41.1

Therefore, a conservative emission factor of 41.1 kg CH₄/TJ is obtained.

B. EMISSION REDUCTIONS DUE TO DISPLACEMENT OF ELECTRICITY

According to the methodology ACM0006, emission reductions due to the displacement of electricity are calculated by multiplying the net quantity of increased electricity generated with biomass residues as a result of the project activity (EG_y) with the CO₂ baseline emission factor for the electricity displaced due to the project ($EF_{electricity,y}$), as follows:

$$ER_{electricity,y} = EG_y \cdot EF_{electricity,y} \quad (10)$$

Where,

$ER_{electricity,y}$ = Emission reductions due to displacement of electricity during the year y (tCO₂/yr)

EG_y = Net quantity of increased electricity generation as a result of the Project (incremental to baseline generation) during the year y (MWh).

$EF_{electricity,y}$ = CO₂ emission factor for the electricity displaced due to the Project during the year y (tCO₂/MWh)

In this case, all the electricity displaced is from the ECPG.

STEP 1: Determination of $EF_{electricity,y}$

The Project has been identified as the scenario 2 of ACM0006, i.e. the baseline of the power generation is P4 – “The generation of power in the grid”, the emission factor for the displacement of electricity should correspond to the grid emission factor ($EF_{electricity,y} = EF_{grid,y}$). As the installed capacity of the Project is more than 15MW, the $EF_{grid,y}$ shall be determined as a combined margin (CM), following the guidance in the section “Baselines” in the “Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources” (ACM0002).



Referring to the relevant chapter of ACM0002, the combined margin (CM) should be calculated according to the “Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system” (hereafter referred to as the Emission Factor Tool).

Sub-step 1: Identify the relevant electricity systems

According to the latest guidelines issued on 30th, December 2008 by China’ DNA⁴, the geographical boundary of ECPG covers, Shanghai Power Grid, Anhui Power Grid, Jiangsu Power Grid, Zhejiang Power Grid, Fujian Power Grid. For the purpose of determining the operating margin emission factor, the methodology provides following four options to determine the CO₂ emission factor for net electricity import from the ECPG:

- (a) 0 tCO₂/MWh, or
- (b) The weighted average operating margin (OM) emission rate of the exporting grid; or
- (c) The simple operating margin emission rate of the exporting grid; or
- (d) The simple adjusted operating margin emission rate of the exporting grid.

For this project activity, we choose option (b) to calculate the OM emission rate of the ECPG.

Sub-step 2: Choose whether to include off-grid power plants in the project electricity system

Option I: Only grid power plants are included in the calculation.

Optional II: Both grid power plants and off-grid power plants are included in the calculation.

Option I corresponds to the procedure contained in earlier versions of the tool. Option II allows the inclusion of off-grid power generation in the grid emission factor.

According to Chinese administrative regulation for power plants, all power plants should be connected to power grid. The power grids undertake most of power supply. Therefore, only grid power plants are included in the calculation. Accordingly, Option I is applicable to the project activity.

Sub-step 3: Select an operating margin (OM) method

The calculation of the operating margin emission factor ($EF_{grid,OM,y}$) is based on one of the following methods:

- a) Simple OM
- b) Simple adjusted OM
- c) Dispatch data analysis OM
- d) Average OM

Option b needs the annual load duration curve of the grid. The data required by this method is not publicly available in China. This option is not applicable.

Option c requires the detailed operating and dispatch data of power plants within the grid, but the dispatch data for the East China Power Network is not publicly available. This option is not applicable.

Option d can be only used when low-cost/ must run resources account for more than 50% of the total amount of grid power generation. As shown in table A1 of annex 3, the ECPG is a coal-fired dominated



power grid, where the installed capacity of low cost and must run plants account for 11.79%, 10.96%, 9.77%, 11.94% and 11.44% in 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006 respectively. The fractions are all below 50%, so this option is not applicable.

Therefore the Simple OM is selected and the emission factor is calculated using the following data vintage:

Ex-ante option: A 3-year generation weighted average, based on the most recent data available at the time of submission of the CDM-PDD to the DOE for validation, without requirement to monitor and recalculate the emissions factor during the crediting period.

Sub-step 4: Calculate the operating margin emission factor according to selected method

The Simple Operating Margin emission factor $EF_{grid,OM,y}$ is defined as the generation-weighted average emissions per unit net electricity generation (tCO₂/MWh) of all generating sources serving the system, not including low-operating cost and must-run power plants. Two options can be selected to calculate the simple OM:

Option A: Based on the net electricity generation and a CO₂ emission factor of each power unit; or

Option B: Based on the total net electricity generation of all power plants serving the system and the fuel types and total fuel consumption of the project electricity system.

Option B can only be used if:

- (a) The necessary data for Option A is not available; and
- (b) Only nuclear and renewable power generation are considered as low-cost / must-run power sources and the quantity of electricity supplied to the grid by these sources is known; and
- (c) Off-grid power plants are not included in the calculation (i.e. if Option I has been chosen in Step 2).

For data of each power station and power unit is not public available in China, it can't adopt option A. Meanwhile, only nuclear and renewable power generation are considered as low-cost / must-run power sources and the quantity of electricity supplied to the grid by these sources is known from "China Electric Power Yearbook" and "China Energy Statistical Yearbook". Therefore, option B could be used to calculate OM emission factor.

The formula of $EF_{grid,OM,simple,y}$ is:

$$EF_{grid,OMsimple,y} = \frac{\sum_i FC_{i,y} \cdot NCV_{i,k} \times EF_{CO2,i,y}}{EG_y} \quad (11)$$

Where:

$EF_{grid,OMsimple,y}$ = Simple operating margin CO₂ emission factor in year y (tCO₂/MWh)

$FC_{i,y}$ = Amount of fossil fuel type i consumed in the project electricity system in year y (mass or volume unit),

$NCV_{i,y}$ = net calorific value (energy content) of fossil fuel type i in year y (TJ/mass or volume unit)

$EF_{CO2,i,y}$ = CO₂ emission factor of fossil fuel type i in year y (tCO₂/TJ)



EG_y = net electricity generated and delivered to the grid by all power sources serving the system, not including low-cost/must-run power plants/units, in year y (MWh)

i = All fossil fuel types combusted in power sources in the project electricity system in year y

y = Three most recent years for which data is available at the time of submission of the CDM-PDD to the DOE for validation (ex-ante option)

Based on calculation from the China DNA (see Annex 3), the OM Emission Factor of the East China Power Grid is 0.954 tCO₂e/MWh.

Sub-step 5: Identify the cohort of power units to be included in the build margin (BM)

According to the tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system, the sample group of power units m used to calculate the build margin could consist of either:

- (a) the set of five power plants that have been built most recently, or
- (b) the set of power capacity additions in the electricity system that comprise 20% of the system generation (in MWh) and that have been built most recently;

The tool also states that project participants should use the set of power units that comprises the larger annual generation. In this case option (b) is used.

In terms of the vintage of the data Option 1 is chosen: For the first crediting period, the build margin emission factor is calculated ex-ante based on the most recent information available on units already built for sample group m at the time of CDM-PDD submission to the DOE for validation. For the second crediting period, the build margin emission factor should be updated based on the most recent information available on units already built at the time of submission of the request for renewal of the crediting period to the DOE. For the third crediting period, the build margin emission factor calculated for the second crediting period should be used. This option does not require monitoring the emission factor during the crediting period.

Sub-step 6: Calculate the build margin emission factor

According to the tool, the build margin emission factor is the generation-weighted average emission factor (tCO₂/MWh) of all power units m during the most recent year y for which power generation data is available, calculated as follows:

$$EF_{grid, BM, y} = \frac{\sum_m EG_{m, y} \cdot EF_{EL, m, y}}{\sum_m EG_{m, y}} \quad (12)$$

Where:

$EF_{grid, BM, y}$ = Build margin CO₂ emission factor in year y (tCO₂/MWh)

$EG_{m, y}$ = Net quantity of electricity generated and delivered to the grid by power unit m in year y (MWh)

$EF_{EL, m, y}$ = CO₂ emission factor of power unit m in year y

m = Power units included in the build margin



y = Most recent historical years for which power generation data is available

Following guidance issued by the CDM Executive Board in response to a request for guidance from an accredited DOE on the determination of the Build Margin in methodology AM0005 in China¹⁰⁷, $EF_{BM,y}$ is calculated as the capacity weighted average emissions factor of new installed capacity rather than the generation weighted factor. Furthermore, it is suggested in the same guidance note that the efficiency level of the best technology commercially available in the provincial/regional or national grid of China is used as a conservative proxy for each fuel type in estimating the fuel consumption when calculating the Build Margin. The suggested approach is followed in the determination of the Build Margin for the purposes of this project.

Because capacities of technologies using coal, oil and gas cannot be separated from the total thermal power generation from available statistics, the following method is used for the calculation: first, use the recent one year available energy balance data and calculate percentages of CO₂ emissions of power generation using solid, liquid and gas fuel in the total CO₂ emission. Second, calculate grid thermal power emission factors, using the percentages (as weights) and emission factors of technologies corresponding to best available efficiencies. Lastly, the thermal power emission factor is multiplied by the percentage of thermal power in the newest 20% capacity in the grid, and the result is the Build Margin emission factor of the grid.

The steps and equations are as follows:

1. Calculate percentages of CO₂ emission of power generation using solid, liquid and gas fuel in total CO₂ emission.

$$\lambda_{Coal,y} = \frac{\sum_{i \in COAL,j} F_{i,j,y} \times NCV_{i,y} \times EF_{CO_2,i,j,y}}{\sum_{i,j} F_{i,j,y} \times NCV_{i,y} \times EF_{CO_2,i,j,y}} \quad (13)$$

$$\lambda_{Oil,y} = \frac{\sum_{i \in OIL,j} F_{i,j,y} \times NCV_{i,y} \times EF_{CO_2,i,j,y}}{\sum_{i,j} F_{i,j,y} \times NCV_{i,y} \times EF_{CO_2,i,j,y}} \quad (14)$$

$$\lambda_{Gas,y} = \frac{\sum_{i \in GAS,j} F_{i,j,y} \times NCV_{i,y} \times EF_{CO_2,i,j,y}}{\sum_{i,j} F_{i,j,y} \times NCV_{i,y} \times EF_{CO_2,i,j,y}} \quad (15)$$

Where,

$F_{i,j,y}$ = amount of fuel i (tce) consumed by power plants m in year y,

COAL, OIL and GAS refer to coal fuel, oil fuel and gas fuel in the subscript set.

¹⁰⁷http://cdm.unfccc.int/UserManagement/FileStorage/AM_CLAR_QEJWJEF3CFBP1OZAK6V5YXPQKK7WYJ

**2. Calculate thermal emission factor**

$$EF_{Thermal} = \lambda_{Coal} \times EF_{Coal,Adv} + \lambda_{Oil} \times EF_{Oil,Adv} + \lambda_{Gas} \times EF_{Gas,Adv} \quad (16)$$

Where,

$EF_{Coal,Adv}$, $EF_{Oil,Adv}$ and $EF_{Gas,Adv}$ are emission factors corresponding to commercially optimal efficient power generation technology using coal, oil and gas.

3. Calculate the BM of the Grid

$$EF_{Grid,BM,y} = \frac{CAP_{Thermal}}{CAP_{Total}} \times EF_{Thermal} \quad (17)$$

Where,

CAP_{Total} = newest 20% added total capacity,

$CAP_{Thermal}$ = newly added thermal power capacity.

The data used to calculate OM and BM emission factors are all publicly available. The generation data and average self consumption rate data are from publicly available China Electric Power Yearbooks. The data of fuel consumption per electricity generated and net calorific values of fuels are from the China Energy Statistical Yearbooks. The $OXID_i$ and $EF_{CO2,i}$ data by fuels are from the “2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories,” Volume 2 Energy.

According to the announcement “China's Regional Grid Baseline Emission Factors Renewed”, the weighted average of coal consumption per kWh supplied of 30 new built 600 MW sub critical units in 2006 is adopted to determine the emission factor of the best advanced coal fired generation technology, which is 329.94gce/kWh. In other words, the efficiency of best advanced coal fired generation technology is 37.28%.

The maximum electricity supplied efficiency of oil and gas fired generation plants are regarded as approximate estimation of commercially optimal efficiency technology. Similarly, the fuel consumption per kWh supplied of best advanced oil and gas fired generation technology is determined to be 252 gce/kWh, which means a generation efficiency of 48.81%.

According to the Chinese DNA⁴, the $EF_{Grid,BM,y}$ for the East China Power Grid is 0.8236 tCO₂e/MWh. For the data source and the calculations, please see Annex 3.

Sub-step 7: Calculate the combined margin emissions factor

The combined margin emissions factor is calculated as follows:

$$EF_y = w_{OM} \cdot EF_{Grid,OM,y} + w_{BM} \cdot EF_{Grid,BM,y} \quad (18)$$

Where,

$EF_{grid,OM,y}$ = Operating margin CO₂ emission factor in year y (tCO₂/MWh)



$EF_{grid,BM,y}$ = Build margin CO₂ emission factor in year y (tCO₂/MWh)

W_{OM} = Weighting of operating margin emissions factor (%)

W_{BM} = Weighting of build margin emissions factor (%)

The defaults weights are used, i.e. each of the Operating Margin and Build Margin is weighted equally.

$$w_{OM} = w_{BM} = 0.5$$

In this case, for the first crediting period:

$$EF_{grid,CM,y} = 0.5 \times EF_{grid,OM,y} + 0.5 \times EF_{grid,BM,y} = 0.8888 \text{ tCO}_2/\text{MWh}$$

STEP 2: Determination of EG_y

Where scenario 2 applies, EG_y corresponds to the net quantity of electricity generation in the Project plant ($EG_y = EG_{\text{project plant},y}$).

C. EMISSION REDUCTIONS OR INCREASES DUE TO DISPLACEMENT OF HEAT

The proposed project will not claim GHG emission reductions from displacing heat that would otherwise be produced within Mohekou Industrial Park.

$$ER_{\text{heat},y} = 0$$

(19)

D. BASELINE EMISSIONS DUE TO NATURAL DECAY OR UNCONTROLLED BURNING OF BIOMASS RESIDUES

$BE_{\text{biomass},y}$ is determined in 2 steps:

Step1: Determination of the quantity of biomass residues used as a result of the project activity

Step2: Estimation of methane emissions, consistent with the baseline scenario for the use of biomass residues

Step1 Determination of the quantity of biomass residues used as a result of the project activity ($EF_{PJ,k,y}$)

Where scenario 2 applies, the total quantity of biomass residues used in the project plant ($\sum BF_{k,y}$) is

attributable to the project activity and hence $EF_{PJ,k,y} = EF_{k,y}$, namely the quantity of biomass residues combusted in the project plant during the year y (tons of dry matter or litter)

Step 2 Estimation of methane emissions

As shown above, the baseline scenario is B1 and B3 (uncontrolled burning or aerobic decay of the biomass residues), therefore the emissions from avoided disposal of the biomass to be used by the project activity in year y can be calculated as shown below. This assumes that for both B1 and B3, that the biomass residues would be burned in an uncontrolled manner.

$$BE_{\text{biomass},y} = GWP_{CH4} \cdot \sum_k BF_{PJ,k,y} \cdot NCV_k \cdot EF_{\text{burning},CHA,k,y} \quad (20)$$



where:

$BE_{biomass,y}$: Baseline emissions due to natural decay or burning of anthropogenic sources of biomass residues during the year y (tCO₂e/yr)

GWP_{CH_4} : Global Warming Potential of methane valid for the commitment period (tCO₂e/tCH₄)

$BF_{PJ,k,y}$: Incremental quantity of biomass residue type k used as a result of the project activity in the project plant during the year y (tons of dry matter or litter), for this project, $BF_{PJ,k,y} = BF_{k,y}$

NCV_k : Net calorific value of the biomass residue type k (GJ/ton of dry matter or GJ/litter)

$EF_{burning,CH_4,k,y}$: CH₄ emission factor for uncontrolled burning of the biomass residue type k during the year y (tCH₄/GJ)

As lack of more accurate information, the IPCC value 0.0027tCH₄ per ton of biomass is used as default value for the product of NCV_k and $EF_{burning,CH_4,k,y}$ which is recommended by the baseline methodology.

Furthermore, the uncertainty can be deemed to be greater than 100%, resulting in a conservativeness factor of 0.73, according to Table 6 of the methodology. This conservativeness factor is then multiplied with the estimate for the CH₄ emission factor given above. Thus the emission factor of 0.001971t CH₄/t of biomass residue is used here.

E. LEAKAGE

Option L2 (ACM0006, Section Leakage) is used to demonstrate that there is an abundant surplus of straw in the region of the project activity, and then the leakage can be neglected.

L2: Demonstrate that there is an abundant surplus of the biomass residue in the region of the project activity which is not utilized. For this purpose, demonstrate that the quantity of available biomass residue of type k in the region is at least 25% larger than the quantity of biomass residues of type k that are utilized, including the project plant.

The geographical boundary in the biomass availability report is covering a radius of 60 km around the project site.

The biomass residue availability report was done by the FSR writing institute with support from the local authorities on the plantation area and crop yield. The values of each ratio grain to straw are official published experienced data. The values of each ratio grain to straw are official published experienced data. The Rice Husk amount is provided by local Agriculture Bureau. The loss rates for straws and rice husk are experienced data. The consumption amount for uses other than the project are done by survey on the local farmers and rice mill owners and confirmed by the local Agriculture Bureau.

Based on the feasibility study report and the biomass residue availability research report, currently, the biomass residues to be used in the proposed project are: Rice husk, Wheat straw, Rice straw, Maize straw, Cotton straw and their availabilities are summarized as follows:

Table B-14 Biomass availabilities¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁸ Note: The project owner had asked the reputational lab to test the NCV and Moisture of the sampled main straws (The formal testing outcome were provided to the auditor), like the rice straw, cotton straw, wheat straw,



Biomass type	Rice Husk	wheat straw	Rice Straw	Corn Straw	Cotton Straw
Total biomass generation in the region(10,000t)	19.20	44.26	30.57	9.02	0.43
Biomass loss (10,000t)	1.92	6.64	4.59	1.35	0.06
Available Biomass(10,000t)	17.28	37.62	25.98	7.67	0.37
Biomass Consumption other than the project (10,000t)	3.46	5.64	2.60	0.77	0.00
Biomass Consumption in the project plant(10,000t)	8.79	9.78			
Total used biomass Consumption (10,000t)	12.25	18.79			
Available Biomass/Total biomass Utilized - 100%	41%	281%			
Leakage? (if it is more than 25%, No; if not, Yes)	No	No			
The limit volume of each biomass residue type that the project owner is allowed to use to avoid leakage(kt)	10.37	24.45	18.19	5.37	0.29

Based the analysis above, we can find out that the quantity of available biomass residues in the defined geographical boundary are far larger than 25% the quantity of biomass residues utilized in the project. Thus the utilization of the biomass residues by the project plant is considered to have no influence on the current biomass usage, and therefore the leakage of proposed project is considered to be 0. The project owner will guarantee the consumption volume of each straw type not exceeding the limited volume mentioned in the above table to avoid leakage.

In conclusion, the Project does not result increase of fossil fuel consumptions, i.e. the leakage is zero ($L_y = 0 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$). The real situation of Leakage will be monitored once the project owner begins collecting biomass residues.

B.6.2. Data and parameters that are available at validation:

Data / Parameter:	<i>GWP_{CH4}</i>
Data unit:	tCO ₂ e/tCH ₄
Description:	Global warming potential for CH ₄
Source of data used:	IPCC 2006 Revised Guidelines
Value applied:	21 for the first commitment period. Shall be updated according to any future COP/MOP decisions.
Justification of the choice of data or description of measurement methods and procedures actually applied :	IPCC 2006 default value
Any comment:	-

maize straw which have been mentioned clearly in the FSR that will be used in the project activity as fuels. However, the FSR writing institute calculates the straws consumption amount as a whole in an ideal situation based on a NCV of 3000Kcal for the mixed straws. As there is no specific amount of each type of straw that would be consumed by the proposed project, therefore, the leakage analysis is based on the total amount of straws available, not each straw type. The consumption for each straw type will be monitored once the project owner begins collecting straws and the project owner will make sure that the consumption of each straw will not result in leakage.



Data / Parameter:	$FC_{i,y}$
Data unit:	t (m ³)
Description:	Consumed quantity of fuel <i>i</i> in year(s) <i>y</i> by power plants in ECPG
Source of data used:	China Energy Statistical Yearbooks
Value applied:	Refer to annex 3
Justification of the choice of data or description of measurement methods and procedures actually applied :	Detailed fuel consumption data of individual thermal power plants is not available to the public. The total consumption of various fuels is used instead.
Any comment:	-

Data / Parameter:	$COEF_i$
Data unit:	tCO ₂ /t(m ³)
Description:	CO ₂ emission coefficient of fuel <i>i</i> (tCO ₂ / mass or volume unit of the fuel)
Source of data used:	Calculated
Value applied:	Refer to annex 3
Justification of the choice of data or description of measurement methods and procedures actually applied :	Calculated according to the methodology
Any comment:	-

Data / Parameter:	$GEN_{i,y}$
Data unit:	MWh
Description:	$GEN_{j,y}$ is the electricity (MWh) delivered to the ECPG from power plant using fuel <i>i</i> in year(s) <i>y</i> (Excluding low cost/must run power plants)
Source of data used:	China Electric Power Yearbooks
Value applied:	Refer to annex 3
Justification of the choice of data or description of measurement methods and procedures actually applied :	Operation data of individual power plants is not available to the public. Summary data is adopted instead.
Any comment:	-

Data / Parameter:	$CAP_{i,y}$
Data unit:	MW
Description:	Installed capacity of power plants using fuel <i>i</i> in year(s) <i>y</i> in ECPG
Source of data used:	China Electric Power Yearbooks
Value applied:	Refer to annex 3
Justification of the	Operation data of individual power plants is not available to the public.



choice of data or description of measurement methods and procedures actually applied :	Summary data is adopted instead.
Any comment:	-

Data / Parameter:	NCV_i
Data unit:	TJ/t(m^3)
Description:	Net calorific value of fuel i
Source of data used:	China Energy Statistical Yearbooks
Value applied:	Refer to annex 3
Justification of the choice of data or description of measurement methods and procedures actually applied :	According to the requirement of methodology, country specific value is used.
Any comment:	-

Data / Parameter:	$OXID_i$
Data unit:	%
Description:	$OXID_i$ is the oxidation factor of the fuel i
Source of data used:	IPCC default value
Value applied:	Refer to annex 3
Justification of the choice of data or description of measurement methods and procedures actually applied :	According to the requirement of methodology, IPCC default value is adopted.
Any comment:	-

Data / Parameter:	Eff_i
Data unit:	%
Description:	Power generation efficiency of commercially applicable technology of fuel i in ECPG at present time
Source of data used:	China CDM DNA
Value applied:	Refer to annex 3
Justification of the choice of data or description of measurement methods and procedures actually applied :	According to the deviation method of EB, technology with maximum efficiency utilized can be the representative of such kind technology.
Any comment:	-

Data / Parameter:	$EF_{CO2,i}$
--------------------------	--------------



Data unit:	tCO ₂ /TJ
Description:	Carbon content of fuel used for power generation
Source of data used:	IPCC default value
Value applied:	Refer to annex 3
Justification of the choice of data or description of measurement methods and procedures actually applied :	According to the requirement of methodology, IPCC default value is adopted.
Any comment:	-

Data / Parameter:	TDL _{i,y}
Data unit:	%
Description:	average technical transmission and distribution losses for providing electricity to source j in year y.
Source of data used:	Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption
Value applied:	20
Justification of the choice of data or description of measurement methods and procedures actually applied :	Because the data is not available within host country, the default value (20%) can be adopted for project emission calculation according to the Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption. Since in China, the average TDL for the power sector during 2008-2006 has been estimated to be between 7%-9% only and it is expected to be decreased to about 6% by year 2020 ¹⁰⁹ , therefore, the value used here is conservative.
Any comment:	-

Data / Parameter:	EF_{CH₄,BF}
Data unit:	tCH ₄ /GJ
Description:	CH ₄ emission factor for controlled burning of the biomass residue in the project plant
Source of data used:	IPCC 2006 Default Value ; ACM0006
Value applied:	41.1 Where the default CH ₄ emission factor of 30kg/TJ is used, the uncertainty is estimated to be 300%, resulting in a conservativeness factor of 1.37. Thus, in this case the value of this parameter is: EF _{CH₄,BF} =30*1.37=41.1
Justification of the choice of data or description of measurement methods and procedures actually applied :	It is calculated using the conservative IPCC 2006 default values. The conservative factor is applied, as specified in the baseline methodology.

¹⁰⁹ <http://www.okokok.com.cn/Htmls/GenCharts/080314/7505.html>



applied :	
Any comment:	-

Data / Parameter:	$NCV_k * EF_{burning, CH_4, k, y}$
Data unit:	tCH ₄ /tonne
Description:	CH ₄ emission factor for uncontrolled burning of the biomass residue
Source of data used:	IPCC 2006 Default Value ; ACM0006
Value applied:	0.001971 Where the default CH ₄ emission factor of 0.0027 CH ₄ /t biomass is used, the uncertainty can be deemed to be greater than 100%, resulting in a conservativeness factor of 0.73. Thus this value is used according to ACM0006
Justification of the choice of data or description of measurement methods and procedures actually applied :	The conservative factor is applied, as specified in the baseline methodology
Any comment:	-

B.6.3 Ex-ante calculation of emission reductions:

Project emissions

a) Carbon dioxide emissions from combustion of fossil fuels for transportation of biomass residues to the project plant (PETy)

According to the Feasibility Study Report, the Project is designed to consume 87,900tons rice husk and 97,800 tons of straws annually which includes cotton straw, rice straw and oil rape straw annually. Wet quantity of the biomass is used to calculate **PETy**, which is conservative.

The farthest distance the trucks travel will not be more than 60km away from the project site, which is from the biomass collection plan. Therefore, the longest distance and the smallest loading capacity is chosen, namely: AVD_y is adopted as 120km (2 × 60)..

Since the direct measurement of diesel consumption per unit distance is costly and complicated ,the CO₂ emission factor for the trucks 0.001097 tCO_{2e}/km is used, which is IPCC default value from the for Moderate control US Heavy Duty Diesel Trucks and is conservative.

The conservativeness of the emission factor chosen is depicted as follows:

The trucks used in the project is expected to use light diesel with an average load of 3t, with the weight of the truck included, the weight of the fully loaded truck should be no more than 10t. It is stated that the average diesel consumption for trucks with load around 10t will be around 20 liter/100km in China¹¹⁰.

¹¹⁰ http://www.moc.gov.cn/zhuzhan/jiaotongxinwen/xinwenredian/200706xinwen/200709/t20070926_416413.html



Using the IPCC 2006 default NCV(0.043TJ/t) and EF(20.2 tc/tj) for diesel¹¹¹ and the diesel density of 0.85kg/liter¹¹², the CO₂ emission factor for trucks is just:

20liter/100km × 0.85kg/liter × 0.043tj/t × 20.2tc/tj × 44/12=0.00054 tCO₂e/km, which shows that 0.001097 tCO₂e/km used as the emission factor here is conservative.

Refer to the equation (3), the emissions from biomass residues transportation is calculated as follow:
 $PE_{Ty} = 185,700 \text{ t} / 3\text{t} \times 120\text{km} \times 0.001097\text{tCO}_2\text{e/km} = 8,149 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}.$

b) Carbon dioxide emissions from on-site consumption of fossil fuels (PEFF_y)

The on-site consumption of fossil fuels is from two sources. The first one is from the start-up diesel whose consumption is estimated as 25t per year. The second source is from the diesel consumption for forklifts at collections sites and project site whose consumption is estimated as 50t per year. There is no co-firing fossil fuels consumption in the project site.

Since the direct measurement of NCV of diesel is not economically practical to such a small amount of uncontinuous consumption and the reliable China Energy Statistical Yearbook is available and updated annually. Therefore, 0.042652 TJ/t is used as the NCV of diesel which is from China Energy Statistical Yearbook 2007.

Since the direct measurement of EF of diesel is not feasible and the reliable local or national data is not available, therefore, 74.1tCO₂e/TJ is used as the EF of diesel which is IPCC default value.

Therefore the PEFF_y is calculated as follow:

$$PEFF_y = (25+50)\text{t} \times 0.042652 \text{ TJ/t} \times 74.1\text{tCO}_2\text{e/TJ} = 237\text{tCO}_2\text{e}.$$

c) CO₂ emissions from electricity consumption (PEEC_y)

There will be some electricity consumption in the biomass residues pretreatment at the collection sites and at the project site and it is estimated as 1,857MWh conservatively (This electricity consumption only refers to electricity consumption for the biomass residues pretreatment and it is exclusively from the 12% auxiliary consumption of the project). EF_{EL-j,y}(=EF_{grid,CM,y}) is calculated in Annex 3 as 0.8888 tCO₂e/MWh, thus the CO₂ emissions from electricity consumption (PEEC_y) can be calculated as:

$$PEEC_y = 1,857\text{MWh} \times 0.8888\text{tCO}_2\text{e/MWh} \times (1+20\%) = 1,981\text{tCO}_2\text{e}$$

d) Methane emission from Biomass residues combustion(PE_{biomass,CH₄,y})

According to the Feasibility Study Report and the project owner, the quantity of rice husk consumed annually is 82,626t (dry weight), and the Net Calorific Value(NCV) is 0.012964TJ/t. The quantity of straws consumed annually is 79,805t (dry weight, the smallest moisture value of the straws is used, which is conservative). The NCVs of cotton straw, rice straw, wheat straw, maize straw are 0.014887, 0.011883, 0.014317, and 0.014239TJ/t respectively and the highest NCV (0.014887TJ/t) of the straws and the rice husk is conservatively used to calculate PE_{biomass,CH₄,y},

¹¹¹ 2006 IPCC guidance for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Chapter 1, Volume 2, Table 1.2 and 1.3

¹¹² <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Diesel>



The CH₄ emission factor for controlled burning of the biomass residue in the project plant, $EF_{CH_4,BF}=41.1\text{kgCH}_4/\text{TJ}$, which is calculated using the IPCC default values described in the methodology. So, $PE_{\text{biomass},CH_4,y} = (82,626+79,805) \times 0.014887\text{TJ/tonne} \times 41.1\text{kgCH}_4/\text{TJ}=99.38\text{tCH}_4$

Therefore, the project emissions are calculated as:

$$PE_y = PET_y + PEFF_y + PEEC_{y,y} + GWP_{CH_4} \times PE_{\text{biomass},CH_4,y} \\ = 8,149\text{tCO}_2\text{e} + 237\text{tCO}_2\text{e} + 1,981\text{tCO}_2\text{e} + 21 \times 99.38 = 12,453\text{tCO}_2\text{e}$$

Emission reductions due to displacement of electricity

Step 1: Determination of $EF_{\text{electricity},y}$

Based on the description in B.6.1 and detailed calculation in Annex 3, the $EF_{\text{electricity},y} = EF_{\text{grid},y} = 0.8888\text{tCO}_2\text{e/MWh}$.

Step 2: Determination of EG_y

According to the Feasibility Study Report, the delivered electricity is 126,720MWh per year, i.e. $EG_y = 126,720\text{MWh}$. Therefore:

$$ER_{\text{electricity},y} = 126,720\text{MWh} \times 0.8888\text{tCO}_2/\text{MWh} = 112,629\text{tCO}_2\text{e}$$

Emission reductions or increases due to displacement of heat

The proposed project will not claim GHG emission reductions from displacing heat that would otherwise be produced within Mohekou Industrial Park.

$$ER_{\text{heat},y} = 0$$

Uncontrolled burning or decay of biomass baseline emission

Step 1 Determination of the quantity of biomass residues used as a result of the project activity

The quantity of rice husk consumed annually in the proposed activity is 82,626t (dry weight) and the quantity of straw consumed annually in the proposed activity is 71,590t (dry weight, the biggest moisture value of the straws is used, which is conservative)).

Step2 Estimation of methane emissions

As lack of more accurate information, the emission factor 0.001971 tCH₄/tonne biomass residue is used in the PDD, which is suggested by the baseline methodology.

So, Baseline emissions due to natural decay or burning of anthropogenic sources of biomass residues during the year y,

$$BE_{\text{biomass},y} = GWP_{CH_4} \cdot \sum_k BF_{PJ,k,y} \cdot NCV_k \cdot EF_{\text{burning},CHA,k,y} \\ = 21\text{tCH}_4/\text{tCO}_2 \times (82,626+71,590) \times 0.001971\text{tCH}_4/\text{tonne} = 6,383\text{tCO}_2\text{e}$$

Leakage

Based on the description in B.6.1, the leakage of the Project is zero, i.e. $L_y = 0\text{tCO}_2\text{e}$

Emission Reductions

Refer to the equation (1), the emission reductions are calculated as:

$$ER_y = ER_{\text{heat},y} + ER_{\text{electricity},y} + BE_{\text{biomass},y} - PE_y - L_y = 106,559\text{tCO}_2\text{e}$$

**B.6.4 Summary of the ex-ante estimation of emission reductions:**

Year	Estimation of project activity emissions (tonnes of CO ₂ e)	Estimation of baseline emissions (tonnes of CO ₂ e)	Estimation of leakage (tonnes of CO ₂ e)	Estimation of overall emission reductions (tonnes of CO ₂ e)
2011	12,453	119,012	0	106,559
2012	12,453	119,012	0	106,559
2013	12,453	119,012	0	106,559
2014	12,453	119,012	0	106,559
2015	12,453	119,012	0	106,559
2016	12,453	119,012	0	106,559
2017	12,453	119,012	0	106,559
Total (tonnes of CO₂e)				745,911

B.7 Application of the monitoring methodology and description of the monitoring plan:**B.7.1 Data and parameters monitored:**

Data / Parameter:	BF _{k,v}
Data unit:	tons of dry matter
Description:	Quantity of each biomass residue type combusted in the project plant in year y.
Source of data to be used:	On-site measurements
Value of data applied for the purpose of calculating expected emission reductions in section B.5	Rice husk: 82,626t Straws: 71,590t when the biggest moisture is used 79,805t when the smallest moisture is used (the quantity of each of the straw will be monitored in operation)
Description of measurement methods and procedures to be applied:	Use weight meters. Adjust for the moisture content in order to determine the quantity of dry biomass. The quantity shall be crosschecked with the quantity of electricity and heat generated and any fuel purchase receipts. Monitoring frequency: Continuously, energy balance will be prepared annually.
QA/QC procedures to be applied:	The meter will undergo calibration/maintenance subject to appropriate industrial standards. Direct measurements at the plant site will be cross-checked with an annual energy balance that is based on purchased quantities and stock changes



Any comment:	-
--------------	---

Data / Parameter:	Moisture content of the biomass residues
Data unit:	% water content
Description:	Moisture content of the biomass residues
Source of data to be used:	On-site measurements
Value of data applied for the purpose of calculating expected emission reductions in section B.5	6 for rice husk 21.20 for cotton straw 18.40 for rice straw 26.80 for maize straw
Description of measurement methods and procedures to be applied:	The data will be sampled periodically and analyzed daily by the moisture analyzers in the laboratory of the plant. Monitoring frequency: Continuously sampled at fixed time period and analyzed daily, Mean values will be calculated at least annually.
QA/QC procedures to be applied:	The monitoring procedures in the laboratory of the plant will be done according to authoritative instructions or guidance
Any comment:	In case of dry biomass, monitoring of this parameter is not necessary.

Data / Parameter:	NCV_K
Data unit:	GJ/ton of dry matter
Description:	Net calorific value of each biomass residue of type
Source of data to be used:	Measurements
Value of data applied for the purpose of calculating expected emission reductions in section B.5	rice husk: 12.964 cotton straw: 14.887 rice straw: 11.883 maize straw: 14.240 wheat straw: 14.317
Description of measurement methods and procedures to be applied:	Measurements will be carried out at reputed laboratories and according to relevant international standards. NCV_K will be measured based on dry biomass. Monitoring frequency: At least every six months, taking at least three samples for each measurement
QA/QC procedures to be applied:	The consistency of the measurements will be checked by comparing the measurement results with measurements from previous years, relevant data sources. If the measurement results differ significantly from previous measurements or other relevant data sources, Additional measurements will be conducted.
Any comment:	-

Data / Parameter:	AVD_y
Data unit:	Km



CDM – Executive Board

page 73

Description:	Average round trip distance (from and to) between the biomass fuel supply sites and the project plant during the year y
Source of data to be used:	On site records maintained in the log books
Value of data applied for the purpose of calculating expected emission reductions in section B.5	120
Description of measurement methods and procedures to be applied:	The data is recorded in the log books based on the information given by the truck driver about the distance from biomass supply site to the project site. Monitoring frequency; Continuously
QA/QC procedures to be applied:	The data on distance of fuel supply site from the plant can be verified by cross checking data records on the distances available with Information from other sources (e.g. maps). If data is missing for a particular round trip, the following backup data apply in their order: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ The round trip distance between the farthest biomass fuel supply site and the project plant will be used. ♦ If the farthest biomass fuel supply site could not be verified, 200km would be used for conservativeness
Any comment:	-

Data / Parameter:	Ny
Data unit:	-
Description:	Number of truck trips for the transportation of biomass
Source of data to be used:	On site records maintained in the log books
Value of data applied for the purpose of calculating expected emission reductions in section B.5	61,900
Description of measurement methods and procedures to be applied:	Each time every truck which transports biomass residue to the plant will be counted and recorded in the log books. Monitoring frequency; Continuously
QA/QC procedures to be applied:	The consistency of the number of truck trips will be checked with the quantity of biomass combusted by the relation with previous years
Any comment:	-

Data / Parameter:	EF _{km,CO2}
Data unit:	tCO ₂ e/km
Description:	Average CO ₂ Emission Factor for transportation of biomass with trucks during year y
Source of data to be used:	IPCC default value



Value of data applied for the purpose of calculating expected emission reductions in section B.5	0.001097 Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (Table 1-32 on Page 1.75) of the Reference Manual (Estimated Emission Factors for US Heavy Duty Diesel Vehicles)
Description of measurement methods and procedures to be applied(if any):	Choose emission factors applicable for the truck types used from the literature in a conservative manner. The appropriateness of the data will be reviewed annually
QA/QC procedures to be applied:	-
Any comment:	-

Data / Parameter:	EF_{CO₂,i,y}
Data unit:	kgCO ₂ e/TJ
Description:	CO ₂ emission factor for fossil fuel type i (diesel)
Source of data to be used:	IPCC default value
Value of data applied for the purpose of calculating expected emission reductions in section B.5	74,100 IPCC 2006 default value (Volume2.Chapter2.P16) , diesel emission factor
Description of measurement methods and procedures to be applied,(if any):	The appropriateness of the data will be reviewed annually
QA/QC procedures to be applied:	-
Any comment:	The plant is designed to use diesel at this stage. Should any other fossil fuel be used during operation, the same monitoring procedures apply.

Data / Parameter:	NCV_i
TJ/tonne	TJ/tonne
Description:	Net Calorific Value(NCV _i) of fossil fuel type i(diesel)
Source of data to be used:	Reliable National Data
Value of data applied for the purpose of calculating expected emission reductions in section B.5	0.042652 China Energy Statistical Yearbook 2007,Diesel NCV
Description of measurement methods and procedures to be applied:	The appropriateness of the data will be reviewed annually
QA/QC procedures to be applied:	-



Any comment:	The plant is designed to use diesel at this stage. Should any other fossil fuel be used during operation, the same monitoring procedures apply.
--------------	---

Data / Parameter:	$FF_{project\ plant\ i, y}$
Data unit:	<i>Tonnes</i>
Description:	Quantity of fossil fuel type <i>i</i> (diesel) combusted in the project plant during year <i>y</i>
Source of data to be used:	On-site measurements
Value of data applied for the purpose of calculating expected emission reductions in section B.5	25
Description of measurement methods and procedures to be applied:	The consumption of diesel will be monitored using volume flow meters and recorded by the project participants. This will be converted to the mass of diesel consumed using the standard density of diesel (0.85 kg/litre). Monitoring frequency: Continuously
QA/QC procedures to be applied:	The meter will under go calibration/maintenance subject to appropriate industrial standards. The measurements will be cross-checked by the purchased quantities and stock changes if available.
Any comment:	This includes diesel used for start-up. The plant is designed to use diesel at this stage. Should any other fossil fuel be used during operation, the same monitoring procedures apply.

Data / Parameter:	$FF_{project\ site, i, y}$
Data unit:	<i>Tonnes</i>
Description:	Quantity of fossil fuel type <i>i</i> combusted in the project site(including the collection sites) for other purposes that are attributable to the project activity during year <i>y</i>
Source of data to be used:	On site consumption records maintained in the log books
Value of data applied for the purpose of calculating expected emission reductions in section B.5	50
Description of measurement methods and procedures to be applied:	The consumption of diesel will be monitored using Diesel purchase and consumption log book. Monitoring frequency: Continuously
QA/QC procedures to be applied:	The data will be cross checked by the purchase receipts.



Any comment:	This should not include fossil fuels co-fired in the project plant but any other fuel consumption at the project site (including the biomass collections sites) that is attributable to the project activity (e.g. for mechanical preparation of the biomass residues). If there is any fossil fuel used from shredders, forklift or other machines for the mechanical preparation of the biomass residues, it will be recorded. They are supposed to use diesel at this stage. Should any other fossil fuel be used during operation, the same monitoring procedures apply.
--------------	--

Data / Parameter:	EC_{PJ,y}
Data unit:	MWh
Description:	On-site electricity consumption (including the electricity consumption for the mechanical treatment of the biomass in the biomass collection sites and the project site) attributable to the project activity during the year y
Source of data to be used:	On-site measurements by meter or calculated conservatively as the weight of straws smashed in tons and the electricity consumption factor (kWh/ton)
Value of data applied for the purpose of calculating expected emission reductions in section B.5	It is estimated as 1,857 MWh .
Description of measurement methods and procedures to be applied:	<p>When the biomass residue is mechanically pretreated, the proposed project needs a certain amount of electricity from grid. This amount will be metered or calculated conservatively.</p> <p>If the monitoring data is missing, or it is not feasible to install a dedicated meter to monitor this indicator, it will be calculated conservatively as the weight of straws smashed in tons and the electricity consumption factor (kWh/ton). The electricity factor can be calculated as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Collecting all the nameplates power (in kW) and capacity(t/h) of every straw crackers 2) Calculating the electricity factor corresponding to each cracker in kWh/t 3) Using the largest number as a conservative electricity factor for the calculation <p>Monitoring frequency: Continuously ,aggregated at least annually</p>
QA/QC procedures to be applied:	Cross-check measurement results with invoices for purchased electricity if available
Any comment:	-

Data / Parameter:	EG_{project plant,y}
Data unit:	MWh
Description:	Net quantity of increased electricity generated in the project plant during the year y
Source of data to be	On-site measurements



CDM – Executive Board

page 77

used:	
Value of data applied for the purpose of calculating expected emission reductions in section B.5	126,720
Description of measurement methods and procedures to be applied:	Electricity supplied to the grid and purchased from the grid will be monitored by double way meters and the data will be cross-checked by the invoices and the power transaction note if available. The meters are 0.5 double-way meters. Monitoring frequency: Continuously
QA/QC procedures to be applied:	The consistency of the data will be cross-checked with receipts from electricity sales and invoices, if available; and the quantity of fuels fired to see whether the electricity generation divided by the quantity of fuels fired results in a reasonable efficiency.
Any comment:	-

Data / Parameter:	-
Data unit:	Tons
Description:	Quantity of each biomass residues type that are utilized in the defined geographical region
Source of data to be used:	Surveys or Statistics
Value of data applied for the purpose of calculating expected emission reductions in section B.5	k=rice husk: 122,500 t k=straws: 187,900t
Description of measurement methods and procedures to be applied:	Surveys or statistics from local agricultural bureau or other official public resource. If they are not available, the project owner will ask specialized institute or consulting company to do the biomass availability research. Monitoring frequency: Annually
QA/QC procedures to be applied:	This parameter will be reviewed annually according to the project data and official data.
Any comment:	This parameter is applicable since approach L ₂ is utilized to rule out leakage.

Data / Parameter:	-
Data unit:	Tons
Description:	Quantity of each biomass residues type that are available in the region
Source of data to be	Surveys or statistics



used:	
Value of data applied for the purpose of calculating expected emission reductions in section B.5	rice husk: 172,800 t straws: 716,400t
Description of measurement methods and procedures to be applied:	Surveys or statistics from local agricultural bureau or other official public resource. If they are not available, the project owner will ask specialized institute or consulting company to do biomass availability research Monitoring frequency: annually
QA/QC procedures to be applied:	
Any comment:	This parameter is applicable since approach L ₂ is utilized to rule out leakage.

B.7.2 Description of the monitoring plan:

This monitoring plan is to serve as a guideline for the project owner to monitor the emission reduction of the proposed project. The contents of the Monitoring Plan are highlighted as follows:

1. The CDM monitoring management

There is a CDM team underway for the proposed project comprising of personnel picked from the power plant who will perform the dual functions of power plant O&M and compliance with the CDM procedures to monitor the project emission reductions and any leakage effects to make sure that the project is in compliance with the CDM monitoring and verification requirements.

The plant manager will be in charge of approving the monitoring report, appointing the CDM manager and the relevant monitoring team members and responsible for the monitoring outcome.

The CDM manager will be responsible for liaising with DOE and the buyers, organizing the relevant training, reviewing all the documents related to the monitoring of the project, correcting any errors in time and acting as the quality supervisor of the monitoring process.

The Operating Manager will be responsible for the monitoring associated with operation of the plant, the net electricity generation, the start-up diesel consumption and the dry biomass combusted. In addition, the Operating Manager will supervise meter maintenance and manage the calibration process.

The Biomass Collecting Manager will be responsible for the monitoring associated with biomass collection, the transportation emissions, the mechanical biomass pretreatment emissions and assisting the annual leakage analysis.

The Financing & Data filing Manager will prepare the available original invoices or receipts associated with the whole monitoring process. Besides, the Financing & Data filing Manager will collect the relevant data from the Operating Manager and the Biomass Collecting Manager summarize the data, file the data and submit reports to the CDM manager in time.




Figure B-3 The CDM monitoring management

2. Monitoring System Design

2.1 Net electricity generation

There will be gate way meters installed on the project site monitoring the electricity supplied to the grid and purchased from the grid. There will be back up meters installed at the project site monitoring the electricity supplied to the grid and purchased from the grid too.

The data of electricity supplied to the grid and purchased from the grid will be measured and cross-checked by the invoices and the power transaction note if available.

The accuracy of all the meters will not be lower than 0.5%.

2.2 Biomass residues consumption

The amount of biomass residues combusted in the boiler will be monitored by the belt weigher. The moisture of the biomass residues combusted will also be monitored by sampled continuously at fixed time period and analyzed daily. An energy balance will be recorded monthly to assist verifying the biomass combusted. The accuracy of the belt weigher will not be lower than 1%.

2.3 Fossil Fuel Consumption in the power plant

For fossil fuel used for starting up, flow meters will be equipped in the supply and return pipe to monitor the quantity of diesel consumption. The accuracy of the flow meters will not be lower than 1%.

If there is any fossil fuel used for the shredders, forklifts or any other machines for the mechanical biomass pretreatment in the project site (including the biomass collection sites) will be monitored by the diesel purchase and consumption log book.

The purchase receipt will be used for cross-check. If there is any data missing or significant error exists, the entire quantity of fossil fuel purchased in a particular monitoring period would be considered as combusted in the power plant for conservativeness.



2.4 Transportation of Biomass residues

The project developer of the proposed project will structure a recording and monitoring system within the biomass residues supply and management system covering all the biomass collection sites established by the proposed project. Each time each truck transporting the biomass into the project site will be counted and recorded in the log book. The transportation distance to the collection sites will be recorded by company staffs at the sites and the data will be recorded in the log books. The data on distance of fuel supply site from the plant can be verified by cross checking data records on the distances available with information from other sources (e.g. maps).

If data is missing for a particular round trip, the following backup data apply in their order:

- The round trip distance between the farthest biomass fuel supply site and the project plant will be used.
- If the farthest biomass fuel supply site could not be verified, 200km would be used for conservativeness

2.5 Electricity consumed on site

When the biomass residue is mechanically pretreated, the proposed project needs a certain amount of electricity from grid. This amount will be metered or calculated conservatively.

If the monitoring data is missing, or it is not feasible to install a dedicated meter to monitor this indicator, it will be calculated conservatively as the weight of straws smashed in tons and the electricity consumption factor (kWh/ton). The electricity factor can be calculated as follows:

- 1) Collecting all the nameplates power (in kW) and capacity(t/h) of every straw crackers
- 2) Calculating the electricity factor corresponding to each cracker in kWh/t
- 3) Using the largest number as a conservative electricity factor for the calculation

If a dedicated meter is installed to monitor this indicator, the accuracy of the meter will not be lower than 0.5%.

2.6 Leakage

The project consumption and availabilities in the defined geographical area of each type of biomass residue not only the biomass types mentioned above but also other biomass residues utilized in the project will be monitored to check the leakage effect brought by the operation of the proposed project. This will be obtained from surveys or statistics from local agricultural bureau or other official public resource. If they are not available, the project owner will ask specialized institute or consulting company to do biomass availability research.

3. Calibration & Maintenance procedures

The meters or monitoring equipment installed in the monitoring system will be calibrated by a certified Party in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations and National Regulations for ensuring reliability of the system. Calibrations shall be evidenced with certificates of calibration for the relevant meter(s) issued by a qualified body. A calibration and error log will be maintained to provide transparency and sound management. The calibration frequency is once a year.

4. Training, Record Keeping, Error or emergency handling and Reporting Procedures

4.1 Training



Members of staff who are involved in the CDM project will be given training on the CDM and reporting requirements, prior to registration of the project. New members of staff joining the CDM project team will also be given training in relation to their responsibilities. Full training procedures and a training plan will be detailed in the CDM Manual.

4.2 Record Keeping and Internal Reporting Procedure

The data associated with the emission reduction will be kept for at least 2 years after the end of the crediting period or the last issuance of CERs, whichever occurs later.

4.3 Error Handling Procedure

In the event that a meter has lost calibration over the allowable error limit then this shall be corrected at the earliest opportunity and re-calibrated and the data recorded from this meter since the last successful calibration shall be ignored.

The check of the CDM Project manager and then the third party verifier prior to issuance of the CERs is considered adequate for errors in the calculations. Where errors in the calculations are discovered by either of these Parties, the monitoring report shall be modified and the corrected version shall be resubmitted to the verifier.

4.4 External Reporting Procedure

After signing by the CDM manager, the report is sent to the third party verifier who is contracted to verify the emissions reductions during the crediting period of the project.

4.5 Procedure for corrective actions arising

The CDM Project Director is responsible for identifying corrective actions arising from the above procedures and for liaising with the purchaser, the third party verifiers and other stakeholders to take necessary steps to implement the corrective actions.

4.6 Emergency procedures

In the unlikely event of an emergency, set procedures will be followed. Details of the procedures to be followed are described in the relevant Operation Manuals. The key points include:

- The Distributed Control System (DCS) will automatically shut off the boilers upon detecting an emergency.
- The operators can also remotely shut off the boilers if they find an emergency situation has occurred.

B.8. Date of completion of the application of the baseline study and monitoring methodology and the name of the responsible person(s)/entity(ies)
--

>>

Date of completion: 27/08/2008

Name of persons determining the baseline study and monitoring methodology:

Contact Information of the responsible person	Is organisation a Project Participant Yes/No
---	--



CDM – Executive Board

page 82

SUN Li GONG Jing LIU Yanan Camco International Limited Floor 14, Lucky Tower A, No. 3 North Road, East 3rd Ring Road, Chaoyang District, Beijing, China 100027 Tel: (86 10) 8448 1623 Fax: (86 10) 8448 2432 email: lilian.sun@camcoglobal.com.cn kerry.gong@camcoglobal.com.cn melody.liu@camcoglobal.com.cn Website: www.camcoglobal.com.cn	Yes

**SECTION C. Duration of the project activity / Crediting period****C.1. Duration of the project activity:****C.1.1. Starting date of the project activity:**

>>

06/11/2007 (Key Equipment Purchase Contract Signed Date, the construction start date is 10/03/2008)

C.1.2. Expected operational lifetime of the project activity:

>>

20 years

C.2. Choice of the crediting period and related information:**C.2.1. Renewable crediting period****C.2.1.1. Starting date of the first crediting period:**

>>

01/01/2011 or the date of registration which ever comes late

C.2.1.2. Length of the first crediting period:

>>

7 years

C.2.2. Fixed crediting period:**C.2.2.1. Starting date:**

>>

Not applicable

C.2.2.2. Length:

>>

Not applicable

**SECTION D. Environmental impacts**

>>

D.1. Documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts, including transboundary impacts:

>>

The EIA of the proposed project was completed by Anhui Science & Technology consultancy center and approved by Anhui Environmental Protection bureau. The summary of this evaluation is as following:

1. Air

In the construction period, the waste gas resource is mainly from, such as the road dust during the transporting process, automobile emission, emissions from excavator and bulldozer, and so on. Some measures will be taken to reduce these negative effects: sprinkling to repress the dust, keep the ground humidity, and clear the soil daggered out in time.

After the project being implemented, there will be waste gas from the boiler. Then, the boiler waste gas will be treated by the bag filter. Furthermore, the waste gas will be out though the high chimney (100m height, 3m internal diameter) to reduce the air pollution by the air diffusion and self-clean ability.

2. Waste Water

During construction, the waste water is mainly from: rainwater, wash water from all kinds of machinery and automobiles, and domestic wastewater. The wash water mainly contains the suspended sediment, and it will be collected by a simple drain, filter by grid, and then recovery and utilization after sedimentation. The domestic wastewater will be transmitted by engineer sewage pipe network to the domestic sewage integration treatment equipment for treating.

When the project is operated, all kinds of waste water will be treated separately and reused after reach discharge standard: (1) [acid-alkali wastewater](#) will be neutralized and then reused as industrial water; (2) Oily wastewater will be separated the oil and water by the oil-water separator and then reused as industrial water; (3) Waste water from boiler and other clean system will be regulated PH, and then flocculated, clarified and then reused as industrial water; (4) The domestic waster water will be treated by contact oxidation process and then transmit into the industrial park sewage pipe network.

3. Noise

During construction, the project noise is mainly from: fixed and successive drilling, construction machinery noise, and fluid traffic noise. The noise in the east\west\south\north of the proposed project boundary in the day or night all meets the 3rd standard requirements of <Noise standard of industrial plant boundary>. In additional, there is no resident in the scope of 200m away from the project site, so the noise impact is ignorable.

When the project is operated, the noise source is mainly from machinery noise and gas dynamic noise from the exhaust pipe. The noise control measures include: choosing the equipments with high efficiency and little noise, taking vibration reduction measures when fixing equipments, taking sound proof measures to the noisy equipments, to control the noise in the standard range.

4. Solid Waste

The solid waste produced in the construction period is mainly the construction residues and the domestic



waste from workers. The construction residues will be backfilled the site, and the domestic waste will be collected and sent to local environmental protection department for treatment.

During project operation, the solid waste is mainly: boiler ash residues, domestic waste, which are all common solid waste. The ash residues will be separated from the boiler by a clear system, and then transported to Fertilizer Plant for producing compound fertilizer. The domestic waste produce by this project is not so much and will be collected by the local environmental protection department for land filling.

5. Conclusion

After the above measurements performed, the negative impacts on environments will be minimized below the requirements of laws and regulations during the construction and implementation. Furthermore, as renewable power project, the proposed project can reduce the consumption of fossil fuel sources and GHG emission.

D.2. If environmental impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the host Party, please provide conclusions and all references to support documentation of an environmental impact assessment undertaken in accordance with the procedures as required by the host Party:

>>

According to EIA, no significant environmental impacts are discovered by the project participants or the host party. Anhui Environmental Protection Bureau has approved the EIA in Nov., 5th, 2007.

**SECTION E. Stakeholders' comments**

>>

E.1. Brief description how comments by local stakeholders have been invited and compiled:

There are two ways to invite the local stakeholders to give comments on the projects:

(1) By websites and posters

A summary of the project's introduction, EIA, questionnaires, contact information of the project was published on the website of the People's Government of Wuhe County and the main roads near the project site to invite the local stakeholder to give comments on the project during the EIA report compiling period. http://www.wuhe.gov.cn/xwzx/news_view.php?id=681

(2) By questionnaires

The project owner carried out the investigation stakeholders in Questionnaire. Questionnaire was implemented by filling the stakeholder comments investigation form. 100 copies questionnaires were distributed to the farmer and local residents near the project site. All of the questionnaires are filled and collected.

In Jul., 2007, the project owner carried out the stakeholder comments investigation together with EIA organization in the neighbouring area. The interviewees include the farmer, worker, official and other different occupation persons covering different age levels. Questionnaire was implemented by filling the stakeholder comments investigation form. 100 copies questionnaires were distributed and all of them were collected.

The basic information about the interviewee is described as following table:

Table E-1 Interviewee Statistics

	Number of interviewee	Age				Education			Occupation				
		< 20	20-30	30-50	> 50	Primary school	Middle school	College	official	Students	farmer	worker	other
Number of People	100	5	13	64	18	49	29	22	16	6	56	18	4
Percentage (%)	100.0	5	13	64	18	49	29	22	16	6	56	18	4

The relevant questions in the questionnaire are:

Would you consider the project important?

Do you agree with the construction of the project?

What is the environmental problem associated with the project that you are most concerned about?

What is the effect of the project on local ecologic environment?

Are you satisfied with the methods proposed to alleviate the environment impacts?

Do you think the project will improve the local economy?

Do you think the project will improve local employment opportunities?

**E.2. Summary of the comments received:**

>>

Among them, 97% interviewees think the proposed project is very important, and 3% think it's important. All of the interviewees agree with the construction of the proposed project.

For the most concerned environmental problem, 3% of them think it's noisy pollution and 97% think there is no significant influence on the environment. 48% think the proposed project can improve the local ecological environment and 52% think it has no impacts on the ecological environment. 96% of the interviewees are satisfied with the methods proposed to alleviate the environment impacts and 4% have no idea about it.

97% think the proposed project can promote local economic development, and 3% think it have no significant impact. 95% of them think the proposed project can supply more employment opportunities, 3% think it can not and 2% have no idea.

The outcome of the survey indicated that it is generally believed that the construction of the project will contribute to the local environment and to the development of local enterprises and improve the local employment situation. The participants said that they wish the project could be put into operation as soon as possible. By participating the meeting, all the participants had a better understanding of both the project and the CDM, and expressed their full support for the development of the project.

E.3. Report on how due account was taken of any comments received:

>>

The residents and local government are all very supportive to the proposed project. No negative comments have been received on the project. However, there are few persons who express some concerns about noise. The project owner will take following measures to reduce the impacts: choosing the equipments with high efficiency and little noise, taking vibration reduction measures when fixing equipments, taking sound proof measures to the noisy equipments, to control the noise in the standard range.

Furthermore, the project owner also make a decision to further the project publication together with local government to eliminates that public concerns. And, the project owner will make best use of the CDM and facilitate the project construction. In the future project operation period, the project owner will keep good contact with the local stakeholders, and invite them to supervise their actions for environmental protection.

**Annex 1****CONTACT INFORMATION ON PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROJECT ACTIVITY**

Organization:	Wuhe Kaidi Green Energy Development Co., Ltd.
Street/P.O.Box:	T1 Jiangxia Avenue, Eastlake Newtech Development Zone
Building:	Kaidi Building
City:	Wuhan
State/Region:	Hubei Province
Postfix/ZIP:	433300
Country:	P.R. China.
Telephone:	+86-27-87992876
FAX:	+86-27-87992893
E-Mail:	Cdm_kaidi@yahoo.cn
URL:	
Represented by:	(Primary Signatory)
Title:	Ms.
Salutation:	
Last Name:	Hao
Middle Name:	
First Name:	Jing
Department:	
Mobile:	
Direct FAX:	+86-27-87992893
Direct tel:	+86-27-87992876
Personal E-Mail:	Cdm_kaidi@yahoo.cn
Represented by:	(Secondary Signatory)
Title:	Ms
Salutation:	
Last Name:	Li
Middle Name:	
First Name:	Jiawei
Department:	
Mobile:	
Direct FAX:	+86-27-67869283
Direct tel:	+86-27-67869280
Personal E-Mail:	Ellenleigh8work@126.com

Organization:	Camco International Limited
Street/P.O.Box:	Green Street
Building:	Channel House
City:	St Helier
State/Region:	Jersey
Postfix/ZIP:	JE2 4UH
Country:	Channel Islands
Telephone:	+44 (0)1534 834 618
FAX:	+44 (0)1534 834 601



CDM – Executive Board

page 89

E-Mail:	
URL:	www.camcoglobal.com
Represented by:	(Primary Signatory)
Title:	Mrs
Salutation:	Qualification Director
Last Name:	Rawlins
Middle Name:	
First Name:	Madeleine
Department:	
Mobile:	
Direct FAX:	+86 10 8448 2432
Direct tel:	+86 10 8448 1623
Personal E-Mail:	Project.participant.cn@camcoglobal.com
Represented by:	(Secondary Signatory)
Title:	Ms
Salutation:	Carbon Development Director
Last Name:	Urgel Esteban
Middle Name:	
First Name:	Beatriz
Department:	
Mobile:	
Direct FAX:	+44 207 1216 101
Direct tel:	+44 207 1216 121
Personal E-Mail:	Project.participant.cn@camcoglobal.com

Organization:	Camco Carbon Limited
Street/P.O.Box:	Green Street
Building:	Channel House
City:	St Helier
State/Region:	Jersey
Postfix/ZIP:	JE2 4UH
Country:	Channel Islands
Telephone:	+44 (0)1534 834 618
FAX:	+44 (0)1534 834 601
E-Mail:	
URL:	www.camcoglobal.com
Represented by:	(Primary Signatory)
Title:	Mrs
Salutation:	Qualification Director
Last Name:	Rawlins
Middle Name:	
First Name:	Madeleine
Department:	
Mobile:	
Direct FAX:	+86 10 8448 2432
Direct tel:	+86 10 8448 1623



Personal E-Mail:	Project.participant.cn@camcoglobal.com
Represented by:	(Secondary Signatory)
Title:	Ms
Salutation:	Carbon Development Director
Last Name:	Urgel Esteban
Middle Name:	
First Name:	Beatriz
Department:	
Mobile:	
Direct FAX:	+44 207 1216 101
Direct tel:	+44 207 1216 121
Personal E-Mail:	Project.participant.cn@camcoglobal.com



Annex 2

INFORMATION REGARDING PUBLIC FUNDING

There is no public funding in the project activity.

Annex 3

BASELINE INFORMATION

According to the approved methodology ACM0002 and the document “China's Regional Grid Baseline Emission Factors Renewed”, released at <http://cdm.ccchina.gov.cn/> on 30 December 2008, the $EF_{grid,CM,y}$, $EF_{grid,OM,y}$, and $EF_{grid,BM,y}$ of ECPG could be calculated as following:

A. Electricity Generation of East China Power Grid (2002-2006)

Table A1. Electricity Generation of East China Power Grid (2002-2006)

Year	Electricity Generation (Unit: 10^8 KWh)					Split of low-cost/must-run resources
	Total	Hydro	Thermal	nuclear	Others	
2002	3698.13	378.35	3242.04	56.12	1.63	11.79%
2003	4291.27	319.82	3821.12	149.24	1.09	10.96%
2004	4879.86	255.56	4402.92	219.88	1.50	9.77%
2005	5744.67	441.87	5058.55	226.12	18.13	11.94%
2006	6668.20	502.65	5905.41	236.30	23.84	11.44%

Sources: China Electric Power Yearbook 2003-2007

B. Calculation of Operating Margin Emission Factor ($EF_{grid,OM,y}$)

Table B1. Electricity Generation of East China Power Grid in 2004

	Electricity generation of fuel-fired power plants (MWh)	Auxiliary power ratio (%)	Total Electricity Supplied to the Grid (MWh)
Shanghai	71127000	5.22	67,414,171
Jiangsu	163545000	5.93	153,846,782
Zhejiang	95255000	5.68	89,844,516
Anhui	59875000	6.03	56,264,538
Fujian	50490000	6.07	47,425,257
Total			414,795,263

Sources: China Electric Power Yearbook 2005

Table B2. Electricity Generation of East China Power Grid in 2005

	Electricity generation of fuel-fired power plants (MWh)	Auxiliary power ratio (%)	Total Electricity Supplied to the Grid (MWh)
Shanghai	74606000	5.05	70,838,397
Jiangsu	211429000	5.96	198,827,832
Zhejiang	108110000	5.59	102,066,651
Anhui	62918000	5.9	59,205,838
Fujian	48600000	4.57	46,378,980



Total			477,317,698
--------------	--	--	-------------

Sources: *China Electric Power Yearbook 2006*

Table B3. Electricity Generation of East China Power Grid in 2006

	Electricity generation of fuel-fired power plants (MWh)	Auxiliary power ratio (%)	Total Electricity Supplied to the Grid (MWh)
Shanghai	72033000	5.06	68,388,130
Jiangsu	251258000	5.69	236,961,420
Zhejiang	140349000	5.62	132,461,386
Anhui	71867000	6.05	67,519,047
Fujian	55580000	4.51	53,073,342
Total			558,403,325

Sources: *China Electric Power Yearbook 2007; China Energy Statistical Yearbook 2007*

**Table B4. Calculation of Operating Margin Emission Factor of East China Power Grid in 2004**

Fuel	Unit	Shanghai A	Jiangsu B	Zhejiang C	Anhui D	Fujian E	Total F=A+B+C+D+E	Emission Factor ¹ (tC/TJ) G	Oxidati on ² (%) H	Average CO ₂ Emission (tCO ₂ e) Low Cal oric Val ue ³ (MJ/t or km ³) I	J=G*H*I*F*44/12/1000 (mass) J=G*H*I*F*44/12/1000 (Volume)
Raw Coal	10 ⁴ t	2779.6	7601.9	4008.9	2906.2	2183.7	19480.3	25.8	100	20908	385,300,230
Cleaned coal	10 ⁴ t						0	25.8	100	26344	0
Other Washed Coal	10 ⁴ t		5.46			4.63	10.09	25.8	100	8363	79,826
Coke	10 ⁴ t						0	29.2	100	28435	0
Coke Oven Gas	10 ⁸ m ³	2.59					2.59	12.1	100	16726	192,198
Other Gas	10 ⁸ m ³	72.46					72.46	12.1	100	5227	1,680,380
Crude Oil	10 ⁴ t						0	20	100	41816	0
Gasoline	10 ⁴ t						0	18.9	100	43070	0
Diesel Oil	10 ⁴ t	2.69	27.17	6.23			36.09	20.2	100	42652	1,140,116
Fuel Oil	10 ⁴ t	58.52	55.07	202.89		23.26	339.74	21.1	100	41816	10,991,148
PLG	10 ⁴ t						0	17.2	100	50179	0
Refinery Gas	10 ⁴ t	0.77	0.55				1.32	15.7	100	46055	34,996
Natural Gas	10 ⁸ m ³		0.14				0.14	15.3	100	38931	30,576
Other Petroleum Products	10 ⁴ t	21.22	1.37		24.89		47.48	20	100		1,335,957
Other Coking Products	10 ⁴ t						0	25.8	100	28435	0
Other Energy	10 ⁴ tce	6.43		15.48			21.91	0	100	0	0
Total CO₂ Emission : 400,785,429											
Net electricity imported from Yangcheng, Shanxi Province (MWh)							11,649,610				
Net electricity imported from Central China Grid (MWh)							26,933,850				
Total emission of the East China Power Grid(tCO₂e)							436,037,347				
Fossil power supply of the East China Power Grid(MWh)							453,378,723				
OM emission factor of the East China Power Grid(tCO₂e/MWh)							0.96175				

Sources: China Electric Power Yearbook 2005

1,2 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Volume 2 Energy, chapter 1, page 1.21-1.24, table 1.3 and 1.4.

3 China Energy Statistical Yearbook 2007, Page 287

**Table B5. Calculation of Operating Margin Emission Factor of East China Power Grid in 2005**

Fuel	Unit	Shanghai A	Jiangsu B	Zhejiang C	Anhui D	Fujian E	Total F=A+B+C+D+E	Emission Factor ¹ (tC/TJ) G	Oxidat ion ² (%) H	Average Low Ca loric Va lue ³ (MJ /t or km ³) I	CO ₂ Emission (tCO ₂ e) J=G*H*I*F*44/12/100 0 (mass) J=G*H*I*F*44/12/100 0 (Volume)
Raw Coal	10 ⁴ t	2847.31	9888.06	4801.52	3082.9	2107.69	22727.48	25.8	100	20908	449,526,100
Cleaned coal	10 ⁴ t						0	25.8	100	26344	0
Other Washed Coal	10 ⁴ t						0	25.8	100	8363	0
Coke	10 ⁴ t			0.03			0.03	29.2	100	28435	913
Coke Oven Gas	10 ⁸ m ³	1.68	1.38		1.71		4.77	12.1	100	16726	353,971
Other Gas	10 ⁸ m ³	83.72	24.97	0.06	30		138.75	12.1	100	5227	3,217,676
Crude Oil	10 ⁴ t			27.01			27.01	20	100	41816	828,263
Gasoline	10 ⁴ t						0	18.9	100	43070	0
Diesel Oil	10 ⁴ t	1.25	16	4.52		1.67	23.44	20.2	100	42652	740,491
Fuel Oil	10 ⁴ t	59.39	13.22	153.22		7.45	233.28	21.1	100	41816	7,546,992
PLG	10 ⁴ t						0	17.2	100	50179	0
Refinery Gas	10 ⁴ t	0.57	0.83				1.4	15.7	100	46055	37,117
Natural Gas	10 ⁸ m ³	1.09	1.85	0.62			3.56	15.3	100	38931	777,514
Other Petroleum Products	10 ⁴ t	21	8.38	34.8			64.18	20	100	38369	1,805,850
Other Coking Products	10 ⁴ t						0	25.8	100	28435	0
Other Energy	10 ⁴ t tce	12.36		15.29			27.65	0	100	0	0
Total CO₂ Emission : 464,834,887											
Net electricity imported from Yangcheng, Shanxi Province (MWh)							11,282,000				
Net electricity imported from Central China Grid (MWh)							27,039,000				
Total emission of the East China Power Grid(tCO₂e)							498,646,318				
Fossil power supply of the East China Power Grid(MWh)							515,638,698				
OM emission factor of the East China Power Grid(tCO₂e/MWh)							0.96705				

Sources: China Electric Power Yearbook 2006



Table B6. Calculation of Operating Margin Emission Factor of East China Power Grid in 2006

Fuel	Unit	Shanghai A	Jiangsu B	Zhejiang C	Anhui D	Fujian E	Total F=A+B+C+D+E	Emission Factor ¹ (tC/TJ) G	Oxidati on ² (%) H	Average Low Cal oric Val ue ³ (MJ/t or km ³) I	CO ₂ Emission (tCO ₂ e) J=G*H*I*F*44/12/1000 (mass) J=G*H*I*F*44/12/1000 (Volume)
Raw Coal	10 ⁴ t	2744.45	10945.42	6065	3455.2	2369.63	25579.7	25.8	100	20908	505,940,068
Cleaned coal	10 ⁴ t						0	25.8	100	26344	0
Other Washed Coal	10 ⁴ t		150.54		23.06		173.6	25.8	100	8363	1,373,419
Coke	10 ⁴ t			39.07			39.07	29.2	100	28435	1,189,463
Coke Oven Gas	10 ⁸ m ³	1.71	3.13	0.23	0.71		5.78	12.1	100	16726	428,920
Other Gas	10 ⁸ m ³	84.64	106.54	3.28	25.12		219.58	12.1	100	5227	5,092,160
Crude Oil	10 ⁴ t			20.3			20.3	20	100	41816	622,501
Gasoline	10 ⁴ t						0	18.9	100	43070	0
Diesel Oil	10 ⁴ t	2.13	3.7	4.11	1.21	1.11	12.26	20.2	100	42652	387,305
Fuel Oil	10 ⁴ t	44.51	3.77	71.98	0.02	4.5	124.78	21.1	100	41816	4,036,838
PLG	10 ⁴ t						0	17.2	100	50179	0
Refinery Gas	10 ⁴ t	0.29	0.4		2.95		3.64	15.7	100	46055	96,505
Natural Gas	10 ⁸ m ³	3.2	13.5	9.18			25.88	15.3	100	38931	5,652,267
Other Petroleum Products	10 ⁴ t	18.82	3.57				22.39	20	100	38369	629,993
Other Coking Products	10 ⁴ t						0	25.8	100	28435	0
Other Energy	10 ⁴ tce	6.66	2.8	27.45	3.21		40.12	0	100	0	0
Total CO₂ Emission : 525,449,440											
Net electricity imported from Yangcheng, Shanxi Province (MWh)							11,150,820				
Net electricity imported from Central China Grid (MWh)							24,029,150				
Total emission of the East China Power Grid(tCO ₂ e)							555,969,044				
Fossil power supply of the East China Power Grid(MWh)							593,583,295				
OM emission factor of the East China Power Grid(tCO ₂ e/MWh)							0.93663				

Sources: China Electric Power Yearbook 2007; China Energy Statistic Yearbook 2007

**Table B7. Weighted-average OM emission factor of East China Power Grid (2004-2006)**

	2004	2005	2006	Weighted-average OM emission factor
Total Emission, tCO ₂	436,037,347	498,646,318	555,969,044	
Total power supply, MWh	453,378,723	515,638,698	593,583,295	
OM emission factor, tCO ₂ /MWh	0.96175	0.96705	0.93663	0.95396

Therefore, the $EF_{grid,OM,simple}$ could be calculated as:

$$EF_{grid,OM,simple} = (436,037,347 + 498,646,318 + 555,969,044) / (453,378,723 + 515,638,698 + 593,583,295) = \mathbf{0.95396} \text{ tCO}_2\text{e/MWh}$$

C. Calculation of the Build Margin Emission Factor ($EF_{grid,BM,y}$)

Table C1 Emission Factor of Best Technology

	Variable	Electricity supply efficiency	Emission factor of fuel (tC/TJ)	Oxidation rate	Emission factor (tCO ₂ /MWh)
		A	B	C	$D = 3.6/A/1000 * B * C * 44/12$
Coal-based power plants	$EF_{Coal,Adv}$	37.28%	25.8	1	0.9135
Gas-based power plants	$EF_{Gas,Adv}$	48.81%	15.3	1	0.4138
Oil-based power plants	$EF_{Oil,Adv}$	48.81%	21.1	1	0.5706

Sources: China's grid baseline BM calculation progress, NRDC

**Table C2 The Proportion Of CO₂ Emission From Solid、Liquid、 Gas Fuel For Generating Electricity**

Fuel	Unit	Shanghai	Jiangsu	Zhejiang	Anhui	Fujian	Total	Caloric	Emission	Oxidatio	Emission
		A	B	C	D	E	F=A+...+E	G (KJ/kg)	H	I	J=F*G*H*I*44/12/100
Raw Coal	10 ⁴ t	2744.45	6065	10945.4	3455.2	2369.63	25579.7	20908	25.8	1	505,940,068
Cleaned Coal	10 ⁴ t	0	0	0	0	0	0	26344	25.8	1	0
Other Washed	10 ⁴ t	0	0	150.54	23.06	0	173.6	8363	25.8	1	1,373,419
Briquette	10 ⁴ t	0	0	0		0	0	20908	26.6	1	0
Coke	10 ⁴ t	0	39.07	0	0	0	39.07	28435	29.2	1	1,189,463
Subtotal											508,502,949
Crude Oil	10 ⁴ t	0	20.3	0	0	0	20.3	41816	20	1	622,501
Gasoline	10 ⁴ t	0	0	0	0	0	0	43070	18.9	1	0
Kerosene	10 ⁴ t	0	0	0	0	0	0	43070	19.6	1	0
Diesel Oil	10 ⁴ t	2.13	4.11	3.7	1.21	1.11	12.26	42652	20.2	1	387,305
Fuel Oil	10 ⁴ t	44.51	71.98	3.77	0.02	4.5	124.78	41816	21.1	1	4,036,838
Other Petroleum	10 ⁴ t	18.82	0	3.57	0	0	22.39	38369	20	1	629,993
Other Coking	10 ⁴ t	0	0	0			0	28435	25.8	1	0
Subtotal											5,676,637
Natural Gas	10 ⁷ m ³	32	91.8	135	0	0	258.8	38931	15.3	1	5,652,267
Coke Oven Gas	10 ⁷ m ³	17.1	2.3	31.3	7.1	0	57.8	16726	12.1	1	428,920
Other Gas	10 ⁷ m ³	846.4	32.8	1065.4	251.2	0	2195.8	5227	12.1	1	5,092,160
PLG	10 ⁴ t	0	0	0	0	0	0	50179	17.2	1	0
Refinery Gas	10 ⁴ t	0.29	0	0.4	2.95	0	3.64	46055	15.7	1	96,505
Subtotal											11,269,853
Total											525,449,440

Sources: China Energy Statistical Yearbook 2007



Calculate with relevant data and formulae, the value for λ_{Coal} is 96.78% the value for λ_{Oil} is 1.08% and the value for λ_{Gas} is 2.14%.

Therefore,

$$EF_{Thermal} = \lambda_{Coal} \times EF_{Coal,Adv} + \lambda_{Oil} \times EF_{Oil,Adv} + \lambda_{Gas} \times EF_{Gas,Adv} = 0.8991 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e/MWh.}$$

Table C3 Installed capacity of the East China Power Grid in 2004

Installed Capacity	Unit	Shanghai	Jiangsu	Zhejiang	Anhui	Fujian	Total
Fuel-fired	MW	12014.9	28289.5	21439.8	9364.5	8315.4	79424.1
Hydro	MW	0	126.5	6418.4	692.8	7180.1	14417.8
Nuclear	MW	0	0	3056	0	0	3056
Wind & Others	MW	3.4	17.5	39.7	0	12	72.6
Total	MW	12018.3	28433.5	30953.9	10057.3	15507.5	96970.5

Sources: China Electric Power Yearbook 2005

Table C4 Installed capacity of the East China Power Grid in 2005

Installed Capacity	Unit	Shanghai	Jiangsu	Zhejiang	Anhui	Fujian	Total
Fuel-fired	MW	13113.5	42506.4	27688.1	11423.2	9345.4	104076.6
Hydro	MW	0	142.6	6952.1	749.8	8224.9	16069.4
Nuclear	MW	0	0	3066	0	0	3066
Wind & Others	MW	253.3	58.8	37.2	0	52	401.3
Total	MW	13366.8	42707.8	37743.4	12173	17622.3	123613.3

Sources: China Electric Power Yearbook 2006

Table C5 Installed capacity of the East China Power Grid in 2006

Installed Capacity	Unit	Shanghai	Jiangsu	Zhejiang	Anhui	Fujian	Total
Fuel-fired	MW	14526	51776	35391	14134	13001	128828
Hydro	MW	0	136	8369	1001	8957	18463
Nuclear	MW	0	0	3066	0	0	3066
Wind & Others	MW	253	162	43	0	89	547
Total	MW	14779	52074	46869	15135	22047	150904

Sources: China Electric Power Yearbook 2007

Table C6. Calculation of BM Emission Factor of East China Power Grid (2004-2006)

	New Capacity 2004	New Capacity 2005	New Capacity 2006	New Capacity 2005-2006	Percentage of New Capacity
--	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	------------------------	----------------------------



					Additions
	A	B	C	D=C-A	
Fuel-fired (MW)	79424.1	104076.6	128828	49403.9	91.60%
Hydro (MW)	14417.8	16069.4	18463	4045.2	7.50%
Nuclear (MW)	3056	3066	3066	10	0.02%
Wind and others(MW)	72.6	401.3	547	474.4	0.88%
Total	96970.5	123613.3	150904	53933.5	100.00%
Percentage of Year 2006	64.26%	81.92%	100%		

$$EF_{grid,BM,y} = \frac{CAP_{Thermal}}{CAP_{Total}} \times EF_{Thermal} = 0.8991 \times 91.60\% = 0.8236 \text{ tCO}_2/\text{MWh}.$$

D. Calculation of the Baseline Emission Factor ($EF_{grid,CM,y}$)

$$EF_{grid,CM,y} = 0.5 \times EF_{grid,OM,y} + 0.5 \times EF_{grid,BM,y} = 0.5 \times 0.9540 + 0.5 \times 0.8236 = 0.8888 \text{ tCO}_2/\text{MWh}$$



Annex 4

MONITORING INFORMATION

No Supplement Information.