

 <p style="text-align: center;">CDM: Proposed New Methodology Meth Panel recommendation to the Executive Board (version 04) <i>(To be used by the Meth Panel to make a recommendation to the Board regarding a proposed new methodology)</i></p>	
Date of Meth Panel meeting:	6 – 9 September 2005
Related F-CDM-NM document ID number (electronically available to EB members)	F-CDM-NM0092-rev: “Transalloys Manganese Alloy Smelter Upgrade and Energy Efficiency Project in South Africa”
Related F-CDM-NMex document ID number(s) (electronically available to EB members)	F-CDM-Nmex0092-rev: Not applicable
Related F-CDM-NMpu document ID number(s) (electronically available to EB members)	F-CDM-Nmpu0092-rev: Not applicable
<p><i>Note to those completing this form, as applicable: Please provide recommendations on the proposed new baseline and monitoring methodologies based on an assessment of CDM-NMB and CDM-NMM and of their application in sections A to E of the draft CDM-PDD, desk reviews and public input. Please ensure that the form is entirely filled and that arguments and expert judgements are substantiated.</i></p>	
A. Final recommendations by the Meth Panel	
I. Recommendation on the proposed new baseline methodology: (checkmark the choice made)	
Title of proposed new baseline methodology:>> <u>Baseline methodology for energy efficiency on electricity and fossil fuel consumption through technological improvements in metal production at metal ore reducing facilities.</u>	
a. To approve this proposed methodology with minor changes <input type="checkbox"/> <div style="margin-left: 40px;"> i. Conditions under which this proposed methodology is applicable to other potential CDM project activities (e.g. project type, region, data availability): >> ii. Minor changes: >> </div>	
b. To reconsider this proposed methodology, subject to required changes <input type="checkbox"/> <div style="margin-left: 40px;"> i. Conditions under which the proposed methodology is applicable to other potential projects (e.g. project type, region, data availability): >> ii. Required changes: >> </div> <p><i>(Project participants shall make required changes to the proposed new methodology and send it back to the Meth Panel. The proposed new methodology will be reconsidered by the Meth Panel if changes required are made by the project participants. The Executive Board will only consider this proposed new methodology after the revised proposed methodology has been reconsidered by the Meth Panel.)</i></p>	

c. Not to approve the proposed methodology



i. Reasons for non-approval:

>> The baseline methodology should give instructions and information that are detailed enough to allow a third party to understand and implement the methodology. In some cases, this may require methodologies to include information specific to sub-sectors. The proposed methodology indicates that it could be easily adapted and generalised to any other industrial sector aiming at energy efficiency savings leaving to the DOE the responsibility for deciding about the adequacy or not of the project activity. In the currently proposed methodology (especially in the proposed CDM-NMM), the generalisation is too vague to be verifiable. (For example, what are "relevant units" of metal? Intermediate production? Final products?). The methodology is missing:

- A clear description of situations in the Manganese metal industry to which the methodology may be applied.
The methodology should elaborate on how to apply the “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality” to concrete circumstances of the metal industry and on which possible baseline scenarios might exist.
- An elaboration of formulae to calculate baseline, project and leakage emissions, which take into account the specific circumstances (emission sources, gases etc.) of the different processes in the metal production industry. With that respect, the methodology must make sure that the same activity rate (production of goods) and the same quality of goods is considered both in the baseline and in the project case.
- Assumptions and data sources to be used for specific project contexts and how it is ensured that these are adequate, reliable and conservative.
- An evaluation of related uncertainties. The current consideration of uncertainties and the arbitrary postulation of acceptable data vintages are not acceptable. The assessment of low uncertainties to all data sources needs to be justified.
- A description of how the methodology ensures transparency and conservativeness. The aspects provided in section G are too general and should be specified with respect to specific project contexts.

Further:

- The applicability conditions should be clarified (it is not clear from reading the methodology exactly what types of project activities are covered by the proposed methodology. Without this information, it is difficult to assess whether the suggested boundary is appropriate.
- Although the methodology mentions the AM0008 “Industrial fuel switching from coal and petroleum fuels to natural gas without extension of capacity and lifetime of the facility” (fuels switching) it ignores the possibility of autonomous fuel switch, and therefore all emission reductions are associated with the project activity(the applicability conditions refers only to energy efficiency projects). This should be verified.

Some of the requests presented by the Meth Panel regarding the baseline scenario and “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality” were not adequately implemented:

- A clear method for choosing baseline scenarios should be made explicit. It is not adequate to say that this will be done through the use of the consolidated tools.
- "In addition to the reference to the use of “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality” agreed by the Executive Board, in accordance with the guidance by the Board at its eighteenth meeting (para 20 of the report) “project participants are encouraged, however, to suggest further details on how to implement this tool with regard to specific project types covered by the proposed methodology.” In this regard, when proposing the use the additionality tool, the following issues should be emphasized in the new methodology:
 - i) Clarify that information used to assess additionality will be publicly available
 - ii) Include a procedure to assess different baseline scenarios and choose between them"
 - iii) Finally the acceptance of two year or one year data for the calculation of baseline emissions as proposed in the Methodology is inadequate.

Few of the previous Meth Panel recommendations have been implemented as per example:

- To consider fossil fuels as an alternative to autonomously generate electricity inside the project boundaries and so, subject to energy efficiency projects.
- Clarify that the additionality tool is to be applied to each individual furnace (or other energy using equipment) or to the project as a whole. The Meth Panel recommends that the “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality” should be applied to each different furnace (equipment) typology.
- To exclude other greenhouse gases than CO₂, N₂O and CH₄.

(A new proposal should be submitted in accordance with the procedures for submission and consideration of proposed new methodologies of the Executive Board.)

II. Recommendation on the proposed new monitoring methodology: (checkmark the choice made)

Title of proposed new monitoring methodology: >> [Monitoring methodology for energy efficiency on electricity and fossil fuel consumption through technological improvements in metal production at metal ore reducing facilities.](#)

a. To approve this proposed methodology with minor changes

☐

i. Conditions under which methodology is applicable to other potential projects (e.g. project type, region, data availability):

>>

ii. Minor changes:

>>

b. To reconsider this proposed methodology, subjected to required changes

☐

i. Conditions under which the proposed methodology is applicable to other potential projects (e.g. project type, region, data availability.):

>>

ii. Required changes:

>>

(Project participants shall make required changes in the proposed new methodology and send it back to the Meth Panel. The proposed new methodology will be reconsidered by the Meth Panel if changes required are correctly made by the project participants. The Executive Board will only consider this proposed new methodology after required changes proposed have been made and the revised proposed methodology has been reconsidered by the Meth Panel.)

c. Not to approve the proposed methodology

☒

i. Reasons for non-approval:

>> [Main changes requested to the baseline methodology were not implemented. Lack of information regarding the sub sector specific data cannot have solution. Detailed recommendations on what to monitor and how are needed in order for the DOE to be able to verify a methodology. The currently proposed methodology is too vague.](#)

(A new proposal should be submitted in accordance with the procedures for submission and consideration of proposed new methodologies of the Executive Board.)

B. Details of the evaluation of the proposed new methodology by the Meth Panel:

I. Proposed new baseline methodology (*specify title here*): >> Baseline methodology for energy efficiency on electricity and fossil fuel consumption through technological improvements in metal production at metal ore reducing facilities.

(1) Short description of the methodology, including an assessment of which approach from paragraph 48 of the CDM modalities and procedures was used:

a) Describe the methodology:

>> This methodology focuses on entities that are planning the introduction of new technologies in the metal production industry (where electricity is used to reduce metal oxides) that lead to the reduction of electricity and potentially fossil fuel consumption during the production processes. The methodology proposes the determination of the baseline scenario between 3 alternatives:

The possible alternative scenarios in absence of the CDM project activity would be as follows:

- The proposed project activity without any revenues from the CDM;
- All other plausible and credible alternatives to the project activity that provide a similar energy service to the project which are technically feasible to implement with comparable quality, properties and application areas;
- Continuation of the current situation (no project activity or other alternatives undertaken).

Among the alternatives that do not phase any prohibitive barriers, the most economically attractive alternative should be considered as the baseline scenario.

The project additionality is to be demonstrated using the consolidated additionality tool.

No additional information regarding the Baseline scenario and Project Activity additionality is supplied

The baseline scenario and additionality are to be determined in a step-wise process to determine the financial barriers associated with the development of the project, based on approach of paragraph 48(b) of CDM modalities and procedures: "Emissions from a technology that represents an economically attractive course of action, taking into account barriers to investment". and following the "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality". Due to the fact that the project is a grid-connected energy efficiency project, the methodology rely on the ACM0002 "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid connected electricity generation from renewable sources" to calculate project and baseline emissions not considering any specific characteristics of the Manganese industry.

b) State the approach selected:

>> The proposed approach is as per paragraph 48 (b) of the CDM modalities and procedures: "Emissions from a technology that represents an economically attractive course of action, taking into account barriers to investment".

c) Indicate (in summary form) why the approach selected is the most appropriate. Please provide your expert judgement on the appropriateness of the selected approach to the project category:

>> The approach selected is appropriate, although the approach of paragraph 48 (a) of the CDM modalities and procedures would also be appropriate, since the project would not have been implemented in the absence of CDM given its likely inferior economic performance and the fact that barriers to its implementation exist. In addition, as this methodology focuses on current metal smelting activities, real and verifiable data in relation to existing performance of the installation will be applied to underpin the baseline development process in a credible and transparent manner. "Existing actual or historical emissions, as applicable".

(2) Basis for determining the baseline scenario:

a) State whether the documentation explains how the baseline scenario is to be chosen and identified:

>> The documentation does not explain how the baseline scenarios are to be identified and how the baseline scenario is to be chosen. The CDM-NMB just uses the "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" to assess that the project is not the baseline scenario, but it does not identify what other baseline scenarios could be.

b) State the basic underlying rationale for algorithms/formulae used (e.g. marginal vs. average basis) (see also section 4 below):

>> The marginal approach is adopted to evaluate the emissions factor [combined margin] for the grid electricity.

No other assessment is supplied to the specific sector (Metals production) or sub sector (Manganese production).

c) State whether the documentation explains how, through the use of the methodology, it can be demonstrated that a project activity is additional and therefore not the baseline scenario. If so, what are the tools provided by the project participants?

>> No explanation is provided unless that the additionality tool is to be used.

d) State whether the basis for determining the baseline scenario and for assessing additionality is appropriate and adequate:

>> It is adequate as a general guideline. It is completely inadequate as a specific methodology (doesn't exist).

(3) Assessment of the description of the proposed methodology and its applicability

a) State whether the methodology has been described in an adequate manner:

>> No, the methodology has not been described in an adequate manner. There are many vague areas. A key inadequacy is hinged around the fact that the baseline scenario determination component and Project additionality proof is missing.

b) State whether the proposed methodology is appropriate for the referred proposed project activity and the referred project context (described in Sections A - E of the draft CDM-PDD and submitted along with CDM-NMB):

>> The proposed methodology was generalized beyond the referred CDM project scope.

c) State whether the application of the methodology could result in a baseline scenario that reasonably represents the anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases that would occur in the absence of the proposed project activity.

>> The application of the methodology would result in a baseline scenario that reasonable represent the anthropogenic emissions that would occur in the absence of the proposed project activity only if the Methodology would have been modified and completed according to the Meth Panel recommendations. The improvements implemented are considered to be insufficient and too generalistic.

Please explain:

>> The proposed methodology was generalized beyond the referred CDM project scope.

(4) Assessment of algorithms/formulae and type of data needed:

a) State whether the description of the methodology includes algorithms and generic formulae that can be applied to other potential project activities (if not, the proposed new methodology will be considered as a project-specific methodology):

>> The methodology based on consolidated baseline methodology includes general formulae/ algorithms, which can be used to determine emission reduction of electricity from a grid system through use of energy efficiency measures and technologies. No specific formulae are provided to estimate energy efficiency improvements and electricity consumption reduction.

b) Explain the spatial scope of data used to determine the baseline and whether the scope is appropriate:

>> The spatial scope of data used to determine baseline correspond to the installation, local, national and international level, depending on whether or not it refers to alloy production, electricity consumption or process fuel consumption. Local level for example covers the evaluation of the project financial parameters, national or regional for the discount rate and the grid emission factor and international for the default emission factors. Yes, the spatial scope is appropriate.

c) Explain the vintage of data used (in relation to the duration of the project crediting period) and whether the vintage of data is appropriate, indicating the period covered by the data:

>> The vintage of the data used is appropriate if tree year data is selected for baseline scenario and data sources are based on measurements from the project site. For example, data sources used are based on last three years, from 2000-2002 and obtained from "relevant" grid system. However, we stressed the word "relevant" as there is a need to consider grid interconnections in the determination of what is the "relevant grid". The vintage and the quality of the results can be improved if instead of yearly data, hourly data is used in the creation of the baseline.

(5) Definition of the project boundary related to the baseline methodology:

a) State how the project boundary is defined in terms of:

i) Gases and sources

>> The project boundary is defined by any "relevant" CO₂ emissions that could be affected by the proposed project. The issue of relevance is associated with the choice of an appropriate grid.

ii) Physical delineation

>> The spatial extent of the project boundary includes the project site and the electrical system affected by the proposed project activity.

b) Indicate whether this project boundary is appropriate:

>> Yes, the project boundary is appropriate as long as emissions from onsite fossil fuel used is properly handled, and the "relevant" grid is properly chosen. "Relevant" should be defined so that the methodology gives clear instructions for other users.

(6) Key assumptions/parameters (including emission factors and activity levels) and data sources:

a) List the implicit and explicit key assumptions. Identify those, if any, which are problematic and explain:

>>

- Information on acceptable IRR or discount rates is available from sources like business statistics or expert judgement. This is not a problematic assumption.
- The calculation of IRR will be conservative, and the checking by the DOE will ensure this is so. This may be considered a problematic assumption, as the detailed steps to be utilized are not provided.
- Emission factors, conversion factors or default data used can be obtained from scientific publications, specialized institutions and consultants, the IPCC, or other recognized sources or validated documents. This assumption is particularly not problematic, however there is a need to provide references to the sources of these data. More specific information regarding the sub sector emissions should be included.
- It is assumed that the baseline methodology ACM0002 "Consolidated methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources", the AM0008 "Industrial fuel switching from coal and petroleum fuels to natural gas without extension of capacity and lifetime of the facility" methodology, the simplified methodologies for small-scale CDM project activities and the "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" support the proponent's new methodology. The proponent should be however explicitly write out his own assumptions, as it relates to the utilization of theses AMs since he is applying for the approval of his own methodology.
- Possible baseline scenarios addressed in a very general way. This is problematic.

b) State whether the key assumptions are arrived at in a transparent manner:

>> The non-problematic assumptions can be arrived at in a transparent manner, however the problematic ones need further elucidation in the methodology for transparency.

c) Give your expert judgement on whether the assumptions/parameters are adequate:

>> The assumptions/parameters are adequate but incomplete.

d) Indicate which data sources are used and how the data are obtained (e.g. official statistics, expert judgement):

>> The data sources that will be used should include specific data like information from the grid operator; IPCC data; validated documents; and expert information. The Methodology should be more specific.

e) Give your expert judgement on whether the data used are adequate, consistent, accurate and reliable:

>> Data used are adequate, consistent but incomplete.

f) State possible data gaps:

>> Detailed data regarding sub sector analysis of the Methodology that were not implemented.

(7) Assessment of uncertainties:

a) State whether the methodology includes an assessment of uncertainties regarding:

i) The basis for determining the baseline scenario:

>> The methodology for determining baseline scenario is ad-hoc and not adequate and as such, does not include an assessment of uncertainties.

ii) Algorithms/formulae:

>> Algorithms and formulae for baseline scenario determination based on approved consolidated baseline methodology ACM0002 for "Consolidated methodology for grid electricity generation from renewable sources". There are also algorithm and formulae for the determination of emissions of the baseline and the project. However, uncertainty related to reduction of electricity consumption from the grid through application of energy efficiency technology needs to be elaborated.

iii) Key assumptions:

>> Most of the key assumptions in the methodology are certain but incomplete and too generalized. The assessment of uncertainty is equally incomplete

iv) Data:

>> No specific handling of uncertainty is mentioned on the data utilized in the algorithm and formulae for calculating emission reduction.

b) State whether the uncertainties presented are reasonable:

>> The project proponent identifies sources of uncertainties but no assessment of it is included. In most of the cases it is mentioned that the DOE should check the key factors and assumptions.

(8) Leakage:

a) State how the baseline methodology addresses any potential leakage due to the project activity:

>> The methodology analyses the following potential leakages:

- Electricity generation; as it is defined by ACM0002 eventual leakages arise from plant construction, fuel handling and land inundation (for hydroelectric generation – not applicable in this case). In applying the methodology no leakage is considered for those activities.
- Differences in the fuel consumption due to the project activities can generate leakages, but it is not mentioned how the leakage should be evaluated if this situation occurs.
- Other leakage sources; no other forms of leakage were identified by the project proponent, but this assumption should be verified once the project is underway.

b) Indicate whether the treatment for leakage is appropriate and adequate:

>> The basic treatment of the leakage is appropriate; Since Methodology is lacking sub sector details there is no means to identify if treatment was adequate.

(9) Transparency and “conservativeness”:

a) Indicate whether the baseline methodology was developed in a transparent way:

>> The baseline methodology cannot be developed in a transparent way as long as the baseline scenario candidates are not robustly selected.

b) State whether the baseline methodology is conservative:

>> The ad-hoc determination of baseline scenarios will impact on the conservative determination of baselines even though the approved methodology, which should yield a conservative result, will be used.

(10) Potential strengths and weaknesses of the proposed baseline methodology (please explain):

>>

Strengths:

- The methodology builds on existing approved baseline methodologies (ACM0002 “Consolidated methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources” and other methodologies approved for grid connected electricity generation where information is insufficient to support application of ACM0002). It extends the scope of these methodologies by making them applicable to components of any project improving energy efficiency in metals production through smelting and reducing the amounts of electricity taken from a grid system. The methodology also builds on principles established in the recently approved NM0041-rev2 “Khorat Waste to Energy Project, Thailand” that quantification protocols for the production of electricity and sent to a grid has the same quantification impact as electricity generated on site and not taken from a grid-similar to electricity conserved on site;
- The methodology builds on processes set out in the small scale methodologies and AM0008 “Industrial fuel switching from coal and petroleum fuels to natural gas without extension of capacity and lifetime of the facility” (for example) to quantify any emissions from other fossil fuels;
- The methodology proposes the use of an already existing “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality”.

Weaknesses:

- The methodology does not attempt to incorporate transport and distribution losses in the grid system;
- The inadequate representation of the need to choose an appropriate reference grid, especially where there are interconnections;
- Lack of provisions to determine the baseline scenario;
- Lack of clarity on the use of the “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality”, and information provisions;
- Vague instructions.

(11) Other considerations, such as a description of how national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances have been taken into account (please explain):

>> Only general references are made to national and/or sectoral policies. The following national circumstances should be explicitly taken into consideration:

- The low price of energy (a market barrier for this type of projects),
- The thermal predominance of the power system,
- The adoption of the simple adjusted OM approach instead of the dispatch data analysis, and the
- Regional demand side management programme which encourages industry to reduce electricity consumption from the grid through implementation of energy efficiency measures and technologies.

(12) Applicability of the proposed methodology across project types and regions (please indicate):

>> The methodology would be applicable to nearly all project types in metal industry and regions since it is so general and superficial. Restrictions were made to avoid aluminium industry but more should be done as stated above.

(13) Any other comments:

a) State whether any other source of information (i.e. other than documentation on this proposed methodology available on the UNFCCC CDM web site) has been used by you in evaluating this methodology. If so, please provide specific references:

>> None.

b) Indicate any further comments:

>> No further comments.

II. Proposed new monitoring methodology (specify title here): >> Monitoring methodology for energy efficiency through technological improvements in the metals production industry through smelting.

In respect of the proposed new monitoring methodology, evaluate each section of CDM-NMM to the draft CDM-PDD. Please provide your comments section by section:

(1) Brief description of new methodology:

Describe new methodology:

>> The monitoring methodology has been conceived to monitor emissions resulting from the project activities during and after project implementation. The monitoring of the emission related to the grid electricity generation relies on the monitoring methodology defined by the already approved ACM0002 methodology and, if the required data is not available, other approved methodologies could be applied. If changes in on-site fossil fuels are identified in the project scenario related to the baseline scenario, the emission source should be monitored using procedures similar to those settled by the SSC methodologies and the approved AM0008 methodology.

(2) Key assumptions/parameters:

a) List the implicit and explicit key assumptions. Identify those, if any, which are problematic and explain:

>>

The key assumptions include:

- Quantity of metal production is known with sufficient precision and provided by the project proponent. Not Problematic and Implicit;
- Quantity of grid electricity consumed by tonne of metal produced is known accurately and provided by the project proponent. Not Problematic and Implicit;
- Quantity of any fossil fuel consumed by tonne of metal produced known with certainty, and will be provided by the project proponent. Not Problematic, Implicit;
- The IPCC emissions factor can be utilized for any fossil fuel consumed for the metal production. Not Problematic, Implicit;
- The grid emission factor to be provided by the project proponent. Not explicitly mentioned by the proponent, is the fact that those emission factors would be calculated using data provided by the grid operator. The source of this grid information must be specified explicitly;
- Change in fossil fuel consumption that will occur between the baseline and the project cases was considered. Not problematic assumption that was explicitly stated.

b) State whether the key assumptions are arrived at in a transparent manner:

>> The key assumptions have been established in a transparent manner, even though they are mostly implicit.

c) Give your expert judgement on whether the assumptions/parameters are adequate:

>> The assumptions mentioned in a) above have been utilized in an adequate manner.

(3) Data sources and data quality:

a) *Indicate which data sources are used and how the data are obtained (e.g. official statistics, expert judgement):*

>> The data sources include: from historical and measured data from the project site; data from relevant grid operator; IPCC; national sources.

b) *Give your expert judgement on whether the data used are adequate, consistent, accurate and reliable:*

>> Data used are adequate, consistent, accurate and reliable.

c) *State possible data gaps:*

>> The baseline methodology lacks specific information regarding the energy efficiency type of project. So does the monitoring methodology.

(4) Assessment of the description of the proposed methodology and its applicability:

a) *State whether the proposed methodology has been described in an adequate manner:*

>> It is consistent with the Baseline Methodology.

b) *State whether the proposed methodology is appropriate for the referred proposed project activity and the referred project context (described in Sections A - E of the draft CDM-PDD and submitted along with CDM-NMM):*

>> No. Lack of project specific type data in the baseline and Monitoring Methodologies.

c) *State whether this proposed monitoring methodology is compatible with the proposed baseline methodology described in CDM-NMB of the draft CDM-PDD:*

>> Yes, the proposed monitoring methodology is compatible with the proposed baseline methodology described in CDM-NMB.

(5) Leakage (please elaborate, if appropriate):

>>

The monitoring methodology identifies three eventual leakage sources:

- Electricity generation; based on ACM0002, leakage could be related to the plant construction, fuel handling and land inundation. The methodology proposed doesn't consider any significant leakage due to these causes and also affirm that no credits shall be claimed by the project if these emissions are reduced below the level of the baseline scenario;
- On site fossil fuel leakage; the methodology considers changes in the fossil fuel consumption per tonne produced will arise and, leakage will be evaluated;
- Other leakage sources; the methodology doesn't anticipate any other off-site leakage as a result of the project activities, but this assumption should be verified once the project had been developed.

(6) Quality assurance and control procedures (please explain):

>> The methodology covers appropriately the QC and QA procedures for: metal production, grid electricity consumption, fossil fuel utilised and emissions factors. The corresponding data have a low level of uncertainty.

(7) Potential strengths and weaknesses of the proposed monitoring methodology (please explain):

>>

Strengths:

- The monitoring methodology is based on already approved methodologies for grid connected electricity generation (ACM0002 and other methodologies, where data required for the ACM0002 methodology is not available)
- The monitoring methodology is based on the already approved small-scale and AM0008 methodologies for the emissions arising from the use of fossil fuel
- The methodology is simple.

Weaknesses:

- The monitoring methodology don't consider the transmission and distribution losses, which is considered by the project proponent as a weakness, in my opinion this limitation provide an additional degree of conservatism to the methodology.
- The monitoring methodology has the same problems identified in the baseline methodology regarding assessing sub sector specific information.

(8) Applicability of the proposed methodology across project types and regions (please indicate):

>> It is applicable to all Metal Industry, but is incomplete and too general.

(9) Any other comments:

a) State whether any other source of information (i.e. other than documentation on this proposed methodology available on the UNFCCC CDM web site) has been used by you in evaluating this methodology. If so, please provide specific references:

>> None.

b) Indicate any further comments:

>> No further comments.



Signature of Meth Panel Chair

Date: 14/09/2005

(Jean-Jacques Becker)



Signature of Meth Panel Vice-Chair

Date: 14/09/2005

(José Miguez)

Information to be completed by the secretariat

F-CDM-NMmp doc id number	F-CDM-NM0092-rev
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat	14 September 20005
Date of transmission to the EB	14 September 20005
Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site	14 September 20005