CDM: Proposed New Methodology
Meth Panel summary recommendation to the Executive Board (version 01)
(To be used by the Meth Panel in addition to the full recommendation to the Board regarding a proposed new methodology (F-CDM-NMmp))

Date and number of Meth Panel meeting:	6 - 9 September 2005 Meth Panel 17
Related F-CDM-NM document ID number (electronically available to EB members)	**F-CDM- NM0116:** "Reduction in the use of Ordinary Portland Cement for concrete mix preparation"
Title of proposed new baseline methodology:	Reduction in the use of Ordinary Portland Cement for concrete mix preparation
Title of underlying project activity:	Reduction in Ordinary Portland Cement consumption in concrete mix preparation utilizing lower cement concrete technology.
History of submission: (new section)	First submisison (Round 11, 01 June 2005) Final recommendation at Meth 17

1. One sentence describing the purpose of the methodology. *(new section)*

>> The methodology proposes to consider concrete mixing as a CDM project activity if the share of Ordinary Portland Cement (OPC) in the mixed cement is below specific standards assuming this leads to a reduced clinker production at cement plants.

2. Suggested applicability of methodology *(former section A.I and B.I)*

>>

- The Project activity involves reduction in ordinary portland cement (OPC) use for the preparation of concrete mix in a variety of construction applications by substituting part of OPC content in concrete mix with alternate materials of less GHG intensity;
- There are no existing regulations/ legislation that encourage or prohibit the reduction in OPC content in concrete mix preparation;
- The concrete mix prepared by the project activity does not adversely impact the functionality and is in compliance with applicable standards/ guidelines etc., on the functional characteristics of concrete mix.

3. Summary description of baseline methodology . Short statements on each on how the proposed methodology: *(chooses the baseline scenario, demonstrates additionality, calculates baseline emissions, calculates project emissions, calculates leakage, calculates emission reductions) (former section B.I.)*

>> The methodology proposes to estimate the emission reductions from using less energy-intensive materials in concrete mix preparation based on the change in proportion of OPC used for the mix and a benchmark emission factor for OPC production based on energy use, and therefore emissions, in nearby OPC plants.

The methodology does not provide appropriate guidance on how to choose the baseline scenario, it rather prescribes that the baseline scenario is defined by standards for concrete mix preparation or tender document specifications. A modification of "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality"is used to demonstrate additionality. The emission reductions result all from positive leakage as they occur outside the project boundary. Emissions resulting from clinker production in the baseline case are estimated with the help of a CO_2 emission factor calculated on data of "a maximum of four" cement plants.

Only negative leakage due to a change in transport of materials is considered, other important sources of leakage such as price and volume effects in the cement market are neglected.

Emission reductions are calculated by comparing requirements for OPC in the baseline and project activity multiplied by the CO_2 emission factor for clinker (the same for baseline and project activity). Finally, emission reductions are adjusted by negative leakage from increased transports.

4. Suggested "recommendation level" for the baseline and monitoring methodologies (A, B or C).
(former section A.I and A.II.)

>> C. Not to be approved.

5. Major reasons for B/C choice from the proposed baseline methodology: (outline the major reasons for needing revision/rejection)
(former section A.I.)

>> The methodology lacks a number of issues, which would require a considerable modification of the methodology, including the basic underlying assumption that the project activity leads indirectly to a reduction of cement production. In the following, the most important issues are highlighted:

- The claimed CERs are based on a problematic and non-conservative assumption.

  The methodology suggests that the project activity is reducing no emissions within the project boundary. The claimed CERs result all from positive leakage effects, which is based on a problematic assumption. The methodology assumes that every ton of OPC not consumed in the project activity will directly result in one tone less OPC production at a cement plant. This assumption is whether likely to be true nor conservative.
- Insufficient data base for emission reduction calculation.

  The methodology lacks a clear and robust procedure on how to gather data on fuel and electricity use for OPC production at cement plants.
- Clear guidance on how to use the "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" is missing.

  The project proponent might be whether the producer nor the final consumer of OPC, which needs to be reflected when assessing additionality. Therefore, the used additionality tool needs to be supplemented with specific guidance for this project type, especially clarifications regarding step 2 and 3 are needed. The guidance given by the methodology is confusing and not specific enough.
- A clear description on how to identify the baseline scenario is lacking.

  The methodology does not indicate how to determine possible different baseline scenarios and gives no substantial guidance on how the most likely baseline scenario is selected.
- Leakage is not treated in an appropriate manner.

  Negative leakage due to increase in consumption of OPC elsewhere and emissions from preparation of admixtures and alternate cementious material outside of the project boundary are not accounted for.
- Lack of clarity.

  The methodology uses unspecific language, and ambiguous terms and instructions. Formulas and their nomenclature would need further clarifications.

6. Any major issues arising from the assessment of the proposed monitoring methodology (if different to those already raised above).
(former section A.II.)

>> None.

7. Any other issues arising to be stated, if necessary (e.g. cross-cutting, general or precedent-setting issues raised by the proposed new baseline or monitoring methodology).

>> None.

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-NM0116
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat	14 September 2005
Date of transmission to the Executive Board	14 September 2005
Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site	14 September 2005