



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))

<i>Date and number of Meth Panel meeting:</i>	17 - 19 October, 2005
<i>Related F-CDM-NM document ID number (electronically available to EB members)</i>	F-CDM-NM0117: "Nanjing Chemical Industries Co Ltd (NCIC) Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project"
<i>Title of proposed new baseline methodology:</i>	Baseline Methodology for catalytic N ₂ O destruction in the Reactor gas of Nitric Acid plants"
<i>Title of underlying project activity:</i>	Nanjing Chemical Industries CO. Ltd (NCIC) Nitrous Oxide Abatement Project
<i>History of submission: (new section)</i>	First submission, (Round 11, 13 July 2004) Clarifications received in response to preliminary recommendation at Meth Panel 17 Final recommendation at Meth Panel 18
1. One sentence describing the purpose of the methodology. (new section)	
>> This methodology concerns projects which attempt to destroy N ₂ O produced as a by-product of nitric acid manufacture, through the installation of a secondary catalyst, located just behind the reactor which oxidizes ammonia.	
2. Suggested applicability of methodology (former section A.I and B.I)	
>> The applicability condition suggests that the methodology is limited to secondary destruction of N ₂ O. If this is so, then condition 2,3 and 5 could be redundant, though the relationship to proposed project activity type is not entirely clear. Overall constraints on CERs claimed are imposed by historical maximum production, but design capacity would be a better alternative.	
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.)	
>> <u>Baseline scenario selection:</u> The methodology discusses several baseline options such as recycling, stripping and NSCR, but also rejects them. <u>Demonstration of additionality:</u> The CDM-NMB demonstrates additionality through the four steps, which, while not identical with the "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality", draws upon it. <u>Baseline calculation:</u> The baseline emissions are calculated by multiplying the volume flow rate of the reactor gas at the inlet of the destruction facility by the N ₂ O concentration of the gas, taking into account subsequent destruction which would have happened in the absence of the project activity. <u>Project emissions:</u> Project emissions include the non destroyed N ₂ O at the outlet (again volume flow rate times N ₂ O concentration).	

Leakage: Leakage is assumed to be an increase in energy consumption.

Emission reduction: Emission reduction is Baseline emissions - Project emissions - Leakage

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

>> B. To be reconsidered.

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

>>

1. The basic algorithm of calculating baseline and project emissions by multiplying the volume of gas by N₂O concentration is acceptable, subject to ensuring stable production conditions such as temperature, pressure, catalyst composition and NH₃ input. This needs to be clarified.
2. Remove all project-related references within the methodology (e.g. sections D3, D4 and D6 of CDM-NMB) in order to make this methodology applicable for other similar projects regardless of region.
3. Provide justification for the downstream destruction rate (NDF), which is assumed to be 1%. Conversely, provide methods to yield a reliable figure of baseline emissions, such as monitoring (option 1 in CDM-NMB which is rejected) or ex ante calculation (subject to similar production conditions such as pressure, temperature, catalyst composition and NH₃ input).
4. A limit to CERs should be linked to design capacity, not maximum production. Provide explicit description in the CDM-NMB on how design capacity serves as a limit to CERs.
5. Baseline alternatives should not be rejected outright in the CDM-NMB. Rather, the CDM-NMB should focus on how the baseline scenario should be evaluated and selected.
6. Description of leakage should be clarified.
7. Address the potentially large uncertainty with respect to N₂O measurement.

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

>> Remove all project-related references and improve consistency with CDM-NMB.

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).

>> It is the view of the Panel that NM0111 (originally developed for tertiary destruction) is better prepared with a potential for application to secondary destruction.



Signature of Meth Panel Chair

Date: 24/10/05 (Jean-Jacques Becker)



Signature of Meth Panel Vice-Chair

Date: 24/10/05 (José Miguez)

Information to be completed by the secretariat

F-CDM-NMmp doc id number	F-CDM-NMmp0117
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat	24 October 2005
Date of transmission to the Executive Board	24 October 2005
Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site	24 October 2005