 <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:	4 - 8 April 2005
Related F-CDM-NM document ID number (electronically available to EB members)	F-CDM-NM0077: “Shell Fuel Switching and Cogeneration Project”
Related F-CDM-NMex document ID number(s) (electronically available to EB members)	F-CDM-NMex0077: Creighton-Thomas / Paruchuri
Related F-CDM-NMpu document ID number(s) (electronically available to EB members)	F-CDM-NMpu0077: Harthan / Takao
<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:>> Fuel switching and changes in self-generation and/or cogeneration at an industrial facility	
<p>a. To approve this proposed methodology with minor changes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>i. Conditions under which this proposed methodology is applicable to other potential CDM project activities (e.g. project type, region, data availability):</p> <p>>></p> <p>ii. Minor changes:</p> <p>>></p>	
<p>b. To reconsider this proposed methodology, subject to required changes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>i. Conditions under which the proposed methodology is applicable to other potential projects (e.g. project type, region, data availability):</p> <p>>></p> <p>ii. Required changes:</p> <p>>></p> <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 methodology is well prepared upon approved methodologies AM0008, AM0014, ACM0002 and “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality”. However, the methodology is incomplete or insufficient in a number of key aspects, if project participant would like to re-submit a methodology they shall address the following issues:

- 1) The method should be revised so that it provides an explanation of how to identify and select a baseline if more than one probable scenario meets the criteria within the “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality”.
- 2) The rational for algorithms and formulae are not clearly presented though the methodology is based on ACM0002 for calculating emission factors of the grid.
- 3) Though the methodology provides a method for calculating *ex ante* and *ex post* baseline emissions, it is not clear when one should be used instead of the other or in what situations one approach is more appropriate.
- 4) The baseline scenario of continued use of current fuels and continued generation of heat and electricity is mentioned and all formulae or algorithms are provided for this scenario only in section D.6 (page 5 of CDM-NMB). In case the baseline scenario is different, e.g. the project activities are changes in equipment, this methodology is not applicable. Clarification regarding the algorithms and formulae for each of different project types e.g. co-generation and changes in self generation and fuel switch technologies is needed.
- 5) The methodology covers several categories of project activities, but the formulae or algorithms for calculating project emissions for all types of activities are merely depending on fuel consumption (see Eq. D.7.1. page7 of CDM-NMB). In order to apply this equation you have to apply several parameters. The methodology however does not specify how to determine the parameters.
- 6) The methodology proposes to use a so called “thermodynamic analysis” for determining ex-ante baseline emissions, but no detailed description of the procedure for implementing thermodynamic analysis is provided. Project participants need to indicate a best practice conservative approach for calculating emissions when using this analysis approach.
- 7) The use of a scaling parameter of 3 for a combined heat and electricity output needs to be justified more in detail.

(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: >> Fuel switching and changes in self-generation and/or cogeneration at an industrial facility

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:

>> This monitoring methodology is not approved because of the concerns in the baseline methodology above and the following issues:

- 1) Add Baseline Emission Factor in B.2.3 for monitoring the grid system, and all other data variables, as appropriate, of ACM0002 required for calculating the grid electricity emission factor will be monitored in accordance with ACM0002.
- 2) Consider adding other variables, as appropriate, for monitoring as provided in the approved monitoring methodology AM0008.
- 3) How to implement “thermodynamic analysis” shall be simply provided (refer to the reasons in baseline methodology).
- 4) Further clarification of QA/QC procedures in the methodology is required.

(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): >> Fuel switching and changes in self-generation and/or cogeneration at an industrial facility

(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:

>> The methodology is proposed for project activities involving one or more of the following components: a) fuel switch, b) electricity (co-)generation for self use, and c) electricity (co-)generation for a grid system. Other methodologies were proposed earlier for similar project activities either singly or in combination of similar activities, however, the earlier proposed / approved methodologies have certain limitations. It seems this methodology is proposed as a consolidation of some of the elements existing in approved methodologies and to remove those limitations.

Details of elements consolidated into this methodology are furnished below:

- 1) AM0008, approved methodology for industrial fuel switching from coal and petroleum fuels to natural gas. Large part of the proposed new methodology (NM0077) is similar to AM0008. AM0008 can be applied to project activities involving only single type element processes and not involving surplus electricity export to grid system or involving extension of capacity / lifetime of existing equipment. These limitations of AM0008 are removed by adding in the new proposed methodology the elements of co-generation of heat and electricity (plural energy sources), surplus electricity export to grid system and extension of capacity / lifetime. Further, AM0008 is applicable to only natural gas and the proposed new methodology seems to be applicable for other one or more low carbon intensive fuels than current fuels and also for current fuels where energy efficiency improvements are involved.

While consolidating the elements of AM0008, the following applicability criteria are ignored, even though they are relevant for the proposed new methodology:

- The local regulations / programs do not constrain the facility from using coal / petroleum fuels,
 - Use of coal / petroleum fuels is less expensive than natural gas per unit of energy in the country and sector, and
 - The facility would not have major efficiency improvements during the crediting period.
- 2) AM0014, approved baseline methodology for natural gas based package cogeneration. AM0014 has a limitation that it cannot be applied to project activities exporting electricity to a grid system. The proposed new methodology removes this limitation. Algorithms for determining the baseline, project, and leakage emissions in the new proposed methodology are almost similar to that of AM0014 except minor alterations in interpretations. AM0014 allows use of simplified methodology for small scale CDM project activities. This provision of AM0014 is incorporated in the new proposed methodology.
- 3) ACM0002, approved consolidated baseline methodology for grid connected electricity generation from renewable sources. The proposed new methodology incorporates ACM0002 entirely in its present form, since, electricity export to grid is also an eligible project activity to use the proposed methodology.
- 4) Simplified methodology for small scale CDM project activities. The proposed new methodology incorporates simplified methodology for small scale CDM project activities, in case the electricity displaced is less than or equal to 15 MW equivalent.
- 5) Consolidated tool for demonstration of additionality. The methodology incorporated draft tools for demonstration of additionality provided as Annex 3 to the report of the 15th meeting of CDM EB.

b) State the approach selected:

>> The proposed approach is as per paragraph 48 (a) of the CDM modalities and procedures: “Existing actual or historical emissions as applicable”.

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 chosen is applicable since the project activity may involve a combination of technologies so that no single technology can be used as a reference, as required in the second option. For the same reason, each project within the proposed set of applicable project activities is likely to be unique and cannot be readily identified with “similar” project activities elsewhere. The first option “existing actual or historical emissions” involves data that are uniquely determined, so that emissions and emissions reductions can be measured.

(2) Basis for determining the baseline scenario:

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

>> The method is not complete. The methodology listed few alternatives to the project activity and prescriptions to analyse all options, and added that the baseline scenario will need to be determined by the additionality tests taking into account legal requirements, economic and financial considerations and barriers, but it does not explain in detail how to select a baseline if more than one probably scenario meets the criteria.

In section D.6, it is explicitly mentioned that the baseline scenario is the continued use of current fuels and

continued generation of heat and electricity. All formulae or algorithms are provided for this scenario only. In case the baseline scenario is different then this methodology is not applicable. All identified alternatives or options in section D.1 may not use the same formulae. Some options may require entirely different set of formulae/algorithm.

The baseline calculations refer to the approved consolidated method ACM0002, however this method was developed for renewable energy resources and the justification for applying it in the context of the proposed methodology is not clearly explained.

Methods for calculating ex-ante and ex-post baselines are provided, but it is not clear when one should be used instead of the other or in what situations one approach is more appropriate. More clarification on this is required.

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

>> The rationale for algorithms and formulae are not clearly presented. As far as the fuel switch and existing electricity (co-)generation for self use are concerned, the basic underlying rationale is straight forward i.e. existing actual / historical emissions. For electricity (co-)generation for export to a grid system or avoiding grid electricity, the rationale could be either marginal or average, since, the methodology incorporates approved consolidated baseline methodology, ACM0002. But, the methodology provided neither elaboration nor formulae for the electricity component except a short description on incorporation of approved consolidated methodology ACM0002. Further clarification regarding the algorithms and formulae for each of the different project types e.g. co-generation and changes in self generation and fuel switch technologies would be useful.

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?

>> The methodology incorporated the “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality”. No further description or elaboration is included in the baseline methodology.

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

>> The basis for determining the baseline scenario is weak and not adequate. Further elaboration may be required, for example, a step-wise or systematic approach on how to determine the baseline scenario.

Assessing additionality through the application of the “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality” is not appropriate. As per the CDM EB guidance, the additionality shall be demonstrated through the application of "tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" provided as Annex 1 of Report of the 16th meeting of CDM EB or through the application of other tools.

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

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

>> The method has not been described adequately. The methodology provides many different options for developing a baseline, but it is not clear when each method should be applied. Further clarification and guidance regarding the different baseline options and their applicability to the different applicable project types (e.g. fuel switch, cogeneration and self-generation) is necessary. Additionally, a thermodynamic analysis is recommended although a procedure for implementing such an analysis is not described. Formulae indicating a best practice conservative approach for calculating emissions using this analysis approach is necessary. It is not easy to understand from the description how the proposed scaling factor to adjust for varied fuel consumption will be applied to the baseline. Clarification is necessary.

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):

>> Only with major changes will the methodology be appropriate.

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.

>> In general, yes. But not as the methodology is currently written.

Please explain:

>> See comments above.

(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):

>> Yes. The methodology does include algorithms and generic formulae that can be applied to other potential project activities. The description of the formulae and algorithms are entirely similar to that of the approved methodology AM0008. However, notations of variables and parameters are changed. The methodology provided four alternatives for determining baseline emissions, it is advisable to restrict the alternatives to only two.

The typical surrogate variable suggested in the methodology (taken from AM0008) is applicable only when baseline and project scenarios are similar as in AM0008 where only fuel switch is involved, and baseline and project fuel consumption are related in terms of consumption and efficiencies (constraint relation). For, situations where project scenarios are different from baseline scenarios, e.g. the baseline scenario is only heat generation and the project scenario is both capacity expansion and electricity co-generation, fuel consumption and efficiencies in baseline and project scenarios cannot be related. A different approach shall be followed.

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

>> The data covers all emissions from fuel use at the industrial site and includes fugitive methane emissions from fuel use and emissions from the transportation of supplies to the project site. The spatial scope of the data for electricity export component is left to the considerations in the Approved Consolidated Methodology ACM0002. The 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:

>> Fuel consumption data are required for three years prior to project implementation in order to determine ex ante baseline and project emissions. This is appropriate.

(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

>> Gas emissions of CO₂, CH₄ and N₂O associated with fuel use and combustion are included within the project boundary, including fugitive methane emissions and emissions from the transportation of fuels.

ii) Physical delineation

>> The project boundary is limited to the physical and geographical site of the industrial plant i.e. operation of existing facilities, fuel switch, heat and/or electricity (co-)generation occurs within in the project boundary. In case the existing industrial facility has a separate energy facility that supplies both heat and electricity to the rest of the industry, then project boundary is limited to that specific energy facility. This seems acceptable in view of the convenience of identification of sources and monitoring of energy flows.

b) Indicate whether this project boundary is appropriate:

>> Appropriate.

(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:*

>>

Implicit assumption:

- Data availability for 3 years prior to project implementation (for fuel consumption or thermodynamic analysis). Existing equipment has sufficient remaining life to cover the crediting period and continue to operate without modifications.

Problematic assumptions:

- A scaling parameter of 3 for a combined heat and electricity output (see (6) b) below).
- Emissions are calculated on the assumption of absolute fuel consumption in both the project and baseline case. A scaling factor can be used to account for variations in consumption but it is not clear how this should be applied to the baseline.

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

>> The identification of a scaling parameter of 3 for a combined heat and electricity output appears to be totally random.

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

>> The assumptions / parameters are adequate, but clarification for some assumptions and parameter are not adequate (see comments above).

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

>> For fuel switch activities, the data source is the industrial facility.

Emission factor data are:

- Carbon dioxide emissions factor per unit of fuel - National inventory or direct measurement or IPCC default values
- Methane emission factor per unit energy of fuel - IPCC default values
- Nitrous oxide emission factor per unit energy of fuel - IPCC default value
- Baseline emission factor for grid - refer to ACM0002 or small scale methods

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

>> In general yes.

f) *State possible data gaps:*

>> It would be useful if the method included data on:

- The capacity and lifetime of the proposed co-generation and proposed changes to fuel switching & self generation technologies.
- The capacity of the grid.
- The state and trend of the grid i.e. whether there is more supply than demand or more demand than supply in the grid, to provide a complete assessment of the power generation replacement achieved by the projects that are connected to a grid.

(7) Assessment of uncertainties:

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

i) The basis for determining the baseline scenario:

>> Uncertainties are not clearly defined.

ii) Algorithms/formulae:

>> The uncertainties in formulae and their applicability are not made.

iii) Key assumptions:

>> An assessment regarding key assumption uncertainties is not clearly made.

iv) Data:

>> An assessment of the key data used for the formulae is made.

b) State whether the uncertainties presented are reasonable:

>> The uncertainties assessed are incomplete.

(8) Leakage:

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

>> The methodology considers two types of leakages due to the project activity. One is fugitive emissions from fuel production and distribution in both baseline and project scenarios. Since they are likely to be small compared to other components of baseline and project emissions, the methodology provided for qualitative estimation of leakage based on IPCC default values in case of non-availability of data and diversities / uncertainties. The methodology provided to ignore fugitive emissions from coal mining in the baseline scenario if they are negligible.

The other type is CO₂ emissions of fuel consumption for fuel transport, where applicable. The leakage estimation is based on IPCC default values. The treatment of leakage is entirely similar to that of approved methodology AM0008.

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

>> The treatment of leakage is appropriate and adequate.

(9) Transparency and “conservativeness”:

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

>> Yes, but not completely.

b) State whether the baseline methodology is conservative:

>> As the baseline is currently written it is not conservative, because it comprises many elements, uncertainties and alternative procedures. The methodology may be modified to restrict the number of alternative procedures.

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

>>

Strengths:

- The methodology is straight forward and easy to adopt, and is applicable to a wide range of activities in industrial facilities that consume heat and/or electricity, irrespective of the region.
- The methodology attempts to create a general approach that builds on existing approved methodologies.

Weaknesses:

- The method is not clearly described and therefore open to interpretation by project developers.
- Additionally data is missing and thus the conservativeness of the approach is questionable.

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

>> The methodology requires analysis of legal requirements and obligations, environmental impact assessment, laws, regulations, whether any special national incentives and sectoral policies are available to promote similar activities. These requirements as part of the methodology are sufficient, however, much more elaboration is required on how national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances have been taken into account. Guidance given by the Executive Board in this respect vide Annex 3 of Report of 16th meeting of EB shall be incorporated in the methodology.

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

>> The methodology can be applied across a wide range of similar project activities e.g. fuel switch, co-generation and self generation, under the Energy Industries category (Sectoral scope 1) in industrial facilities irrespective of the regions. Various types of industries that consume energy such as refineries, chemical, paper, cement, fertilizer etc. can adopt the methodology. With minor modifications, the methodology may be applied to end-use energy efficiency improvement activities that result in saving of existing fuel and/or electricity consumption.

(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:

>> No other sources of information have been used.

b) Indicate any further comments:

>> Though not mentioned explicitly or implicitly, the methodology may be applied to energy efficiency activities that result savings in current fuel and/or electricity consumption.

II. Proposed new monitoring methodology (specify title here): >> Fuel switching and changes in self-generation and/or cogeneration at an industrial facility

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 methodology requires the monitoring of:

- fuel used to produce heat and/or electricity for use at an industrial facility or for sale to a power grid. Emissions are directly related to fuel consumption at the industrial facility, so that only project fuel consumption needs to be monitored in order to determine project emissions.
- emissions in the grid using the consolidated monitoring methodology ACM0002 “Consolidated monitoring methodology for zero emissions grid connected electricity generation from renewable sources.”

An alternative approach for a dynamic baseline is also described that requires the monitoring of heat output, electricity demand, or other surrogate variable representing industrial production. The methodology AM0008 “Industrial fuel switching from coal and petroleum fuels to natural gas without extension of capacity and lifetime of the facility” is referred to as an example of how this can be done. Leakage emissions are small and would be estimated without the need for additional monitoring.

(2) Key assumptions/parameters:

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

>> Assumption that the methods AM0008 and AM0002 are applicable to the proposed project activities. Further justification of the compatibility of these methods is required. Existing equipment at the industrial facility is presumed to have a lifetime longer than the crediting period of the project.

Problematic assumptions:

- Ex-post baseline emissions may be considered fixed based on historical data on fuel consumption trends, this will not require any monitoring. This is problematic since it is unrealistic that baseline emissions will remain constant due to expected changes in production and activities over time. Therefore the scaling factor should be used in all projects.
- A scaling parameter of three is used for projects that result in changes to heat and electricity generation as part of the primary energy concept. However, the use of the scaling number three is arbitrary and further justification as to why three is used is required.

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

>> Not all the assumptions are arrived at in a transparent manner (see comments above).

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

>> The assumptions and parameters require some changes.

(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):*

>>

- Electricity supplied to the grid - sales data from the industrial facility or calculations.
- Electricity purchased from the grid - purchase forms from the industrial facility or calculations.
- Efficiency of boiler at the industrial facility - measured.
- Emissions factors - official statistics and/or IPCC default values.

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

>> In general, yes. But, data are not adequate.

c) *State possible data gaps:*

>> It would be useful if the method included data on:

- The capacity and lifetime of the proposed co-generation and proposed changes to fuel switching & self generation technologies.
- The capacity of the grid.
- The state and trend of the grid i.e. whether there is more supply than demand or more demand than supply in the grid, to provide a complete assessment of the power generation replacement achieved by the projects that are connected to a grid.

(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:*

>>

- Additional data variables as listed in the approved methodology AM0008 may be included as appropriate, to increase the accuracy of emission reductions.
- Further clarification of how to use the Thermodynamic Analysis and clarification of ex post and ex ante procedures for different project types would improve the methodology.

b) *State whether the proposed methodology is appropriate for the referred proposed project*

<p>activity and the referred project context (described in Sections A-E of the draft CDM-PDD and submitted along with CDM-NMM):</p> <p>>> After major changes it might be appropriate.</p> <p>c) State whether this proposed monitoring methodology is compatible with the proposed baseline methodology described in CDM-NMB of the draft CDM-PDD:</p> <p>>> After major changes it could be compatible.</p>
<p>(5) Leakage (please elaborate, if appropriate):</p> <p>>></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fugitive CH₄ emissions from fuel production and transport, and CO₂ emissions from fuel transportation are categorized as leakage. Emissions from fuel production/transportation is counted only if the fuel is produced/transported in a non-Annex I country. Since emissions associated with leakage are either very small or negligible compared to baseline and project emissions, they are estimated ex ante based on IPCC default values, this seems appropriate and adequate. However, the methodology shall specify a minimum percentage below which monitoring can be excluded.
<p>(6) Quality assurance and control procedures (please explain):</p> <p>>> No quality assurance and control procedures are provided in the methodology. Further clarification is required.</p>
<p>(7) Potential strengths and weaknesses of the proposed monitoring methodology (please explain):</p> <p><u>Strengths:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The methodology is simple and easy to implement in terms of requiring few parameters for monitoring, and Could be applicable to a wide variety of projects across regions. <p><u>Weakness:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is difficult to follow and requires major changes to make it implementable (see comments above).
<p>(8) Applicability of the proposed methodology across project types and regions (please indicate):</p> <p>>> The methodology intends to be applicable for all co-generation and for changes made to fuel switching and self-generation technology, irrespective of the region.</p>
<p>(9) Any other comments:</p> <p>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:</p> <p>>> No other sources of information have been used.</p> <p>b) Indicate any further comments:</p> <p>>> No further comments.</p>

	
Signature of Meth Panel Chair	
Date: 15/04/2005	(Jean-Jacques Becker)
 Signature of Meth Panel Vice-Chair	
Date: 15/04/2005	(José Miguez)
Information to be completed by the secretariat	
F-CDM-NMmp doc id number	F-CDM-NMmp - NM0077
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat	15 April 2005
Date of transmission to the EB	15 April 2005
Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site	15 April 2005