

Meth Panel recommendation

Comment category	Required changes	Location of change in NM0092	Description of change
A.1.b.ii.	1 Since the methodology can be utilized for many ore reducing facilities where electricity and fossil fuels are the energy sources, the assumption that emissions from fossil fuel is immaterial should be removed from the new methods to allow for a wider range of applicability. Quantity of individual onsite fossil fuel utilized should be quoted in relevant units in specific terms. Emissions from Onsite fossil fuel utilization should be left within the consideration of baseline emissions and mention of it in the discussions of leakages should be completely removed.	D.6.	Removed on two locations: Where system boundary setting excludes onsite fossil fuel emissions (following an assumption of their immateriality) equation 3 and equation 4 may be ignored from the analysis.
	1	D.8.	Also removed: On Site Fossil Fuel Leakage The expected materiality in the change of on site fossil fuel emissions can lead to fossil fuel use being excluded from system boundaries, and consequently from baseline analysis quantification of expected project and baseline emissions. However this assumption (that no material change to on site fossil fuel emissions occurs) could potentially lead to a source of leakage where the assumption is in practice actually incorrect. If on site fossil fuel emissions are excluded from system boundaries under the assumption that they will not be materially affected by the proposed CDM project, consumption shall be monitored (see the accompanying new monitoring methodology- NMM000XX).
	2 Methodology should request project proponents to make adequate references to relevant national and sectoral policies that may have impact on the use of the methods.	D.4.	Removed: This can be done by analysing the policies (subsidies, laws, economic trends), as well as the behaviour of companies involved in the same production sector in the region where the project will be implemented. Included: For example, if energy efficiency standards are being introduced by the national government, they should be incorporated in the available baseline scenario as part of the baseline determination process.

3 The conditions listed in the use of AM0008 relevant for the use of this new method should be included in the relevant section on applicability.

4 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:

- Clarify if the additionality tool is to be applied to each individual furnace (or other energysusing equipment) or to the project as a whole
- Clarify that information used to assess additionality will be publicly available
- Include a procedure to assess different baseline scenarios and choose between them
- Clarify which types of GHG and sources are to be included in the project boundary. The current text "any relevant CO2 emission associated with the activity that will be materially affected..." is too vague.

Clarify if the additionality tool is to be applied to each individual furnace (or other energysusing equipment) or to the project as a whole
Clarify that information used to assess additionality will be publicly available

Include a procedure to assess different baseline scenarios and choose between them
Clarify which types of GHG and sources are to be included in the project boundary. The current text "any relevant CO2 emission associated with the activity that will be materially affected..." is too vague.

5 The redrafting of the new methodology should focus some attention at showing why approved methods such as ACM0002, AM0008 and the consolidated tools are appropriate for this kind of projects.

A.3.

Included the following:

- Electricity and/or other fossil fuel consumption is reduced at metal smelting processes through the introduction of new technologies that lead to energy efficiency;
- No significant HFC, PFC and SF6 gases are released within the project boundary;
- The geographic and system boundaries for the relevant electricity grid can be clearly identified; and information on the characteristics of the grid is available.
- The local regulations/programs do not constrain the facility from using electricity from the grid or electricity generated with onsite fossil fuels;
- Only existing capacity within the project boundary is eligible and the project activity does not increase the lifetime of the existing facility during the crediting period (i.e. this methodology is applicable up to the end of the lifetime of existing facility if this is shorter than the crediting period).

See below:

D.3

Done (see B.I.c)

Remark: This follows from the reverence to the consolidated tool for additionality.

D.1

Done

D.5

Done

D.2

- Attention to the fact that ACM0002 is appropriate has been provided in D.2.
- The reverences to AM8 has been incorporated to make clear that this methodology is building on current guidance and principles from The meth Panel and The CDM E.B.

<p>6 A clear method for choosing baseline scenarios should be incorporated. It is not adequate to say that this will be done through the use of the consolidated tools.</p> <p>7 Ore reduction processes where HFC, PFC and SF6 gases are released should be excluded from projects fro which this method can be applied e.g. Aluminium Oxide reduction processes.</p> <p>8 The boundary for these kinds of projects should be more properly defined in the methodology</p> <p>9 Applicability conditions not currently included in the present draft of the methodology but which are elucidated A (1 b) above should be included in the redrafting.</p>	<p>D.1</p> <p>A.3.</p>	<p>Included: <u>Baseline scenario determination</u></p> <p>The baseline scenario alternatives should include all possible technological options that can achieve the required energy service within the existing production facility. The project participant shall exclude baseline options that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • do not comply with legal and regulatory requirements; or • depend on key resources such as fuels, materials or technology that are not available at the project site. The project participant shall provide evidence and supporting documents to exclude baseline options that meet the above mentioned criteria. <p>The possible alternative scenarios in absence of the CDM project activity would be as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed project activity without any revenues from the CDM; 2. 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; 3. Continuation of the current situation (no project activity or other alternatives undertaken). <p>Among the alternatives that do not phase any prohibitive barriers, the most econc</p> <p>Included : No significant HFC, PFC and SF6 gases are released within the project boundary; See B.I. 5 See all above</p>
<p>A.II.b.ii</p> <p>Ensure that the current version of the monitoring methodology is consistent with all the required changes to the baseline method;</p> <p>Include methods for monitoring onsite fossil fuel consumption. Utilize the method elucidated in AM0008 for this purpose.</p>		<p>Done</p> <p>Adressed in monitoringplan</p>