

Final Ruling Regarding the Request for Issuance of “Chuanhua N2O Abatement Project” (1781)

The CDM-Executive Board decided to reject the request for issuance of certified emission reductions (CERs) for the above project activity on 15th April 2011, for the monitoring period 24/10/2008 - 15/11/2009, in accordance with “*Procedures for review of requests for issuance of CERs*”, version 1.3, EB 55 Annex 41 (the procedures). In accordance with paragraph 23 and 29 of the procedures, the rulings shall contain the reasons and rationale for the final decision, which are as follows:

- The project participant has calculated the project emission factor for a campaign including the data set for the parameters NCSG, VSG, OH, and NAP corresponding to the period when the secondary N2O abatement catalyst was not yet installed, and calculated the emission reductions based on the nitric acid production (NAP) for the entire project campaign, which includes a significant period without the secondary N2O abatement catalyst;
- Whereas AM0034 version 02 specifies that emission reductions over a specific campaign are determined as $ER = (EFBL - EFP) * NAP * GWPN2O$, and the campaign specific emission factor is calculated as $EF_n = PE_n / NAP_n$, where “NAP” is the nitric acid production for the *project campaign* and where project emissions are to be calculated based on project campaign measurements.
- From the above extract of the methodology, the use of data sets selected for parameters NCSG, VSG, OH and NAP should correspond to the period when the secondary N2O abatement catalyst has been installed and the emission reduction should be calculated based on the NAP which corresponds to the CDM project campaign period during which the dedicated N2O abatement (secondary) catalyst has already been installed and operating.
- In the situation that the project activity cannot follow the requirements of the applied methodology, the project participant and the DOE should fully demonstrate the conservativeness of the approach taken to calculate baseline emissions, project emissions and emission reductions. In doing so, the project participant and the DOE should account for any changes that may require recalculation of the baseline emission factor following the requirements of the applied methodology.

Please note, however, that, with paragraph 96 of the Report of the 28th EB Meeting, in cases where the reasons for rejection can be addressed by means of a revised verification report based on a revised monitoring report, the DOE may request permission (including explanation of reasons) to submit a revised request for issuance for the same monitoring period covered by the rejection. The Board will consider such a request at the subsequent EB meeting following that request in accordance with the procedures and decide on a case-by-case basis. In these cases the Board will provide further guidance, as appropriate. In cases where such a revised request for issuance is also rejected it shall not be possible to resubmit for a third time.

- - - - -



History of the document

Project 1781	Related to EB 60 Paragraph 99 (a) 15 April 2011	Decision Class: Ruling Document Type: Information Note Business Function: Issuance
------------------------	---	---