



Final Ruling Regarding the Request for Issuance of CERs of “Mianyang Landfill Gas Utilisation Project” (1664)

The CDM-Executive Board decided to reject the request for issuance of certified emission reductions (CERs) for the above project activity on 13 June 2012, for the monitoring period 25 Feb 11 - 24 Aug 11, submitted by CQC, in accordance with of the Procedures for review of requests for issuance of CERs, version 02.0, EB 64 Annex 4, paragraphs 20 and 29 (the procedures). According to paragraph 28 of the procedures, the rulings shall contain the reasons and rationale for the final decision, which are as follows:

- The DOE has failed to demonstrate that the project activity has complied with the conditions specified in AM_CLA_0047, the clarification to the “Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane for measuring the temperature of the exhaust gases of the flare”. The AM_CLA_047 provides a specific guidance in case the temperature is above 700°C for low height flares (less than 10 internal diameters), as used in the project activity (4 internal diameters), i.e., that methane composition profile should be measured once a year (traversing measuring procedure) at maximum stable flare capacity observed during that year and used to calculate flare efficiency instead of a single point measurement.
- The DOE has failed to demonstrate that the monitoring plan complies with the monitoring requirement of the manufacturer’s specifications for the operation of the flare and the required data and procedures to monitor these specifications. The PDD does not clearly state the manufacturer’s specifications for the operation of the flare as well as the required data and procedures to monitor these specifications, in accordance with the "Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane" which mentions that *"In case of use of the default value for the methane destruction efficiency, the manufacturer’s specifications for the operation of the flare and the required data and procedures to monitor these specifications should be documented in the CDM PDD"*. Thus it was not possible to assess whether the flow rate of residual gas did not exceed the required range in the manufacturer’s specifications.

Please note, however, that, the DOE may re-submit the request for issuance with revised documentation if the reasons for the rejection can be addressed by means of a revised verification report, based on a revised monitoring report.

History of the document

Project 1664	Related to EB 64 Annex 4 Paragraphs 20, 28, 29, 33 13 June 2012	Decision Class: Ruling Document Type: Ruling Note Business Function: Issuance
------------------------	--	--