

CDM - Executive Board



Page 1

F-CDM-RtB



CDM: FORM FOR SUBMISSION OF "LETTER TO THE BOARD" (Version 01.1)

(To be used only by the Project Participants and other Stakeholders for submitting Letter to the Board as per Modalities and Procedures for Direct Communication with Stakeholders)

Name of the stakeholder' submitting this form (individual/organisation):	Cynthia Hendrayani
Address and Contact details of the individual submitting this Letter:	Address: Lt. 46 Menara BCA, Jl. M.H Thamrin 01, Jakarta 10310, Indonesia Telephone number: +62 21 2358 7431 E-mail Address: cynthia.hendrayani@kfw.de
Title/Subject (give a short title or specify the subject of your submission)	Clarification of Delineation of Type II and Type III Projects and Associated Methodologies
Please mention whether the Submitter	☐ Project participant
of the Form is:	☐ Other Stakeholder, please specify
Specify whether you want the Letter to	☐ To be treated as confidential
be treated as confidential ²):	☐ To be publicly available (UNFCCC CDM web site)
Purpose of the Letter to the Board:	
Please use the space below to describe the	he purpose for submitting Letter to the Board.
(Please tick only one of the four types in each submission	on)
Type I:	
⊠ Request Clarification	Revision of Existing Rules
Standards. Please spe	ecify reference
Procedures. Please sp	pecify reference
Guidance. Please spe	cify reference
EB61/Annex 2	l: "General Guidelines to SSC CDM Methodologies"
Forms. Please specify	reference
Others. Please specify	y reference
☐ Type II: Request for Introduction of	New Rules
☐ Type III: Provision of Information an	d Suggestions on Policy Issues

Note that DNAs and DOEs shall not use this form to submit letter to the Board.
 Note that the Board may decide to make this Letter and the Response publicly available

CDM - Executive Board



Page 2

Please use the space below to describe in detail the issue that needs to be clarified/revised or on which the response is requested from the Board as highlighted above. In doing this please describe the exact reference source including the version (if any).

Excerpts: Inquiry of appropriate application of project types under the General Guideline for SSC Methodology

Background Situation (the Project): Our project significantly reduces primary fuel intake for the same output (usable energy), and thus clearly an energy efficiency project. The overall fuel saving is below 180GWh, and thus can be classed as a Type II small scale project, and eligible under a number of Type II methodologies.

Much of the fuel saving is primarily achieved through recovery of existing waste-heat, and to a much smaller extent, via the slight efficiency improvement of switching from coal to waste heat and supplementary natural gas. The total emission reduction out of this activity is +/-75,000tCO2.

Question A: Clarification on Type II Limit.

Type II methodology (for example AMS-IID) or AMS-IIC) stipulate a maximum fuel saving of 180GWh per year in determining project eligibility. However, the General Guideline for SSC CDM Methodologies (Version 17), no longer contains similar provision and instead, paragraph 3(iii) defines type II eligibility as "60GWh per year", without specifying if this is calculated on energy supply side or energy demand side.

We would like to receive confirmation if the Project can continue to apply 180GWh fuel saving, as the limit for a Type II project, regardless of the lack of specification in the Guideline?

Question B: Impact of Methodology Combination to continual applicability of Type II Limit.

Within a single (inseparable) application/process/and technology, the Project reduces emissions in two distinctive ways:

- (a) **ER Source 1**: by using waste-heat to replace coal, contributing to 43,000tCO2 of emission reduction; and
- (b) **ER Source 2**: by using natural gas to replace coal, contributing to 32,000tCO2 of emission reduction;

For reason unclear to us, energy saving activities via waste-heat recovery (ER Source1) and fuel switching (ER Source 2) are each classed as Type III project. This rather "grey" definition unfortunately has a very strong implication to our activity. Whereas as a whole the Project is Type II, but the applicable accounting methods are combination of two Type III methodologies.

Furthermore the Guideline stipulates that "the sum of the size of components of a project activity belonging to the same type" must not exceed 60,000ktCO2. Thus, with both components adding to above 60,000tCO2, ER Source 2 must be excluded to meet the limit, and thus a 32,000tCO2 of credible emission reductions are un-claimable due to these delineation.

On the onset of the above described situation,

- 1. Can we continue to apply the 180GWh limit of energy saving for the whole "project activity", despite the presence of two Type III sub-components, considering the nature of the "project activity"?
- 2. Alternatively, could we apply a Type II methodology to calculate ER Source 2 (II.D) instead of type III methodology (IIIB), on justification that:
 - 1. the resulting GHG accounting method (for this sub-component) and results is exactly the same in either methodologies and thus resulting to no loss of fidelity in calculating and monitoring emission reduction, and
 - 2. whereas the sub-component (ER Source 1) is <u>primarily</u> fuel switching, the "project activity" is energy efficiency.

UNFCCC/CCNUCC







Page 3

Please use the space below to any mention any suggestions or information that you want to provide to the Board. In doing this please describe the exact reference source including the version (if any).

N/A

If necessary, list attached files containing relevant information (if any)

N/A

Section below to be filled in by UNFCCC secretariat

Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat

20 December 2011

2011-056-S

History of document

Version	Date	Nature of revision
01.1	09 August 2011	Editorial revision.
01	04 August 2011	Initial publication date.
Position Oloop Position:		

Decision Class: Regulatory **Document Type**: Form

Business Function: Governence