

CDM-PA0171-RULE01

Ruling note

Request for issuance for “Caieiras landfill
gas emission reduction”

Version 01.0



United Nations
Framework Convention on
Climate Change

1. The CDM-Executive Board decided to reject the request for issuance of certified emission reductions (CERs) for the above project activity on 4 October 2013 during its 75th meeting (paragraph 33), for the monitoring period of 01 Sep 2011 – 31 Mar 2012, in accordance with of the "Project Cycle Procedure", version 03.1, EB 70, Annex 4, paragraphs 223 and 224 (the procedure). According to paragraph 229 of the procedure, the rulings shall contain an explanation of the reasons and rationale for the final decision, which are as follows:
 - (a) The DOE (GLC) failed to validate whether the approach adopted to determine the flare efficiency was the most conservative assumption theoretically possible since it was not monitored as per frequency specified in the monitoring plan, in line with VVS version 3.0, paragraphs 234 (b) and 246 (a).
 - (b) The relevant requirements in full are:
 - (i) VVS version 3.0, Paragraph 234 (b): "The DOE shall determine whether:
(b) All parameters stated in the monitoring plan and relevant Board decisions have been monitored and updated as applicable, including: (i) Project emission parameters; (ii) Baseline emission parameters; (iii) Leakage parameters; (iv) Management and operational system: the responsibilities and authorities for monitoring and reporting are in accordance with the responsibilities and authorities stated in the monitoring plan."
 - (ii) VVS version 3.0, Paragraph 246 (a): "The verification report shall contain:
(a) An indication of whether data were not available because activity levels or non-activity parameters were not monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan as well as any actions taken by the DOE to ensure that the most conservative assumption theoretically possible has been made".
 - (iii) VVS version 3.0, Paragraph 252: "If the DOE identifies that the project participants have deviated from the registered monitoring plan and/or methodology, and where the provisions of appendix 1 of the Project standard do not apply, the DOE shall seek prior approval from the Board with respect to the acceptability of the deviations in accordance with the Project cycle procedure."
 - (c) The project participants proposed to adopt a 90% default efficiency for value for enclosed flares based on the most recent version (version 2.0.0) available from the "Project emissions from flaring" tool. However, the DOE has failed to demonstrate whether the proposed approach complies with the following additional requirements from the mentioned version of the tool when applying the default value for flare efficiency for enclosed flares:
 - (i) The temperature of the flare ($T_{EG,m}$) and the flow rate of the residual gas to the flare ($F_{RG,m}$) is within the manufacturer's specification for the flare ($SPEC_{flare}$) in minute m ; and
 - (ii) The flame is detected in minute m ($Flame_m$)"

- (iii) Further, for enclosed flares that are defined as low height flares, the flare efficiency in the minute m ($\eta_{\text{flare},m}$) shall be adjusted, as a conservative approach, by subtracting 0.1 from the efficiency as determined in Options A (default value) or B (measured flare efficiency);
 - (d) Additionally, the DOE should have assessed whether the approach proposed by the project participant configures a deviation from the monitoring plan which could be submitted along with the request for issuance according to paragraph 252 from VVS version 3.0.
2. Please note, however, that, in accordance with paragraph 235 of the PCP version 02.1, 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.

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
01.0	8 November 2013	Initial publication. See also EB75 meeting report, paragraph 33. Related to CDM project cycle procedure, version 03.1 (Paragraphs 223, 224 and 229)

Decision Class: Ruling
 Document Type: Ruling note
 Business Function: Issuance
 Keywords: E-0042, PA0171, calculations, calibration frequency requirements, deviation forms, monitoring plan, rejection of request for issuance