

**CDM-MP69-A09**

## Draft Large-scale Methodology

---

# AM0052: Increased electricity generation from existing hydropower stations through Decision Support System optimization

Version 03.0

Sectoral scope(s): 01

DRAFT



**United Nations**  
Framework Convention on  
Climate Change

## COVER NOTE

### 1. Procedural background

1. The Executive Board of the clean development mechanism (CDM) (hereinafter referred to as the Board), at its eighty-second meeting (EB82), considered a concept note on simplification of methodologies including digitization to reduce transaction costs and adopted the workplan for this project, and the Board agreed to the work on simplification in monitoring in small-scale and large-scale methodologies.
2. At its eighty-seventh meeting (EB87) the Board approved the “Methodological tool: Baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption and monitoring of electricity generation” and requested the MP to review approved methodologies to identify the ones that could refer to the revised tool, with the view to ensuring consistent guidance in the methodologies and the methodological tools. The Board also requested the MP to recommend revisions to related methodologies where required for its consideration at a future meeting.

### 2. Purpose

3. The purpose of the draft revision is to improve the consistency of monitoring requirements and to reduce transaction costs associated with monitoring electricity by referring to the recently revised “Methodological tool: Baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption and monitoring of electricity generation”.

### 3. Key issues and proposed solutions

4. No issues identified.

### 4. Impacts

5. The revision of the methodology, if approved, will simplify and streamline the requirements in monitoring for electricity generation and consumption, thus reducing the monitoring costs of the applicable projects.

### 5. Proposed work and timelines

6. The Meth Panel, at its sixty-ninth meeting, agreed on the draft revision of the methodology. After receiving public inputs on the document, the Meth Panel will continue working on the revision of the methodology, at its next meeting, for recommendation to the Board at a future meeting of the Board.



6. **Recommendations to the Board**
7. Not applicable (call for public inputs).

DRAFT



<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2. SCOPE, APPLICABILITY, AND ENTRY INTO FORCE .....</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1. Scope .....	6
2.2. Applicability .....	6
2.3. Entry into force .....	7
<b>3. NORMATIVE REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1. Selected approach from paragraph 48 of the CDM modalities and procedures .....	7
<b>4. DEFINITIONS .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>5. BASELINE METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>8</b>
5.1. Project boundary .....	8
5.2. Procedure for identification of the most plausible baseline scenario.....	8
5.2.1. Step I: Identify alternatives to the project activity .....	9
5.2.2. Step II: Identify the most likely scenario (the baseline scenario) from the identified alternatives.....	9
5.3. Additionality .....	9
5.3.1. Sub-step 3a. Identify barriers that would prevent the implementation of type of the proposed project activity: .....	10
5.3.2. Step 4. Common practice analysis: .....	10
5.3.3. With respect to Steps 2, 3 and 4:.....	11
5.4. Baseline emissions.....	11
5.4.1. Step 1: Collect data for estimating the baseline flow-output relationship.....	11
5.4.2. Step 2: Estimate weekly baseline flow for each week (generating units and spill).....	12
5.4.3. Step 3: Establish the flow-output (generation) relationship.....	13
5.4.4. Step 4: Determine baseline power generation .....	14
5.4.5. Step 5: Calculation of project electricity generation .....	15
5.4.6. Step 6: Baseline emissions.....	15
5.5. Project emissions .....	16

---

5.6.	Leakage.....	16
5.7.	Emission reduction.....	16
5.8.	Changes required for methodology implementation in 2nd and 3rd crediting periods.....	16
5.9.	Data and parameters not monitored.....	16
<b>6.</b>	<b>MONITORING METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>6.1.</b>	<b>Monitoring procedures .....</b>	<b>21</b>
6.2.	Data and parameters monitored.....	22
<b>APPENDIX.</b>	<b>ESTIMATION PROCESS FOR STANDARD ERROR (SE) .....</b>	<b>28</b>

## 1. Introduction

1. The following table describes the key elements of the methodology:

**Table 1. Methodology key elements**

<b>Typical projects</b>	Increased annual generation of electricity through the introduction of a Decision Support System (DSS) that optimizes the operation of the existing hydropower facility/ies, both run-of-the-river and reservoir-based type, connected to a grid
<b>Type of GHG emissions mitigation action</b>	Renewable energy: Displacement of electricity that would have been provided by more-GHG-intensive means

## 2. Scope, applicability, and entry into force

### 2.1. Scope

2. This methodology is applicable to project activities that implement fossil fuel trigeneration systems, which produce electricity, steam and chilled water as final outputs to supply respectively electricity, heat and cooling demands in an industrial facility.

### 2.2. Applicability

3. This methodology is applicable to existing grid-connected hydropower systems that may include multiple hydro generation units linked in a cascade, including both run of the river and reservoir-based units, where the project activity increases annual electricity generation through the introduction of a Decision Support System (DSS)<sup>1</sup> that optimizes the operation of the existing hydropower facility/facilities.
4. The methodology is applicable under the following conditions:
  - (a) Where the operation of hydropower systems is not currently optimized using a DSS, with optimization controls or modeling;
  - (b) Where, at a minimum, three complete year of recorded data is available to establish the baseline relationship between water flow and power generation;
  - (c) Where power generation units, covered under the CDM project activity, have not undergone and will not undergo significant upgrades beyond basic maintenance (e.g. replacement of runners) that affect the generation capacity and/or expected operational efficiency levels during the crediting period;
  - (d) Where no major changes to reservoir size (e.g. increase of dam height) or to other key physical system elements (e.g. canals, spillways) that would affect

<sup>1</sup> A DSS is an integrated set of computer programs (modules) that use forecasting methods and both optimization and simulation techniques to optimize the long-term and short-term benefits of power system operation.

water flows within the project boundary, have been implemented during the baseline data period or will be implemented during the crediting period;

- (e) Where the project activity only includes the optimization of generation units that generated and supplied power to the electricity system during the year(s) for which historical data for the baseline was collected;
- (f) Where either no additional hydro power units are located downstream of the last hydropower unit within the project boundary or the first hydropower unit downstream the project boundary has the capacity to regulate at least 24 hours of maximum flow from upstream.<sup>2</sup>

### 2.3. Entry into force

5. Not applicable (call for public input).

## 3. Normative references

6. This baseline methodology is based on the NM0186 methodology "Increased electricity generation from existing hydropower stations through Decision Support System optimization" submitted by Quality Tonnes and the World Bank Carbon Unit.

7. For more information regarding the proposals and their consideration by the Executive Board please refer to case NM0186 <http://cdm.unfccc.int/goto/MPappmeth>

8. This methodology also refers to the latest approved versions of the following tools:

- (a) the approved "Tool to calculate emission factor for an electricity system"; and the latest version of the;
- (b) "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality"<sup>3</sup>;
- (c) "Assessment of the validity of the original/current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period";
- (d) "Baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption and monitoring of electricity generation".

### 3.1. Selected approach from paragraph 48 of the CDM modalities and procedures

9. "Existing actual or historical emissions, as applicable".

## 4. Definitions

10. The definitions contained in the Glossary of CDM terms shall apply.

---

<sup>2</sup> Twenty four hour (24 hrs) capacity in cubic meters (m<sup>3</sup>) = Maximum observed annual flow (m<sup>3</sup>/s) \*24 hr\*3600 s/hr \* 0.5. Note that factor 0.5 reflects that the storage must be 50% of the flow volume to regulate the inflow to the average daily value.

<sup>3</sup> Please refer to: <<http://cdm.unfccc.int/goto/MPappmeth>>

## 5. Baseline methodology

### 5.1. Project boundary

11. The project site includes all of the hydropower generating units for which the DSS tool will be installed. The **spatial** extent of the project boundary includes the project site and all power plants connected physically to the electricity system to which the hydropower generating units in the project site is connected.
12. For the baseline determination, project participants shall only account for CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from electricity generation in fossil fuel fired power plants that are displaced due to the CDM project activity. The grid emission factor will be calculated according to approved "Tool to calculate emission factor for an electricity system" The grid boundary for the project is as described in the latest version of approved "Tool to calculate emission factor for an electricity system".

**Table 2. Emission sources included in or excluded from the project boundary**

Source		Gas	Included	Justification/Explanation
Baseline		CO <sub>2</sub>	Yes	CO <sub>2</sub> is emitted when fossil fuels are burned to generate electricity. The project activity would displace those fossil fuels with enhanced hydropower output
		CH <sub>4</sub>	No	-
		N <sub>2</sub> O	No	-
Project activity		CO <sub>2</sub>	No	In terms of project emissions, the project is enhancing the use of existing hydropower capacity to generate additional hydropower. No fossil fuel emissions will be used to generate this additional electricity and thus there will be no project emissions
		CH <sub>4</sub>	No	-
		N <sub>2</sub> O	No	-

### 5.2. Procedure for identification of the most plausible baseline scenario

13. The methodology determines the baseline scenario through the following steps:
  - (a) Step I: Identify all alternatives to the proposed CDM project activity that deliver a similar level of additional generation to the grid;
  - (b) Step II: Identify the most likely scenario (the baseline scenario) from the alternatives identified in Step I using the investment and barriers analysis steps (Step 2 and Step 3, respectively), as defined in the most recent version of the "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality", together with additional guidance provided for these steps in the Additionality section below.

### **5.2.1. Step I: Identify alternatives to the project activity**

14. Project participants shall identify realistic and credible alternatives(s) to the project activity including the following possible alternatives:
  - (a) *Alternative #1*: Status Quo. Continuation of the current water management practices;
  - (b) *Alternative #2*: Changes to hydro system operation or facilities (other than the project), including dam height, turbine replacement, spillway dimensions, and other changes that would materially affect the flow-output relationship;
  - (c) *Alternative #3*: The proposed project activity, not undertaken as a CDM project activity.
15. The alternatives proposed in this Section are only indicative. Project proponents should propose other possible alternatives that are reasonably foreseeable.

### **5.2.2. Step II: Identify the most likely scenario (the baseline scenario) from the identified alternatives**

16. Project participants, after identifying the alternatives to the project activity shall apply the barrier analysis and investment analysis as outlined in Steps 2 and 3 of the most recent version of the “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality” as further elaborated in the Additionality section below.
17. The baseline scenario should be the alternative that faces the fewest barriers among the identified alternatives in Step I. If more than one alternative remains subsequent to barrier analysis, then the baseline scenario will be identified using investment analysis. The baseline scenario is then the alternative that is economically most viable as estimated using Step II of additionality assessment tool. Supporting documentation and evidence demonstrating the barriers and financial constraints of each of the non-baseline alternatives faces shall be presented to the DOE.
18. National/Sectoral Policies: In cases where actively enforced laws mandating the use of Decision Support Tools are in place, the project activity not undertaken as a CDM project (Alternative 3) will be considered the baseline scenario.
19. This methodology is only applicable if Alternative 1, i.e. continuation of current water management practices, is the most likely baseline scenario.

### **5.3. Additionality**

20. The project should be demonstrated as additional using the most recent version of the “*Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality*”, together with additional guidance provided below:

**5.3.1. Sub-step 3a. Identify barriers that would prevent the implementation of type of the proposed project activity:**

21. Establish that there are barriers that would prevent the implementation of proposed project activity from being carried out if the project activity was not registered as a CDM activity. Such barriers may include, among others:

(a) Investment barriers:

- (i) Financing capacity of the project proponent vis-à-vis other investment opportunities;
- (ii) Debt funding may not be available for innovative project activity;
- (iii) Lack of access to international capital markets due to real or perceived risks associated with domestic or foreign direct investment in the country where the CDM project activity is to be implemented;
- (iv) Subsidies may exist that inhibit investments in energy efficiency;
- (v) The electric utility may not recover through revenues the cost of generation, and this could inhibit major investments;
- (vi) Potential lack of access to credit due to poor revenues; or,
- (vii) Inability of the management to dedicate resources, etc for implementation of the CDM project activity.

(b) Technological/lack of familiarity barriers:

- (i) Lack of familiarity or first-of-its-kind project significantly hinders the ability to implement the proposed project activity;
- (ii) Skilled and/or properly trained labor to operate and maintain the technology is not available;
- (iii) Education/training institution for training operators are not present in the host country leading to equipment disrepair and malfunctioning; or,
- (iv) Lack of infrastructure such as appropriate meters and communications links for implementation of the technology.

**5.3.2. Step 4. Common practice analysis:**

22. The project developer may interview electricity utilities, in the selected country or region, and the manufacturers of the DSS software/optimization technology to assess how common is the CDM project activity.

23. The CDM project activity is not a common practice if:

- (a) the project type has not been implemented in the country (or region for large countries);
- (b) companies that provide the technology, used in the CDM project activity, have minimal business in the country where the CDM project is being implemented; and

(c) utility managers are unfamiliar with this type of project.

24. If the optimization has taken place somewhat frequently elsewhere in the country or region, the project developer would need to show the extenuating circumstances that made such project happen and how it would not be replicable.

### **5.3.3. With respect to Steps 2, 3 and 4:**

25. For the investment, barrier and common practice analyses, project participants should provide the following evidence to the DOE:

(a) Letters from the electricity utility implementing the proposed CDM project activity indicating their unfamiliarity with the hydro-optimization technology;

(b) Letters from one or more technology providers/developers that indicate average penetration rates in developed markets and whether similar projects have been developed in the country or region;

(c) Financial statements indicating the revenue losses and overall financial health of the electricity utility implementing the CDM project activity;

(d) Least-cost capacity expansion planning or feasibility studies, if available, that show that electricity utility implementing the proposed CDM project activity has not considered the CDM project activity as an option in these studies. This could include a list of priority investments for the utility. If the list does not include hydro-optimization but includes other projects, it shows that the CDM enables bringing the proposed project forward;

(e) Existing tariff rates or other information that show the income received from additional hydropower generation from implementing the CDM project activity would not translate into additional income, thus making the investment not cost-effective (for the investment analysis).

## **5.4. Baseline emissions**

26. The following six steps are used to estimate baseline emissions. If generating units within the project site, where DSS is implemented, do not share a connected water source, the estimation of the baseline emissions will be sum of the baseline emissions estimated using Steps 1 through 6 for each water course separately.

27. A Data Book shall be prepared prior to the implementation of the Decision Support System containing all functional relationships (charts) for each generating unit, including the flow-generation functions.

### **5.4.1. Step 1: Collect data for estimating the baseline flow-output relationship**

28. The flow-output relationship is developed from baseline data collected for each generating unit and spillway within the project boundary, as described in the steps below. All data available within the most recent three calendar years must be collected and applied to the methodology below. In cases where less than three full years is used, the DOE must verify the unavailability of data. A minimum of one calendar year's data must be used, as required by the applicability conditions.

#### 5.4.2. Step 2: Estimate weekly baseline flow for each week (generating units and spill)

29. The weekly flow ( $Q_x$ ) is sum of the flow through generating unit(s) and the spillway(s), estimated on an hourly basis, as follows:

$$Q_x = \sum_{hpu=1}^N \sum_{h=1}^{168} Q_{hpu,h} + \sum_{SW=1}^M \sum_{h=1}^{168} Q_{SW,h} \quad \text{Equation (1)}$$

Where:

$Q_x$	=	Flow during week 'x' for each generation site (m <sup>3</sup> /week).
$Q_{hpu,h}$	=	Flow through generation unit 'hpu' during hour 'h' in week 'x' estimated using relationship provided in equation 2 (m <sup>3</sup> /hour)
$Q_{SW,h}$	=	Flow over the spillway 'SW' for hour 'h' during week 'x', estimated using equation 3 (m <sup>3</sup> /hour).
$N$	=	Total number of hydro power generation units 'hpu' within the project site on the same water course (number).
$M$	=	Total number of spillways within the project site on the same water course (number).

##### 5.4.2.1. Step 2a: Deduce flow through generating units

30. The hourly flow through each generating unit is determined using the records of measured power output for that hour and the characteristic specifications of the generating unit. A curve for each HPU known as a "Hill Diagram"<sup>4</sup> will be constructed that accurately pinpoints its *power* versus *flow* and *head*. The form of the flow-generation curve for each generating unit is represented by a third order, polynomial equation that relates measured power output to measured head and flow, as follows.

$$EG_{hpu,h} = a + b \times Q_{hpu,h} + c \times Q_{hpu,h}^2 + d \times Q_{hpu,h}^3 \quad \text{Equation (2)}$$

$$a = a_1 + a_2 \times H_{hpu} + a_3 \times H_{hpu}^2 \quad \text{Equation (3)}$$

$$b = b_1 + b_2 \times H_{hpu} + b_3 \times H_{hpu}^2 \quad \text{Equation (4)}$$

$$c = c_1 + c_2 \times H_{hpu} + c_3 \times H_{hpu}^2 \quad \text{Equation (5)}$$

$$d = d_1 + d_2 \times H_{hpu} + d_3 \times H_{hpu}^2 \quad \text{Equation (6)}$$

<sup>4</sup> Design of Small Dams, US Bureau of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Chapter IX, Spillways

Where:

$EG_{hpu,h}$	=	Observed power output of 'hpu' unit for hour 'h' during week 'x' (MWh).
$a, b, c, d$	=	Coefficients that are a function of head, calculated as per equations above
$Q_{hpu,h}$	=	Flow through generation unit 'hpu' during hour 'h' ( $m^3$ /hour).
$a_i, b_i, c_i, \text{ and } d_i$	=	The power polynomial coefficients for each generating unit based on "hill diagram" information provided by the owner or manufacturer
$H_{hpu}$	=	Head acting on the generating unit hpu (headwater level less tail water level) for each hour 'h' (m).

#### 5.4.2.2. Step 2b: Calculate spillway flows.

31. Spillway flows are calculated with the application of a "rating equation" which relates the flow through the spillway gate opening to monitored parameters - the water level and the gate opening<sup>5</sup>. Rating equation provided by the owner and/or equipment manufacturer shall be used for estimating the spillway flows. For example, a typical equation for spillway overflow with a radial gate partially open is:

$$Q_{SW,h} = C_o \times L_e \times O \times (WL_h - E_{sill})^E \times 3600 \quad \text{Equation (7)}$$

Where:

$Q_{SW,h}$	=	Hourly spillway flow ( $m^3$ /hour).
$C_o$	=	Known coefficient taken from manufacturer/owner data.
$L_e$	=	Length of the gate measured as built (m).
$O$	=	Vertical opening (m).
$WL_h$	=	Water level during hour 'h' (m).
$E_{sill}$	=	Elevation of the sill measured as built (m)
$E$	=	Known coefficient taken from manufacturer/owner data.

32. Spillway flows will be calculated for each hour and aggregated weekly over the year. These values are used in Step 3.

#### 5.4.3. Step 3: Establish the flow-output (generation) relationship

33. Tabulate weekly total flow (generation flow and spillway flow) estimated in the previous step along with recorded power generation during the corresponding week of the baseline period. The data plot shall be visually inspected to ensure that the data is uniformly distributed over the range of weekly total flow recorded.<sup>6</sup> Estimate the

<sup>5</sup> Design of Small Dams, US Bureau of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Chapter IX, Spillways Water Resources Engineering, Linsley and Franzini, McGraw Hill

<sup>6</sup> If the data is not uniformly distributed then the project participants shall submit a request for deviation, as per procedures for request for deviation, explaining why the non-uniform distribution data does not affect the robustness of estimation of relationship.

relationship between *total weekly flow* and *total weekly generation* for the baseline through regression analysis using polynomial equation form, taking into account guidance provided by the Board<sup>7</sup>. The estimated equation should be of the form

$$EG_x = f(Q_x) = a + b_1xQ_x + b_2xQ_x^2 + \dots + b_nxQ_x^n \quad \text{Equation (8)}$$

$$EG_x = \sum_{hpu=1}^N \sum_{h=1}^{168} (EG_{hpu,h}) \quad \text{Equation (9)}$$

Where:

$EG_x$  = Recorded value of power generation for week 'x' estimated as sum of recorded observation of power generation in each of the units 'hpu' for hour 'h' in the week 'x' (MWh).

$Q_x$  = Estimated value of flow in the week 'x', estimated as per Step 2 (m<sup>3</sup>/week).

$a, b_1, \dots, b_n$  = coefficients of the estimated regression equation

34. The estimated relationship should be monotonous in nature, i.e. the slope of the function should be non-negative at all points of the function.<sup>8</sup> The criteria for determining the degree of polynomial 'n' is as follows:

- (a) The value 'n' for which the adjusted R<sup>2</sup> of the equation is highest;
- (b) Estimates of parameters a, b<sub>1</sub>, ..., b<sub>n</sub> are significant at the 5 per cent confidence level.

#### 5.4.4. Step 4: Determine baseline power generation

35. Use the flow-output relationship defined in Equation 4 to estimate baseline electricity output during each week of the project period ( $EG_{BL,x}$ ), and sum this for each week of the year 'y'.

$$EG_{BL,y} = \sum_{x=1}^{52} EG^{B1} \quad \text{Equation (10)}$$

$$EG_x^{Bl} = f(Q_x^{Pr}) + 1.96xSE(f(Q_x^{Pr})) \quad \text{Equation (11)}$$

Where:

$EG^{B1}$  = Estimated electricity that would have been generated corresponding to flow  $Q_x^{Pr}$  estimated in the week 'x' of project crediting period 'y' (MWh).

<sup>7</sup> Please see Annex 7 of EB21 meeting report.

<sup>8</sup> The function  $EG = f(Q)$  is **monotone** if, whenever  $Q_x \leq Q_y$ , then  $EG_x \leq EG_y$ .

$Q_x^{Pr}$  = Flow for week 'x' measured during the project year "y" (m<sup>3</sup>/week).

$SE (EG_x^{Bl})$  = Standard error of the estimate  $EG_x^{Bl}$ . The procedure for estimating  $SE$  is given in Appendix I (MWh).

36. Note that due to the inclusion of the second term in Equation 7, there is only a 5 per cent chance that the estimated baseline output would be understated by the equation. Therefore, there would only be a 5 per cent chance that weekly energy generation gains would be overestimated.
37. To be conservative, the project developer will not seek to claim credit for any weekly project results, in which the flow ( $Q_x^{Pr}$ ) falls outside the recorded boundaries of the baseline data<sup>9</sup>.
38. Exclusion of any outlier data points should be documented with a clear rationale (atypical circumstances such as blackouts, major equipment malfunction and repair) and validated and/or verified by the DOE. In the project year, the project developer will not be able to claim any emission reductions in weeks where major atypical circumstances occur.

#### 5.4.5. Step 5: Calculation of project electricity generation

39. The total electricity generation for the project  $EG_y$  in year y is calculated as follows:

$$EG_{Pr,y} = \sum_{x=1}^{52} \sum_{hpu=1}^N EG_{Pr,hpu,x} \quad \text{Equation (12)}$$

Where:

$EG_{Pr,y}$  = Electricity generated during the project in year 'y' (MWh).

$EG_{Pr,hpu,x}$  = Total electricity generated by unit 'hpu' in week 'x' of year 'y' (MWh).

#### 5.4.6. Step 6: Baseline emissions

$$BE = (EG_{Pr,y} - EG_{Bl,y}) \times EF_y \quad \text{Equation (13)}$$

Where:

$EF_y$  = CO<sub>2</sub> emissions factor estimated using "Tool to calculate emission factor for an electricity system" (tCO<sub>2</sub>/MWh).

40. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions factor for the entire electricity grid determined using the combined margin approach approved in "Tool to calculate emission factor for an electricity system".

<sup>9</sup> This gives the project developer incentives to use as many years of baseline data as possible. It also allows the baseline to conservatively and accurately normalize data in changing climates and in different withdrawal regimes.

## 5.5. Project emissions

41. Project emissions are zero.

$$PE_y = 0 \quad \text{Equation (14)}$$

## 5.6. Leakage

42. There is no leakage expected from the installation of a Decision Management System. The installation of software and meters will not lead to additional emissions.

## 5.7. Emission reduction

$$ER_y = BE_y - PE_y \quad \text{Equation (15)}$$

Note: It should be noted that if the actual generation is less than the baseline generation for a given week, it will be treated as a negative value and deducted from the total annual savings. If in the unlikely event a project activity temporarily results in a negative emission reduction, i.e. baseline emissions minus project emissions are negative, any further CERs will only be issued when the emissions increase has been compensated by subsequent emission reductions by the project activity. (See EB 21, item 18).

## 5.8. Changes required for methodology implementation in 2nd and 3rd crediting periods

43. Project participants shall assess the continued validity of the baseline and update the baseline by applying the tool "Assessment of the validity of the original/current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period".

~~Given that DSS systems could become standard practice over time in many regions (even in the absence of the GDM), the baseline scenario for the 2nd and 3rd crediting periods should be revisited. A regional common practice assessment should be conducted or consulted and if DSS systems are found to have become common practice in the region, the baseline scenario would then be considered to be the project itself.~~

## 5.9. Data and parameters not monitored

44. Data for all the variables mentioned below shall be based on 3 years of historic records prior to start of the project activity. It shall be ensured that the precipitation pattern in the watershed of the project area for the year does not represent either a DRY or WET year. This implies that the annual average precipitation is within one standard deviation for the normal average annual rainfall. Normal is defined as 30 year average of annual average rainfall. DOE in its validation report shall report the reasons for non-availability of records for three years and its assessment of the situation. All the data used for establishing baseline relationships and baseline shall be reported in the registered CDM-PDD.

**Data / Parameter table 1.**

<b>Data unit:</b>	<b>Units</b>
Data / Parameter:	<i>M</i>
Description:	Total number of spillways within the project site on the same water course, in the year before the implementation of the project activity.
Source of data:	Project site.
Measurement procedures (if any):	Count the number of spillways within the project site on the same water course in the year before the implementation of the project activity. The data shall be stored until two years after the end of the crediting period.
Monitoring frequency:	-
QA/QC procedures:	-
Any comment:	-

**Data / Parameter table 2.**

<b>Data / Parameter:</b>	<i>N</i>
Data unit:	Units
Description:	Total number of hydro power generation units within the project site on the same water course, in the year previous to the implementation of the project activity.
Source of data:	Project site.
Measurement procedures (if any):	Count the number of hydro power generation units within the project site on the same water course in the year previous to the implementation of the project activity. The data shall be stored until two years after the end of the crediting period.
Monitoring frequency:	-
QA/QC procedures:	-
Any comment:	-

**Data / Parameter table 3.**

<b>Data / Parameter:</b>	$a_i, b_i, c_i$ and $d_i$
Data unit:	Units
Description:	The power polynomial coefficients for each generating unit based on "hill diagram" information provided by the owner or manufacturer. The "hill diagram" is the one which defines the three dimensional relationship between power output, head and flow
Source of data:	Owner or manufacturer of the generating unit.
Measurement procedures (if any):	The data shall be stored until two years after the end of the crediting period.
Monitoring frequency:	-
QA/QC procedures:	-
Any comment:	-

**Data / Parameter table 4.**

<b>Data / Parameter:</b>	$H$
Data unit:	m
Description:	Head acting on the generating unit (headwater level less tail water level)
Source of data:	Manufacturer/owner data, design and or testing information for spillway.
Measurement procedures (if any):	Hourly data records for each hydropower generating unit in the project boundary from the year previous to the implementation of the project activity shall be used to characterize the baseline scenario. The data shall be stored until two years after the end of the crediting period.
Monitoring frequency:	-
QA/QC procedures:	-
Any comment:	The equation given by the owner will provide accurate data. More importantly, the equation will give consistent results between baseline measurements and project year measurements.

**Data / Parameter table 5.**

<b>Data / Parameter:</b>	$C_o$
Data unit:	Units
Description:	Known coefficient taken from manufacturer/owner data.
Source of data:	Manufacturer/owner data, design and or testing information for spillway.
Measurement procedures (if any):	Obtain the value before validation for each spillway in the project boundary. The data shall be stored until two years after the end of the crediting period.
Monitoring frequency:	-
QA/QC procedures:	-
Any comment:	The equation given by the owner will provide accurate data. More importantly, the equation will give consistent results between baseline measurements and project year measurements.

**Data / Parameter table 6.**

<b>Data / Parameter:</b>	$L_e$
Data unit:	m
Description:	Length of the gate measured as built.
Source of data:	Manufacturer/owner data, design and or testing information for spillway.
Measurement procedures (if any):	Obtain the value before validation for each spillway in the project boundary in order to characterize the baseline scenario. The data shall be stored until two years after the end of the crediting period.
Monitoring frequency:	-

QA/QC procedures:	-
Any comment:	The equation given by the owner will provide accurate data. More importantly, the equation will give consistent results between baseline measurements and project year measurements.

**Data / Parameter table 7.**

<b>Data / Parameter:</b>	O
Data unit:	m
Description:	Vertical opening size of spillway.
Source of data:	Measured during operations at the project site.
Measurement procedures (if any):	Hourly data records for each spillway in the project boundary from the year previous to the implementation of the project activity shall be used to characterize the baseline scenario. The data shall be stored until two years after the end of the crediting period.
Monitoring frequency:	-
QA/QC procedures:	-
Any comment:	These measurements are very simple to make and accurate. More importantly the measurements will be completely consistent between the baseline year and the project year. All measurements should use calibrated measurement equipment that is maintained regularly and checked for its functioning.

**Data / Parameter table 8.**

<b>Data / Parameter:</b>	$E$
Data unit:	Units
Description:	Known coefficient taken from manufacturer/owner data.
Source of data:	Manufacturer/owner data, design and or testing information for spillway.
Measurement procedures (if any):	Obtain the coefficient before validation for each spillway in the project boundary in order to characterize the baseline scenario. The data shall be stored until two years after the end of the crediting period.
Monitoring frequency:	-
QA/QC procedures:	-
Any comment:	The equation given by the owner will provide accurate data. More importantly, the equation will give consistent results between baseline measurements and project year measurements.

**Data / Parameter table 9.**

<b>Data / Parameter:</b>	$E_{sill}$
Data unit:	m
Description:	Elevation of the sill measured as built.
Source of data:	Manufacturer/owner data, design and or testing information for spillway.

Measurement procedures (if any):	Obtain the coefficient before validation for each spillway in the project boundary in order to characterize the baseline scenario. The data shall be stored until two years after the end of the crediting period.
Monitoring frequency:	-
QA/QC procedures:	-
Any comment:	The equation given by the owner will provide accurate data. More importantly, the equation will give consistent results between baseline measurements and project year measurements.

**Data / Parameter table 10.**

<b>Data / Parameter:</b>	$WL_h$
Data unit:	m
Description:	Water level in week 'x'.
Source of data:	Operations data log at project site.
Measurement procedures (if any):	Hourly data records for each spillway in the project boundary from the year previous to the implementation of the project activity shall be used to characterize the baseline scenario. The data shall be stored until two years after the end of the crediting period.
Monitoring frequency:	
QA/QC procedures:	
Any comment:	Meters shall be tested annually and calibrated as recommended by the manufacturer. Meters are typically accurate to plus or minus a tenth or hundredth of a per cent. All measurements should use calibrated measurement equipment that is maintained regularly and checked for its functioning.

**Data / Parameter table 11.**

<b>Data / Parameter:</b>	Headwater level
Data unit:	m
Description:	Headwater level.
Source of data:	Operations data log at project site. Measured at head water entering generating unit.
Measurement procedures (if any):	Hourly data records for each power generating unit in the project during the crediting period. The data shall be stored until two years after the end of the crediting period.
Monitoring frequency:	-
QA/QC procedures:	-
Any comment:	Meters shall be tested annually and calibrated as recommended by the manufacturer. Meters are typically accurate to plus or minus a tenth or hundredth of a per cent. All measurements should use calibrated measurement equipment that is maintained regularly and checked for its functioning.

**Data / Parameter table 12.**

<b>Data / Parameter:</b>	Tail water level
Data unit:	m
Description:	Tail water level.
Source of data:	Operations data log at project site. Measured at tail water leaving generation units.
Measurement procedures (if any):	Hourly data records for each power generating unit in the project boundary from the year previous to the implementation of the project activity shall be used to characterize the baseline scenario. The data shall be stored until two years after the end of the crediting period.
Monitoring frequency:	
QA/QC procedures:	
Any comment:	Meters shall be tested annually and calibrated as recommended by the manufacturer. Meters are typically accurate to plus or minus a tenth or hundredth of a per cent. All measurements should use calibrated measurement equipment that is maintained regularly and checked for its functioning.

**Data / Parameter table 13.**

<b>Data / Parameter:</b>	$EG_{hpu,h}$
Data unit:	MWh
Description:	Observed power output of 'hpu' unit for week 'x'.
Source of data:	Operations data log available at the project site.
Measurement procedures (if any):	Hourly data records for each power generating unit in the project boundary from the year previous to the implementation of the project activity shall be used to characterize the baseline scenario. The data shall be stored until two years after the end of the crediting period.
Monitoring frequency:	-
QA/QC procedures:	-
Any comment:	Meters shall be tested annually and calibrated as recommended by the manufacturer. All measurements should use calibrated measurement equipment that is maintained regularly and checked for its functioning.

## 6. Monitoring methodology

### 6.1. Monitoring procedures

45. All data collected as part of monitoring should be archived electronically and be kept at least for 2 years after the end of the last crediting period. 100% of the data should be monitored if not indicated otherwise in the comments in the tables below.
46. The following data for estimating the baseline relationship between power generation and flow shall be archived:
  - (a) All the water courses and corresponding hydro power generating units, included within the project site;

- (b) Relevant parameters of each hydro power generation unit, reservoir dam and the spill way characteristic to verify the applicability conditions;
  - (c) Hourly power generation of each hydro power generation unit within the project site;
  - (d) Parameters for Rating equation to estimate flow over the spill ways;
  - (e) Estimated parameters of power generation and flow relationship, as estimated in Step 3 of Baseline Section in Baseline methodology.
47. The following data for estimating the baseline relationship between power generation and flow index shall be archived:
- (a) Estimated flow for each hour of the crediting period;
  - (b) Projected estimate of baseline power generation corresponding to the project flow index;
  - (c) Project power generation.
48. In addition, various elements of the hydro system (changes to turbines, dams, etc.) need to be monitored to ensure continued adherence to applicability conditions.
49. Furthermore, the monitoring provisions in the tools referred to in this methodology apply. Accordingly,  $EG_{Pr,hpu,x}$  should be determined as per the “Baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption and monitoring of electricity generation”. When applying the tool, requirement for the  $EG_{PJ,grid,y}$  should apply to parameter  $EG_{Pr,hpu,x}$ .

## 6.2. Data and parameters monitored

**Data / Parameter table 14.**

<b>Data / Parameter:</b>	$EG_{Pr,hpu,x}$
<b>Data unit:</b>	MWh
<b>Description:</b>	Total electricity generated by unit ‘hpu’ in week ‘x’ of year ‘y’.
<b>Source of data:</b>	Measured at each hydro generation unit
<b>Measurement procedures (if any):</b>	The monitoring system installed with the DSS will gather and archive this data.
<b>Monitoring frequency:</b>	Hourly, cumulated weekly.
<b>QA/QC procedures:</b>	The data acquisition system used for the Decision Support Tool will provide highly accurate data. Meters will be tested annually and calibrated as recommended by the manufacturer. Meters are typically accurate to plus or minus a tenth or hundredth of a per cent. All measurements should use calibrated measurement equipment that is maintained regularly and checked for its functioning.
<b>Any comment:</b>	-

**Data / Parameter table 15.**

<b>Data / Parameter:</b>	$EF_y$
Data unit:	kgCO <sub>2</sub> /MWh
Description:	Grid electricity emission factor estimated using “Tool to calculate emission factor for an electricity system”.
Source of data:	As per “Tool to calculate emission factor for an electricity system”.
Measurement procedures (if any):	As per “Tool to calculate emission factor for an electricity system”.
Monitoring frequency:	As per “Tool to calculate emission factor for an electricity system”.
QA/QC procedures:	As per “Tool to calculate emission factor for an electricity system”.
Any comment:	-

**Data / Parameter table 16.**

<b>Data / Parameter:</b>	Headwater level
Data unit:	m
Description:	Headwater level
Source of data:	Operations data log at project site. Measured at head water entering generating unit.
Measurement procedures (if any):	Hourly data records for each power generating unit in the project boundary from the year previous to the implementation of the project activity shall be used to characterize the baseline scenario. The data shall be stored until two years after the end of the crediting period.
Monitoring frequency:	Hourly
QA/QC procedures:	The monitoring system used by the DSS will gather and archive this data. The data acquisition system used for the Decision Support Tool will provide highly accurate data. Meters shall be tested annually and calibrated as recommended by the manufacturer. Meters are typically accurate to plus or minus a tenth or hundredth of a per cent. All measurements should use calibrated measurement equipment that is maintained regularly and checked for its functioning.
Any comment:	-

**Data / Parameter table 17.**

<b>Data / Parameter:</b>	Tail water level
Data unit:	m
Description:	Tail water level
Source of data:	Operations data log at project site. Measured at tail water leaving generation units.

Measurement procedures (if any):	Hourly data records for each power generating unit in the project boundary from the year previous to the implementation of the project activity shall be used to characterize the baseline scenario. The data shall be stored until two years after the end of the crediting period.
Monitoring frequency:	Hourly
QA/QC procedures:	The monitoring system used by the DSS will gather and archive this data. The data acquisition system used for the Decision Support Tool will provide highly accurate data. Meters shall be tested annually and calibrated as recommended by the manufacturer. Meters are typically accurate to plus or minus a tenth or hundredth of a per cent. All measurements should use calibrated measurement equipment that is maintained regularly and checked for its functioning.
Any comment:	-

**Data / Parameter table 18.**

<b>Data / Parameter:</b>	<i>N</i>
Data unit:	Units
Description:	Total number of hydro power generation units 'hpu' within the project site on the same water course.
Source of data:	Project site.
Measurement procedures (if any):	Count the number of hydro power generation units within the project site on the same water course. The data shall be stored until two years after the end of the crediting period.
Monitoring frequency:	This shall be checked yearly and compared with baseline data.
QA/QC procedures:	-
Any comment:	-

**Data / Parameter table 19.**

<b>Data / Parameter:</b>	<i>M</i>
Data unit:	Units
Description:	Total number of spillways within the project site on the same water course.
Source of data:	Project site.
Measurement procedures (if any):	Count the number of spillways within the project site on the same water course. The data shall be stored until two years after the end of the crediting period.
Monitoring frequency:	This shall be checked yearly and compared with baseline data.
QA/QC procedures:	-
Any comment:	-

**Data / Parameter table 20.**

<b>Data / Parameter:</b>	$a_i, b_i, c_i$ and $d_i$
Data unit:	Units

Description:	The power polynomial coefficients for each generating unit based on "Hill Diagram" information provided by the owner or manufacturer. The "Hill Diagram" defines the three dimensional relationship between power output, head and flow.
Source of data:	Manufacturer/owner
Measurement procedures (if any):	A 'hill diagram' will be included in the data book for every generating unit in the project boundary. This essentially provides information derived in equations 2.
Monitoring frequency:	This shall be checked yearly and compared with baseline data. Hill Diagrams for a generating unit are stationary and do not change measurably within the life of the project. Any changes, however unlikely, would be in the direction of deterioration of the unit and would make the results of the project more conservative (i.e. yield lower generation in project years).
QA/QC procedures:	-
Any comment:	-

**Data / Parameter table 21.**

<b>Data / Parameter:</b>	$C_o$
Data unit:	Units
Description:	Known coefficient taken from manufacturer/owner data.
Source of data:	Manufacturer/owner data, design and or testing information for spillway.
Measurement procedures (if any):	The equation given by the owner will provide accurate data.
Monitoring frequency:	This shall be checked yearly and compared with baseline data.
QA/QC procedures:	-
Any comment:	-

**Data / Parameter table 22.**

<b>Data / Parameter:</b>	$L_e$
Data unit:	m
Description:	Length of the gate measured as built.
Source of data:	Manufacturer/owner data, design and or testing information for spillway.
Measurement procedures (if any):	The equation given by the owner will provide accurate data.
Monitoring frequency:	This shall be checked yearly and compared with baseline data.
QA/QC procedures:	-
Any comment:	-

**Data / Parameter table 23.**

<b>Data / Parameter:</b>	$O$
Data unit:	m

Description:	Vertical opening.
Source of data:	Measured during operations at the project site.
Measurement procedures (if any):	Hourly data records for each spillway in the project boundary from the year previous to the implementation of the project activity shall be used to characterize the baseline scenario. The data shall be stored until two years after the end of the crediting period
Monitoring frequency:	Hourly
QA/QC procedures:	These measurements are very simple to make and accurate. More importantly the measurements will be completely consistent between the baseline year and the project year. All measurements should use calibrated measurement equipment that is maintained regularly and checked for its functioning
Any comment:	-

**Data / Parameter table 24.**

<b>Data / Parameter:</b>	$E_{sill}$
Data unit:	m
Description:	Elevation of the sill measured as built.
Source of data:	Manufacturer/owner data, design and or testing information for spillway.
Measurement procedures (if any):	The equation given by the owner will provide accurate data
Monitoring frequency:	This shall be checked yearly and compared with baseline data
QA/QC procedures:	-
Any comment:	-

**Data / Parameter table 25.**

<b>Data / Parameter:</b>	$E$
Data unit:	Units
Description:	Known coefficient taken from manufacturer/owner data.
Source of data:	Manufacturer/owner data, design and or testing information for spillway.
Measurement procedures (if any):	The equation given by the owner will provide accurate data.
Monitoring frequency:	This shall be checked yearly and compared with baseline data.
QA/QC procedures:	-
Any comment:	-

**Data / Parameter table 26.**

<b>Data / Parameter:</b>	$WL_h$
Data unit:	m
Description:	Water level in week 'x'.
Source of data:	Operations data log at project site.

Measurement procedures (if any):	Hourly data records for each spillway in the project boundary from the year previous to the implementation of the project activity shall be used to characterize the baseline scenario. The data shall be stored until two years after the end of the crediting period.
Monitoring frequency:	Hourly
QA/QC procedures:	Meters shall be tested annually and calibrated as recommended by the manufacturer. Meters are typically accurate to plus or minus a tenth or hundredth of a per cent. All measurements should use calibrated measurement equipment that is maintained regularly and checked for its functioning.
Any comment:	-

DRAFT

## Appendix. Estimation process for standard error (SE)

1. The estimated value of  $EG_{x,x}^{Bl}$  is:

$$EG_x^{Bl} = f(Q_x^{Pr}) = a + b_1 Q_x^{Pr} + b_2 (Q_x^{Pr})^2 + \dots + b_n (Q_x^{Pr})^n \quad \text{Equation (1)}$$

- (a) If the equation is linear, i.e.  $n=1$ .

$$SE(EG_x^{Bl}) = \bar{\sigma} * \sqrt{\left(1 + \frac{1}{N} + \frac{(Q_x^{Pr} - \bar{Q})^2}{\sum_i (Q_i - \bar{Q})^2}\right)} \quad \text{Equation (2)}$$

$$\bar{\sigma} = \frac{1}{N-2} * \sqrt{(1-R^2) * \left(\sum_{i=1}^N (EG_i - \bar{EG})^2\right)} \quad \text{Equation (3)}$$

$$\bar{EG} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N EG_i}{N}$$

DRAFT

$$\bar{Q} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N Q_i}{N} \quad \text{Equation (4)}$$

Where:

$\sigma$	=	is the estimated standard error of the equation. This is reported by the software used to estimate the relationship between power generation and the flow
N	=	is the total number of observations used in estimating the power generation v/s flow equation. It will be 162 if three full years data is used, without any week being dropped off because of unusual circumstances.
$EG_i$	=	is the baseline data that was used to estimate the equation form.
$Q_i$	=	$Q_i$ is the flow data in the baseline used to estimate the equation form.
i	=	index for sample data used in estimating the equation form
x	=	index for the value for week x used in estimating the baseline power generation corresponding to flow $Q_x$ in week x

(b) If  $n > 1$

$$SE(EB_{B1,x}) = \sigma^* (1 + [QX] \{ [QI] [QI] \} [QX]) \tag{Equation (5)}$$

2.  $[QX]$  = is  $(n \times 1)$  vector  $[Q_x, (Q_x)^2, \dots, (Q_x)^n]$  is vector  $(1 \times n)$  of variables for observation of flow in the power equation, where  $n$  is the degree of polynomial.

$$[QX]^T = \begin{bmatrix} Q_x \\ Q_x^2 \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ Q_x^n \end{bmatrix} \text{ is } (n \times 1) \text{ vector transpose of } [QX] \tag{Equation (6)}$$

$$[QI] = \begin{bmatrix} Q_1 & Q_1^2 & Q_1^n \\ Q_2 & Q_2^2 & Q_2^n \\ \cdot & & \cdot \\ \cdot & & \cdot \\ Q_N & Q_N^2 & Q_N^n \end{bmatrix} \text{ is the } (N \times n) \text{ matrix of baseline flow} \tag{Equation (7)}$$

observations, where  $N$  is total number of observations and  $n$  is the degree of polynomial.

$$[QI]^T = \begin{bmatrix} Q_1 & Q_2 & Q_N \\ Q_1^2 & Q_2^2 & Q_N^2 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ Q_1^n & Q_2^n & Q_N^n \end{bmatrix} \text{ is } (n \times N) \text{ transpose of } [QI] \text{ matrix.} \tag{Equation (8)}$$

-----

### Document information

Version	Date	Description
Draft 03.0	22 April 2016	MP 69, Annex 9 A call for public input will be issued on this draft revised methodology. Revision to include the requirements of TOOL05 and TOOL08.

CDM-MP69-A09

Draft Large-scale Methodology: AM0052: Increased electricity generation from existing hydropower stations through Decision Support System optimization

Version 03.0

Sectoral scope(s): 01

---

---

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
02.0	19 October 2007	EB 35, Para 24 Revision to incorporate the use of the “Tool to calculate emission factor for an electricity system”.
01.0	4 May 2007	EB 31, Annex 7 Initial adoption.

---

Decision Class: Regulatory

Document Type: Standard

Business Function: Methodology

Keywords: electricity generation, hydro power plant, renewable energy generation

---

DRAFT