Orientation of the Training Programme

13th May 2011

Climate Change Division, Ministry of Environment JICA Expert Team

Review of the 1st CDM Training Programme Period: 24.6.2010 ~ 8.2010 (13 sessions) Train practitioners of emission reduction project in Sri Lankan Goal: organization to maximize project/environmental value. • Lectures on: Stepwise Consideration of CDM Functional background of CDM Documentation: PDD Carbon Credit Market • CDM Typology CDM development in Sri Lanka Institutional Background of CDM Policy and CDM (Energy, Forest) Post Kyoto **Objective of 1st Training** > To acquire the basic knowledge of CDM > To apprehend the discussion and important issues related to CDM To network with other practitioners for promoting CDM **Objective of 2nd Training** > To understand basic rules and emission reduction calculation formula for each project type > To acquire the skills of calculating emission reduction through hands-on exercises

| Goal: | Build Ha | nds-on Knowledge about Various CDM Categories | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------|--|------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Date | Time | LectureTitle | Lecturer | | | | | | |
| 13 May | 09:00~10:00 | Renewable Energy Project (Non-Biomass & Biomass) | Kawamura | | | | | | |
| | 10:00~10:15 | Break | _ | | | | | | |
| | 10:15~11:15 | Renewable Energy Project (Exercise) | Kawamura | | | | | | |
| | 11:15~12:15 | Waste Management / Handling Project | Sugimoto | | | | | | |
| 20 May | 09:00~10:00 | Fuel Switch Project | Negishi | | | | | | |
| | 10:00~10:15 | Break | _ | | | | | | |
| | 10:15~11:15 | Energy – saving / Demand Side Management project | Chikamatsu | | | | | | |
| | 11:15~12:15 | Afforestation / Reforestation | Chikamatsu | | | | | | |
| 27 May | 09:00~09:50 | Achievement Test | - | | | | | | |
| | 09:50~10:10 | Tea Break | _ | | | | | | |
| | 10:10~10:55 | Trend of Carbon Markets | Negishi | | | | | | |
| | 10:55~11:40 | Policy Measures for Climate Change Mitigation in Other Countries | Sugimoto | | | | | | |
| | 11:40~12:00 | Closing session | - | | | | | | |

The Goal of the Series of the CDM Training Programme by JICA Expert Team

• The Seminar is followed by a supplement seminar by Mr. Satoshi lemoto for updated report about Post-Kyoto Discussions in international arena.

| Date | Lecture Title |
|--|---|
| To be announced | Current discussions over post-Kyoto Mechanism and Bilateral Credit Mechanism (Tentative) |
| The overall sen about emissior | ninar program is designed to build hands-on knowledge n reduction projects. |
| Lectures are me applicable for t | ostly based on current Kyoto Mechanisms but are he Post-Kyoto mechanism. |
| | |



Renewable Energy CDM Projects (Non-biomass & Biomass)

13th May 2011 JICA Expert Team Ai Kawamura

Contents

Session 1:

- 1. How emission reduction is achieved by RE Project
- 2. Energy Source of Renewable Energy
- **3.** Applicable Approved Methodology for RE projects
- 4. CDM Project Prototypes
- 5. Basic Formula for Emission Reduction Calculation of RE project
- 6. Calculation of Grid Emission Factor Session 2:
- 1. Calculation Exercise: Hydro power
- 2. Calculation Exercise: Biomass









3. Applicable Approved Methodology for RE projects (1)

• Full scale and Combined methodology

| Category | Number | Title |
|-------------------------|---------|---|
| Electricity | AM0019 | Renewable energy project activities replacing part of the electricity production of one single fossil-fuel-fired power plant that stands alone or supplies electricity to a grid, excluding biomass projects |
| Electricity | AM0042 | Grid-connected electricity generation using biomass from newly developed dedicated plantations |
| Electricity | ACM0002 | Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources |
| Electricity/ Thermal | ACM0006 | <u>Consolidated methodology for electricity and heat</u> generation from biomass residues |
| Liquid fuel | ACM0017 | Production of biodiesel for use as fuel |
| Electricity | ACM0018 | <u>Consolidated methodology for electricity generation from</u> <u>biomass residues in power-only plants</u> |
| | | 7 |

3. Applicable Approved Methodology for RE projects (2)

• Small Scale Methodology

| Category | No | Title |
|--------------------------|-------|---|
| Electricity | I-A | Electricity generation by the user |
| | I-B | Mechanical energy for the user with or without electrical energy |
| Electricity | I-D | Grid connected renewable electricity generation |
| Electricity | I-F | Renewable electricity generation for captive use and mini-grid |
| Thermal/ Cogeneration | I-C | Thermal energy production with or without electricity |
| Thermal | I-E | Switch from non-renewable biomass for thermal applications by the user |
| Thermal | 1-1 | Biogas/biomass thermal applications for households/small users |
| Liquid fuel | I-G | Plant oil production and use for energy generation in stationary applications |
| Liquid fuel | I-H | Biodiesel production and use for energy generation in stationary applications |
| Liquid fuel | III-T | Plant oil production and use for transport applications |

4. CDM Project Prototypes (1)

• Usage of energy

| Electricity | Grid-connection, On site (by the user) |
|-------------|--|
| Thermal | Onsite (by the user) |
| Liquid fuel | (mainly for vehicle) |

• Energy sources and types of energy use

| Biomass | ~ | \checkmark | ✓ (plant oil) |
|------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|
| Hydro/Wind | \checkmark | | |
| Solar | \checkmark | ✓ | |







| 5. Basic Formula | a for Emis | sion Rec | luct | ion | Calculat | ion of RE | project (2) | |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|------------|----------------|---|----------------------------|---|--|
| Amount | Energy to be replaced: | | | nit | Remarks | | | |
| of energy | Electricity | | | ′h∕y | Hourly output (MW)× hours(h/y) | | | |
| [A] | Fuel to produce electricity | | t/y, kL/y | | e.g., Hourly consumption (t)× annual operating hours(h/y) | | | |
| Emission factor of energy to be replaced [B]For Grid Electricity Grid Emission Factor: 0.65~0.73 tCO2/MWh (No national official figure, PP has to calculate by themselves) | | | | | | | | |
| | For On-Site | Electricity | | | | | | |
| | FuelType | Net Calorif Value (TJ/ [a] | fic 't) | CO2 Factor | Emission (tCO2/TJ) [b] | Oxidation factor [c] | CO2 emission factor(tCO2/t) [a]*[b]*[c] | |
| | Furnace Oil | | 0.041 | | 77.4 | 1.0 | 3.173 | |
| | Gas/Diesel Oil | 0 | .0433 | | 74.1 | 1.0 | 3.209 | |
| | Naphtha | 0 | .0456 | | 73.3 | 1.0 | 3.342 | |
| | Residual Oil | | 0.041 | | 77.4 | 1.0 | 3.173 | |
| SourceEnergy Data 2007, SEA2006 IPCC Guidelines for National GHG Inventories, vol.2 | | | | | | | | |
| | | Ţ | | x ^t | CO2 | = tC | 02 | |
| | Unit check | t_Fuel | I | | Ţ | t_F | Fuel 13, | |









| (| 6. Calculation of Grid Emission Factor (3) Essential Terminologies | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Terminology | Explan | ation | | | | | | |
| | Operating Margin (OM) | Emission factor that refers to the group of electricity generation would be affected by | f existing power plants <mark>whose current</mark> by the proposed CDM project activity. | | | | | | |
| | Built Margin (BM) | Emission factor of the group of prospective and future operation would be affected by | ve power plants <mark>whose construction</mark> y the proposed CDM project activity. | | | | | | |
| Combined Margin Weighted average of OM & BM of the electricity system. (CM) | | | | | | | | | |
| | Low-cost/must-run resources | Power plants with low marginal generation dispatched independently of the daily or s | on costs or power plants that are seasonal load of the grid. | | | | | | |
| | OM | Electricity supplied by CDM project | BM | | | | | | |
| M | W Other so (diesel, natural | Electricity included in OM calculation (Electricity to be replaced by CDM project) | The set of power capacity additions in the electricity system that comprise 20% of the system generation (MWh) and that have been built most recently | | | | | | |
| | Low cost/must (renewable, nuc | run - From OM calculation lear) (Electricity not affected | The set of 5 power units that have been built most recently | | | | | | |
| $\left(- \right)$ | 6 12 1 | 8 24 hour by CDM project) | 18 | | | | | | |







| 6. Calculation of Grid Emission Factor (7) | |
|---|--|
| Example: 2007 Sri Lanka National Grid Emission Factor (I) | |

Conditions apply for Simple OM

- Low-cost/must-run resources needs to be less than 50% of total grid generation.
- low-cost/must run resources is calculated as the average of the five most recent years.

(GWh/y)

| Year | | Thermal Generation | | | | Total | % of low- cost / | | | | |
|-------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|---------------------|-------|--------|------------|----------|
| | CEB Hydro | CEB Wind | SPP Hydro | Total | CEB | IPP | SPP | Hired | Total | Generation | must run |
| 2003 | 3,190 | 3.39 | 121.0 | 3,314 | 2,248 | 1,746 | 1.2 | 394 | 4,389 | 7,704 | 43.0% |
| 2004 | 2,755 | 2.70 | 207.0 | 2,965 | 2,507 | 2,087 | 1.5 | 509 | 5,105 | 8,069 | 36.7% |
| 2005 | 3,223 | 2.44 | 280.0 | 3,505 | 2,162 | 3,177 | 2.3 | - | 5,341 | 8,847 | 39.6% |
| 2006 | 4,290 | 2.31 | 346.4 | 4,638 | 1,669 | 3,136 | 1.7 | - | 4,807 | 9,445 | 49.1% |
| 2007 | 3,603 | 2.27 | 345.0 | 3,950 | 2,336 | 3,559 | 1.1 | - | 5,896 | 9,846 | 40.1% |
| Total | 17,060 | 13.11 | 1299.4 | 18,373 | 10,921 | 13,705 | 7.8 | 903 | 25,537 | 43,910 | 41.8% |

| Fuel Type | Net Calorific Value (TJ/t) | Effective CO2 emission factor (tCO2/TJ) | Oxidation factor | CO2 emission coefficient (tCO2/t) |
|----------------------------|--|--|------------------|---|
| | (a) | (b) | (c) | $(a)^{*}(b)^{*}(c)$ |
| Furnace Oil [Fuel oil] | 0.041 | 77.4 | 1.0 | 3.17 |
| Gas/Diesel O [Auto oil] | 0.0433 | 74.1 | 1.0 | 3.20 |
| Naphtha | 0.0456 | 73.3 | 1.0 | 3.342 |
| Residual Oi | 1 0.041 | 77.4 | 1.0 | 3.17 |
| Sourece | Energy Data 2007, Ministry of Power and Energy | 2006 IPCC Guideling Greenhouse Gas Inven Energy, Tab | | |

6. Calculation of Grid Emission Factor (8)

6. Calculation of Grid Emission Factor (9) Example: 2007 Sri Lanka National Grid Emission Factor (II)

Simple OM:

Generation-weighted average CO2 emissions per unit net electricity generation of all generating power plants serving the system, not including the low-cost/must-run resources.

Option B:

Based on total net electricity generation of all power plants serving the system and the fuel types and total fuel consumption of the project electricity system.

| 2005 | kL=m3 | 1G = | $1G = 10,91M = 10,1K = 10^3$ | | | |
|-------------------|---|--|---|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Fuel Type | Fuel Consumption (1,000kL/y) (a) | Specific Gravity of Fuel (t/m3) (b) | CO2 emission factor (tCO2/t_fuel) (c) | CO2 Emission (tCO2/y) (d) | Electricity Generation (GWh) (e) | Grid Emission Factor (kg_CO2/kWh) (f) |
| Furnace Oil | 500 | 0.972 | 3.173 | 1,542,554 | ļ | |
| Gas/Diesel Oil | 306 | 0.846 | 3.209 | 830,733 | 5 | |
| Naphtha | 180 | 0.690 | 3.342 | 415,076 | Ď | |
| Residual Oil | 270 | 0.972 | 3.173 | 832,979 | 5 3 4 1 | 0.678 |
| Total | - | - | - | 3,621,343 | 5,541 | 0.078 |
| Source | Energy Data 2007, Table "Fuel Consumption in Power Plants" | Energy Data 2007, Table "Conversion Factors and Coefficients" | | (a)*(b)*(c) | Energy Data 2007, Table "Summary" | (d)/(e) |

| 2006 Fuel Type Fuel Consumption 1000kL/y Density of Fuel (m3) COEF (CO2/L fuel) Emission (CO2/y) Electricity Generation (GW) Grid Emission (kg_CO2/k) Furnace Oil 469 0.972 3.173 1.446.916 (c) (f) Gas/Diesel Oil 308 0.846 3.209 836.163 (f) (f) Total 91 0.690 3.342 209.844 (a) (f) (f) Source Energy Data 2007, Table "Fuel Consumption in power Plants" Energy Data 2007, Fable "Conversion Factors and Coefficients" Energy Data (a)*(b)*(c) Energy Data 2007 Energy Data (f) Energy Data 2007, Table Summary" Fuel Type Fuel Consumption (a) Density of Fuel Coefficients" COEF Emission (a)*(b)*(c) Energy Data 2007, Table Summary" 2007 Fuel Type Fuel Consumption 1000kL/y Density of Fuel Coefficients" COEF Emission (a)*(b)*(c) Energy Data 2007, Table (GWh) Grid Emission (kg_CO2/kW 6 0.466 0.846 3.209 1.265.103 (GWh) (kg_CO2/kW 103 0.972 3.173 < | 6. Calculation of Grid Emission Factor (10) Example: 2007 Sri Lanka National Grid Emission Factor (III) | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|----------------|---|--|---------------|--------------|---|----------------------|--|
| $\frac{1000kL/y}{(a)} \frac{t/m3}{(b)} \frac{(cO2/t_{fuel})}{(cO2/t_{fuel})} \frac{(cO2/y)}{(cO2/y)} \frac{(GWh)}{(GWh)} \frac{(kg_{CO2/kW})}{(kg_{CO2/kW})} \frac{(kg_{CO2/kW})}{(kg_{CO$ | 2006 | Fuel Type | Fuel Consumption | Density of Fuel | COEF | Emission | Electricity Generation | Grid Emission Factor | |
| | | 51 | 1000kL/y | t/m3 | (tCO2/t_fuel) | (tCO2/y) | (GWh) | (kg_CO2/kWh) | |
| $\frac{\text{Furnace Oil}}{\text{Gas/Diesel Oil}} = \frac{469}{308} = \frac{0.972}{3.173} = \frac{1.446,916}{1.446,916} \\ \frac{\text{Gas/Diesel Oil}}{\text{Gas/Diesel Oil}} = \frac{308}{266} = \frac{0.690}{3.342} = \frac{3209,844}{209,844} \\ \frac{\text{Residual Oil}}{\text{Residual Oil}} = \frac{266}{0.972} = \frac{3.173}{3.173} = \frac{820,639}{820,639} \\ \hline \text{Total} = $ | | | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) | (f) | |
| $ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | | Furnace Oil | 46 | 0.972 | 3.173 | 1,446,916 | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | C | Gas/Diesel Oil | 30 | 0.846 | 3.209 | 836,163 | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | | Naphtha | 9 | 0.690 | 3.342 | 209,844 | | | |
| $\frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{100} \frac{1}{100$ | | Residual Oil | 26 | 6 0.972 | 3.173 | 820,639 | | | |
| $\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | | Total | | | - | 3,313,561 | 4,807 | 0.689 | |
| $\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | | Source | Energy Data 2007, Table "Fuel Consumption in Power Plants" | Energy Data 2007, Table "Conversion Factors and Coefficients" | | (a)*(b)*(c) | Energy Data 2007, Table "Summary" | (d)/(e) | |
| IO00kL/y t/m3 (tCO2/t_fuel) (tCO2/y) (GWh) (kg_CO2/kV) (a) (b) (c) (d) (e) (f) Furnace Oil 513 0.972 3.173 1,582,660 Gas/Diesel Oil 466 0.846 3.209 1,265,103 Naphtha 138 0.690 3.342 317,303 Residual Oil 296 0.972 3.173 913,809 Total - - 4,078,875 5,896 Source Energy Data 2007, Energy Data 2007, Energy Data 2007, Table "Summary" Energy Data 2007, Table "Summary" 2007, Table Power Plants" Coefficients" 2007 Average | 2007 | Fuel Type | Fuel Consumption | Density of Fuel | COEF | Emission | Electricity Generation | Grid Emission Factor | |
| $\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | | | 1000kL/y | t/m3 | (tCO2/t_fuel) | (tCO2/y) | (GWh) | (kg_CO2/kWh) | |
| $\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | | E 01 | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) | (f) | |
| Gas/Diesel Oil 466 0.846 3.209 1,265,103 Naphtha 138 0.690 3.342 317,303 Residual Oil 296 0.972 3.173 913,809 Total - - 4,078,875 5,896 Source Table "Fuel Table "Conversion Consumption in Factors and Power Plants" (a)*(b)*(c) Energy Data 2007, Table OM 2005 2006 2007 Average | E E | Furnace Oil | 51. | 0.972 | 3.1/3 | 1,582,660 | - | | |
| Naphtha 138 0.690 3.342 317,303 Residual Oil 296 0.972 3.173 913,809 Total - - 4,078,875 5,896 Source Table "Fuel Table "Conversion Consumption in Power Plants" Table "Conversion Coefficients" (a)*(b)*(c) Energy Data 2007, Table OM 2005 2006 2007 Average | C | Jas/Diesel Oil | 460 | 0.846 | 3.209 | 1,265,103 | | | |
| Residual Oil 296 0.972 3.173 913,809 Total - - 4,078,875 5,896 Source Table "Fuel Table "Conversion Consumption in Power Plants" Table "Conversion Coefficients" (a)*(b)*(c) Energy Data 2007, Table OM 2005 2006 2007 Average | | Naphtha | 13 | 8 0.690 | 3.342 | 317,303 | - | | |
| Iotal - - - 4,0/8,8/5 5,896 Source Energy Data 2007, Table "Fuel Table "Conversion Consumption in Power Plants" Factors and Coefficients" (a)*(b)*(c) Energy Data 2007, Table OM 2005 2006 2007 Average | | Residual Oil | 29 | 6 0.972 | 3.173 | 913,809 | 5.000 | 0.000 | |
| Source Table "Fuel Consumption in Power Plants" Table "Conversion Consumption in Power Plants" Energy Data Coefficients" OM 2005 2006 2007 | _ | 1 otal | Energy Data 2007 | Enorgy Data 2007 | - | 4,078,875 | 5,896 | 0.692 | |
| OM 2005 2006 2007 Average | | Source | Table "Fuel Consumption in Power Plants" | Table "Conversion Factors and Coefficients" | | (a)*(b)*(c) | Energy Data 2007, Table "Summary" | (d)/(e) | |
| OM 2005 2006 2007 Average | | | | | | | | | |
| 2000 2007 INCluge | | 20 | 005 | 2006 | 2007 | | Average | | |
| (kg_CO2/kWh) (kg_CO2/kWh) (kg_CO2/kWh) (kg_CO2/kWh) | OM | (kg_CC | 02/kWh) | (kg_CO2/kWh) | (kg | (kg_CO2/kWh) | | (kg_CO2/kWh) | |
| 0.678 0.689 0.692 | | 0.686 | | | | | | | |

| Examp | le: 200 | 7 Sri Lan | ka Na | tiona | al Gr | rid Er | nis | sion Fa | acto | r (III) | |
|-------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|--------------|----------|--------------|------------|---------------------------------|---------|----------------------------|-------|
| BM | No. | Plant | Date commiss | of ioning | Fuel | І Туре | Cor (mi | Fuel sumption illion Ltr) | the the | unit in 2007 llion kWh) | |
| | 1 ACE- Embilipiyiya | | 2004, Ma | ar 2005 | Furna | ace Oil | | 160 | | 663 | |
| | 2 Heladha | navi | Oct 2 | 003 | Furna | ace Oil | | 158 | | 748 | |
| | 3 AES-Ke | elanitissa | Mar 2 | 003 | Aut | o Oil | | 209 | | 789 | |
| | | | | | To | tal of 1-3 | | 528 | | 2,200 | |
| | | Т | otal grid ge | eneration | ı (milli | on kWh) | | | | 9,814 | > 20% |
| | | | Pr | oportior | ı withir | n the grid | | | | 22.4% | |
| | | Fuel | Density of | | | | | Flectric | itu | Grid Emission | 1 |
| | | Consumption | Fuel | CO | EF | Emissi | on | Generat | ion | Factor | |
| | Fuel Type | 1000kL/y | t/m3 | (tCO2/1 | t fuel) | (tCO2/ | (y) | (GWh | n) | (kg CO2/kWh) | |
| | | (a) | (b) | 、 ((| ;) | (d) | | (e) | | (f) | |
| | Fuel Oil | 318 | 0.972 | | 3.173 | 981 | .681 | (-) | | (-) | |
| | Auto Oil | 209 | 0.846 | | 3.209 | 568 | ,482 | | | | |
| | Naptha | 0 | 0.690 | | 3.342 | | 0 | | | | |
| | Heavy Oil | 0 | 0.972 | | 3.173 | | 0 | | | | |
| | Total | _ | - | | - | 1,550 | ,163 | | 2,200 | 0.705 | |
| | Source | SEA Data | Energy Data 2007 | | | (a)*(b)* | (c) | CEB da | ata | (d)/(e) | |
| | Vear | OM | B | М | (| M | | | | | |
| СМ | 2005 | 0.6 | 578 | 171 | , c | -1 v1 | | | | | |
| | 2005 | 0.6 | 589 | | | | | | | | |
| | 2007 | 0.6 | 592 | | | | | | | | |
| | AVERAG | F 0.6 | 586 | 0 705 | | 0.695 | | | | | |

Calculation Exercise

Non-biomass, Biomass

1. Calculation Exercise: Mini-hydro power(1)

- Company A has a CDM project plan with the following details:
 - New mini-hydro power plant project selling the power to CEB
 - Capacity: <u>1.2 MW</u>
 - Expected operation: (dry season) <u>0.8MW</u>, (wet season)<u>1.2MW</u>
 - <u>0.1MW</u> of generated electricity is required for operating the mini-hydro plant
 - Daily operating hours: 24 hours
 - Monthly operating days: <u>25 days</u>
 - Season: (dry season) <u>4 months</u>, (wet season) <u>8 months</u>
 - Grid emission factor: <u>0.70 kgCO2/kWh</u>

(Question)

How much emission reduction is expected by this project activity?





















| • How much fuel is rea | quired for operating the plant annually? quired for biomass transportation annually? |
|---|---|
| Furnace oil required for Diesel required for tra | or operation of the new plant: <u>6t/month</u> nsportation of biomass: <u>2t/month</u> |
| n-site fossil fuel consumptio | on |
| 6 t/month × 12 months | = <u>72 t/year</u> |
| | |
| ossil fuel consumption for bi | iomass transport |





Waste Management/Handling CDM Project

13 May 2011

Satoshi Sugimoto JICA Expert Team



1. Waste Management and GHGs Emission





Source Flaring (Burning) Solid Waste/ CH4 Capture Flaring (Burning) Wastewater Direct heat use Electricity generation CH4 Emission Avoidance/Reduction by Acrobic Treatment of Organic Matter Including composition









4. Key parameters in CH₄ emission from

CH₄ emission from waste

CH₄ is generated as a result of <u>degradation of organic materials</u> under <u>anaerobic conditions</u>.

- The time required for the waste to decay (half-life) is different among the types of waste.
- Part of CH₄ generated is oxidized in the cover of solid waste disposal (CH₄ oxidation by methanotrophic micro-organisms in cover soils).

Key Parameter in CH₄ emission

- Degradable organic materials (Degradable Organic Carbon: DOC) in waste.
- Degree of anaerobic condition in waste (Methane Correction Factor: MCF).
- The time required for the waste to decay (decay rate)

4. Key parameters in CH₄ emission from

(1) Content of DOC by types of waste

| Type of Waste | DOC content (% on weight basis) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|--|--|
| | Wet waste | Dry waste | | |
| Paper/cardboard | 40 | 44 | | |
| Textiles | 24 | 30 | | |
| Food waste | 15 | 38 | | |
| Wood | 43 | 50 | | |
| Garden and park waste | 20 | 49 | | |
| Nappies | 24 | 60 | | |
| Rubber and leather | 39 | 47 | | |
| Inert waste (plastic, metal, glass) | - | - | | |
| | | | | |

Content of organic waste is the key to amount of CH₄ emission.

4. Key parameters in CH₄ emission from

(2) Degree of anaerobic condition (Methane Correction Factor)

| Type of Waste disposal (Landfill) | Methane Correction Factor (MCF) |
|---|---------------------------------|
| Managed – anaerobic | 1.0 |
| Managed – semi-aerobic | 0.5 |
| Unmanaged – deep (>5 m waste) and/or high water table | 0.8 |
| Unmanaged – Shallow (<5 m waste) | 0.4 |
| Uncategorised waste disposal | 0.6 |

The intensity of methane emission is considerably influenced by the anaerobic condition of waste varying with types of final disposal practices.
 The more anaerobic the condition of waste, the more CH₄ is generated.

4. Key parameters in CH₄ emission from

(2) Degree of anaerobic condition (Methane Correction Factor)

| Type of Waste disposal (Landfill) | Definition |
|---|---|
| Managed – anaerobic | The landfills which have controlled placement of waste (i.e. waste directed to specific deposition areas, a degree of control of scavenging and a degree of control of fires) and include at least one of the following: (i) cover material; (ii) mechanical compacting; or (iii) levelling of the waste. |
| Managed – semi-aerobic | The landfills which have controlled placement of waste and include all of the following structures for introducing air to waste layer: (i) permeable cover material; (ii) leachate drainage system; (iii) regulating pondage; and (iv) gas ventilation system. |
| Unmanaged – deep (>5 m waste) and/or high water table | All landfills not meeting the criteria of managed landfill s above and which have depths of greater than or equal to 5 meters and/or high water table at near ground level. |
| Unmanaged – Shallow (<5 m waste) | All landfills not meeting the criteria of managed landfills above and which have depths of less than 5 meters. |

4. Key parameters in CH₄ emission from

(3) Time required for the waste to decay (Decay rate of waste)

| Туре о | f Waste | Tropical Climate (MAT >20°C) | | | |
|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|
| | | Dry (MAP<1,000mm) | Moist and Wet (MAP>=1,000mm) | | |
| Slowly degrading waste | Paper/textiles waste | 0.045 | 0.07 | | |
| | Wood/straw waste | 0.025 | 0.035 | | |
| Moderately degrading waste putrescible/Garden and park waste | | 0.065 | 0.17 | | |
| Rapidly degrading waste Food waste/sewerage sludge | | 0.085 | 0.4 | | |
| Decay rate of wast | e is given as a constan | t by types of waste bas | sed on the time | | |

5. Estimation of CH₄ from Waste Disposal

Site

Equation

| $BE_{CH4,SWDS,y} = \varphi \cdot (1-f) \cdot GWP_{CH4} \cdot (1-OX) \cdot \frac{16}{12} \cdot F \cdot DOC_{f} \cdot MCF \cdot \sum_{x=1}^{y} \sum_{j} W_{j,x} \cdot DOC_{j} \cdot e^{-k_{j} \cdot (y-x)} \cdot (1-e^{-k_{j}}) $ | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| BE _{CH4, SWDS,y} | Methane emissions during the year y from waste disposal at the solid waste disposal site (SWDS) during the period from the start of waste disposal activity to the end of the year y (tCO ₂ e) | | | |
| φ | Model correction factor to account for model uncertainties (0.9) | | | |
| f | Fraction of methane captured at the SWDS and flared, combusted or used in another manner (in this case 0) | | | |
| GWP _{CH4} | Global Warming Potential (GWP) of methane, valid for commitment (21) | | | |
| OX | Oxidation factor (reflecting the amount of methane from SWDS that is oxidized in the soil or other material covering the waste (default value: 0.1) | | | |
| F | Fraction of methane in the SWDS gas (volume fraction) (default value:0.5) | | | |
| DOC _f | Fraction of degradable organic carbon (DOC) that can decompose (default value:0.5) | | | |

5. Estimation of CH₄ from Waste Disposal

| SILE | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|--|
| Equation | <u>n</u> | | |
| BE _{CH4,SWDS,y} = | $\varphi \cdot (1-f) \cdot GWP_{CH4} \cdot (1-OX) \cdot \frac{16}{12} \cdot F \cdot DOC_{f} \cdot MCF \cdot \sum_{x=1}^{y} \sum_{j} W_{j,x} \cdot DOC_{j} \cdot e^{-k_{j} \cdot (y-x)} \cdot (1-e^{-k_{j}})$ | | |
| MCF | Methane correction factor (determined by types of SWDS) | | |
| W _{j,x} | Amount of organic waste type j disposed at the SWDS in the year x (tons) | | |
| DOC _j | Fraction of degradable organic carbon (by weight) in the waste type j | | |
| k _j | Decay rate for the waste type j | | |
| j | Waste type category | | |
| e | The base of natural logarithm (Napier's number: 2.718) | | |
| X | Year during the crediting period: x runs from the first year of the first crediting period (x=1) to the year y for which avoided emissions are calculated (x=y) | | |
| Y | Y Year for which methane emissions are calculated. | | |
| | | | |

6. Exercise: Estimation CH₄ emission from SWDS

Question

Estimate the amount of CH_4 emission from SWDS in 1 (one) year under the following preconditions

(Preconditions)

| Items | Preconditions | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--|--|
| The amount of waste disposed | | 100 tons/day | | |
| Waste composition by types (% by | Paper/Cardboard | 10% | | |
| weight) | Textiles | 0% | | |
| | Food waste | 30% | | |
| | Wood | 0% | | |
| | Garden and park waste | 20% | | |
| | Inert waste | 40% | | |
| Type of Waste Disposal Landfill | Unmanaged -deep (>5m) | landfill | | |
| | | | | |
| | | 17 | | |





6. Exercise: Estimation CH₄ emission from SWDS

| Step 1: Total amount of waste disposed per year | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|--|----|--------|--|--|
| Amount of waste disposed (tons/day) Amount of waste disposed (tons/year) | | | | | | |
| 100 | | 36,500 | | | | |
| Step 2: Amount of waste disposed by type of waste | | | | | | |
| Amount of waste disposed (tons/year) | Waste comp | Amount of Waste by types (tons/year) | | | | |
| 36,500 | Paper/cardboard | | 10 | 3,650 | | |
| | Textiles | | 0 | 0 | | |
| | Food Waste | | 30 | 10,950 | | |
| | Wood O | | 0 | | | |
| | Garden/park waste | | 20 | 7,300 | | |
| | Inert waste | | 40 | 14,600 | | |
| | | | | | | |

6. Exercise: Estimation CH₄ emission from SWDS

| Amount of Waste by types (tons/year) | | Content of DOC (% on weight basis) | Decay rate in the first year | Total amount of DOCs in a year (tons/year) |
|---|---------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| Paper/cardboard | 3,650 | 40 | 0.068 | 99.28 |
| Textiles | 0 | 24 | 0.068 | 0 |
| Food waste | 10,950 | 15 | 0.330 | 542.025 |
| Wood | 0 | 43 | 0.034 | 0 |
| Garden/park waste | 7,300 | 20 | 0.156 | 227.76 |
| Inert waste | 14,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 869.065 | | | |

21



Afforestation Reforestation

20th May 2011 JICA Expert Team Shiro Chikamatsu



Objectives of the Seminar

- To understand the major issues regarding A/R carbon credit projects
- To understand the basic components of the A/R CDM methodology
- To know that there are new approaches to forestry carbon credit projects

Table of contents



1. Basics

- What are A/R projects?
- A/R Definitions
- Remote Sensing Technology
- Geographic Information System
- Stratification

2. A/R Issues

- CDM Statistics
- Issue1: Permanence
- Issue2: Monitoring

3. A/R Methodology

- Types of Methodologies
- Methodologies used for registered projects
- Basic concept
- Procedure

4. New Approach

- Credit pooling
- REDD
- REDD & A/R Comparison
- Countries which may benefit from REDD projects
- REDD, REDD+ and REDD++
- Potential projects in Sri Lanka³



4

1. Basics

1. Basics What are A/R projects?

- A/R→Afforestation Reforestation
- CO₂ is absorbed by the trees
- Trees fix the carbon during its growth, thus prevent emission of CO₂ to the atmosphere.



1. Basics A/R definitions

5

• Reforestation (CDM definition)

is the direct human-induced conversion of non-forested land to forested land through planting, seeding and/or the human-induced promotion of natural seed sources, on land that was forested but that has been converted to non-forested land. For the first commitment period, reforestation activities will be limited to reforestation occurring on those lands that did not contain forest on 31 December 1989.

Afforestation (CDM definition)

is the direct human-induced <u>conversion of land that has not been</u> forested for a period of at least 50 years to forested land through planting, seeding and/or the human-induced promotion of natural seed sources.

1. Basics **Remote Sensing Technology**



Remote Sensing involves acquisition of the land surface data using aerial sensor technologies, such as aerial surveillance and satellite imaging.



Terrain information



Forest Cover Information

1. Basics **Geographic Information System**



Geographic Information System (GIS) is an information technology system which manages data in reference to geographic location data.



1. Basics **Stratification**



- REDD project sites are divided into strata.
- Each strata is in homogenous condition
- Sampling needs to be conducted at each strata.



Source: JICA (2008) Guidebook for Small Scale AR CDM activities

Factors which affects

- - - Tree species
 - Timing of planting & harvesting 9

2. A/R Issues

2. A/R Issues CDM Statistics



- As of May 2011, there are 3034 registered projects.
- Of which <u>21 projects are registered A/R projects</u>.
- That is 0.7% of the total registered projects.



There are two major issues regarding A/R CDM...

2. A/R Issues Issue1: Non-Permanence



11

- Trees stocks carbon (thus it is a carbon sink).
- Once the tree is combusted or rotten, CO₂ and methane are released to the atmosphere.



Carbon credit generated from A/R CDM activities are different from the other CDM projects. **They are time limited credits.** I-CER: expires at the end of the crediting period (end of project) t-CER: expires during every commitment period (end of Kyoto Protocol)

2. A/R Issues Issue2: Monitoring



Monitoring of forestry activity involves covering vast area of land, from 1,000 ha to even 10,000ha.

It involves field survey (per strata) and that requires significant manpower. Therefore monitoring activity is often carried out every 5 years, in which case carbon credit could only be issued every 5 yeas.

Example of Monitoring Parameters for Hydro Power Project:

- Supply of electricity to the grid
- Flow rate of the water
- CO2 emission factor of the grid
- Inhouse electricity consumption

Specific monitoring points

Example of Monitoring Parameters for AR CDM project:

- Fossil fuel use at the site (chainsaw/tractors)
- Burning of biomass
- Nitrogen Fertilization
- Tree diameter sampling

AR CDM needs to cover vast area



13

3. A/R Methodology

3. A/R Methodology Types of methodologies



There are currently 12 large scale and 6 small scale approved CDM methodologies. Small scale methodology is less than 60,000t

Large scale Methodologies

| AR-AM0002 | Restoration of degraded lands through |
|------------------------|---|
| AR-AM0004 | Reforestation or afforestation of land currently |
| AR-AM0005 | Afforestation and reforestation project activities |
| AR-AM0006 | Afforestation/Reforestation with Trees Supported |
| AR-AM0007 | Afforestation and Reforestation of Land Currently |
| AR-AM0009 | Afforestation or reforestation on degraded land |
| AR-AM0010 | Afforestation and reforestation project activities implemented on unmanaged grassland in |
| AR-AM0011 | Afforestation and reforestation of land subject to |
| AR-AM0012 | Afforestation or reforestation of degraded or abandoned agricultural lands |
| AR-AM0013 | Afforestation and reforestation of lands other than wetlands |
| AR-ACM000 AR-ACM000 | Afforestation and reforestation of degraded land Afforestation or reforestation of degraded land without displacement of are project activities |
| | without displacement of pre-project activities |

Small scale Methodologies

 AR-AMS0001 Simplified baseline and monitoring methodologies for small-scale A/R CDM project activities implemented on grasslands or croplands with limited displacement of preproject activities under the CDM implemented on settlements
 AR-AMS0002 project activities under the CDM implemented on settlements
 AR-AMS0003 Simplified baseline and monitoring methodology for small scale CDM afforestation and reforestation project activities implemented on wetlands
 AR-AMS0004 Simplified baseline and monitoring methodology for small-scale agroforestry afforestation and reforestation project activities under the clean development mechanism
 AR-AMS0005 Simplified baseline and monitoring methodology for small-scale afforestation and reforestation project activities under the clean development mechanism implemented on lands having low inherent potential to support living biomass
 AR-AMS0006 Simplified baseline and monitoring methodology for small-scale silvopastoral afforestation and reforestation project activities under the clean development mechanism
 AR-AMS0007 Simplified baseline and monitoring methodology for small-scale silvopastoral afforestation and reforestation project activities under the clean development mechanism
 AR-AMS0007 Simplified baseline and monitoring methodology for small-scale A/R CDM project activities implemented on grasslands or

croplands

3. A/R Methodology Methodologies used for registered projects



15



AR-AMS0001 Simplified baseline and monitoring methodologies for small-scale A/R CDM project activities implemented on grasslands or croplands with limited displacement of pre-project activities



Source: JICA (2008) Guidebook for Small Scale AR CDM activities

3. A/R Methodology Procedure



Delineation of the project activity

Stratification of project boundary

Selection of carbon pools Determination of Baseline Scenario Identification of emission by source Addtionality

Provide calculation methods for exante estimation of baseline, actual removals, Emission, leakage

Determination of ex-ante estimation of net anthropogenic GHG removals

Confirmation of the project boundary

Confirmation of stratification

Sampling design for monitoring

Provide method for field measurement

Provide calculation methods for expost estimation of baseline, actual removals, Emission, leakage

Determination of ex-post estimation of net anthropogenic GHG removals



19

4. New Apporach



As long the carbon credit pool is managed correctly, the carbon credit from these projects, could be treated as "permanent".

20

4. New Approach REDD



REDD:

Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation



4. New Approach REDD & A/R Comparison



AR/CDM stocks carbon, where as REDD project avoids the GHG emission cased by the loss of forest cover.



4. New Approach Countries which may benefit from REDD projects





4. New Approach REDD, REDD+ and REDD++



Avoiding deforestation in one part of the land may cause increase in timber harvesting activities in another part of the land. By providing timber from a sustainably managed REDD+ site, it ensures sufficient quantity of timber will be supplied to the market.

| REDD | DD | Deforestation |
|--------|----------|---|
| | | Forest Degradation |
| REDD+ | + | Reforestation |
| | | Sustainable Forest Management |
| REDD++ | Another+ | Management of the buffer zones (social aspec) |

REDD, REDD+ and REDD++ categorisation



Potential projects in Sri Lanka

- REDD+ and REDD++
- Sustainable forest management
- A/R projects may be beneficial, if it has significant social and/or environmental benefits such as watershed conservation and agroforestry.



25