



Article 5 Ozone Depleting Substances Project Protocol Version 2.0 ERRATA AND CLARIFICATIONS

The Climate Action Reserve (Reserve) published its Article 5 Ozone Depleting Substances Project Protocol Version 2.0 (A5 ODS V2.0) in June 2012. While the Reserve intends for the A5 ODS V2.0 to be a complete, transparent document, it recognizes that correction of errors and clarifications will be necessary as the protocol is implemented and issues are identified. This document is an official record of all errata and clarifications applicable to the A5 ODS V2.0.¹

Per the Reserve's Program Manual, both errata and clarifications are considered effective on the date they are first posted on the Reserve website. The effective date of each erratum or clarification is clearly designated below. All listed and registered A5 ODS projects must incorporate and adhere to these errata and clarifications when they undergo verification. The Reserve will incorporate both errata and clarifications into future versions of the Article 5 ODS Project Protocol.

All project developers and verification bodies must refer to this document to ensure that the most current guidance is adhered to in project design and verification. Verification bodies shall refer to this document immediately prior to uploading any Verification Statement to assure all issues are properly addressed and incorporated into verification activities.

If you have any questions about the updates or clarifications in this document, please contact Policy at policy@climateactionreserve.org or (213) 891-1444 x3.

¹ See Section 4.3.4 of the Climate Action Reserve Program Manual for an explanation of the Reserve's policies on protocol errata and clarifications. "Errata" are issued to correct typographical errors. "Clarifications" are issued to ensure consistent interpretation and application of the protocol. For document management and program implementation purposes, both errata and clarifications are contained in this single document.

Errata and Clarifications (arranged by protocol section)

Section 5

1. Correcting a Citation for Refrigerant Baseline Scenarios (ERRATUM – June 5, 2017) 2
2. Accounting for Non-ODS Material (CLARIFICATION – January 29, 2013)..... 2
3. Performance Requirements for Destruction Facilities (ERRATUM – July 16, 2015)..... 3

Section 6

4. Determining the Mass of ODS Destroyed (CLARIFICATION – April 11, 2013)..... 3

Section 5

1. Correcting a Citation for Refrigerant Baseline Scenarios (ERRATUM – June 5, 2017)

Section: 5.1 (Quantifying Baseline Emissions), Table 5.1. Refrigerant Baseline Scenarios

Context: Footnote 17 on page 16 reads “United Nations Environment Programme, Technology and Economic Assessment Panel. (2005). Report of the Task Force on Foam End-of-Life Issues.” While the value in Table 5.1 that is attributed to this reference (25%) is correct, the reference itself cites the incorrect UNEP TEAP Report.

Correction: Footnote 17, Table 5.1, page 16 shall be replaced with the following citation:

United Nations Environment Programme, Technology and Economic Assessment Panel. (2007). Report of the Task Force on HCFC Issues (with Particular Focus on the Impact of the Clean Development Mechanism) and Emissions Reduction Benefits Arising from Earlier HCFC Phase-out and Other Practical Measures.

2. Accounting for Non-ODS Material (CLARIFICATION – January 29, 2013)

Section: 5.1 (Quantifying Baseline Emissions)

Context: The protocol states that projects shall only include the weight of pure ODS when calculating emission reductions. There are additional specific adjustments that were not mentioned in the protocol and it may not be clear how these adjustments should be made. Specifically, project developers shall exclude the weight of high boiling residue (HBR) in their calculation of emission reductions.

Clarification: The definition of the term “ $Q_{\text{refr},i}$ ” in Equation 5.3 on page 17 shall read “Total quantity of pure refrigerant ODS i sent for destruction by the project.” The total weight of material destroyed by the project shall be adjusted to exclude the weight of ineligible material, including high boiling residue, as determined by the laboratory analysis required in Section 6.6 (in the case of multiple laboratory analyses, the highest reported value for HBR shall be used). In any case where the composition of the single ODS species is less than 100%, the value of this term must be adjusted to reflect the weight of pure ODS for each eligible chemical.

For example, if a project destroys 1,000 lbs. of material that contains 5% high boiling residue and 95% eligible ODS i , the value of $Q_{\text{refr},i}$ would be 902.5 lbs.

While water is also considered ineligible material, the moisture content requirement in Section 6.6 of the protocol (i.e. that the moisture content must be less than 75% of the saturation point for the ODS) already ensures that the weight of any moisture present will not have a material impact on the quantification of emission reductions. Thus the weight does not need to be adjusted to reflect the weight of moisture present in the sample.

3. Performance Requirements for Destruction Facilities (ERRATUM – July 16, 2015)

Section: 5.2.3 (Calculating Site-Specific Project Emissions from ODS Destruction)

Context: The protocol states that destruction facilities “demonstrate their ability to achieve destruction efficiencies upwards of 99.99 percent for substances with thermal stability ratings *higher* than the ODS included herein” (emphasis added). The reference cited for this statement explains a ranking system for the incinerability of ODS species based on their thermal stability. In this system, ODS species that are more thermally stable are more difficult to destroy. This results in a *lower* ranking. Thus, the lowest ranking (1) indicates the chemical that is most difficult to destroy, while the highest ranking (320) indicates the chemical that is easiest to destroy. The above-quoted statement in the A5 ODS Project Protocol includes an error that communicates the opposite of the intended meaning of the statement.

Correction: The second sentence in the first paragraph of this section shall read:

“These facilities demonstrate their ability to achieve destruction efficiencies upwards of 99.99 percent for substances with thermal stability rankings lower than the ODS included herein.”

Section 6

4. Determining the Mass of ODS Destroyed (CLARIFICATION – April 11, 2013)

Section: 6.4 (ODS Composition and Quantity Analysis Requirements)

Context: The protocol requires that the mass of ODS destroyed by the project be determined using (1) the difference between the measured weight of each container when it is full prior to destruction and the measured weight after it has been emptied and (2) the composition and concentration of material destroyed as determined by laboratory analyses of samples from each container.

Clarification: The mass of ODS and any contaminants destroyed shall be considered equal to the difference between the full and empty weights of the containers, as measured by the scale at the destruction facility and recorded by the destruction facility on the weight tickets and the Certificate of Destruction. No adjustments shall be made by the project developer to the weights as measured and recorded by the destruction facility in calculating the mass of ODS and contaminants.

Verifiers shall confirm that the weights recorded on the weight tickets and the Certificate of Destruction by the destruction facility are used without adjustment to calculate emission reductions. The mass of eligible ODS shall then be determined using these weights and the results of the laboratory analyses.