

Agenda item 4.1.(b)

Paragraph 23 of the annotated agenda

Revision of the Combined Tool

CDM EB 96

Bonn, Germany, 18 to 22 September 2017



Background

- EB92 considered and approved the approach proposed by the MP to expand the applicability of the Combined Tool;
- EB92 requested the MP to incorporate the approach into the Tool, and to a) ensure that it will not add unnecessary burden to the PPs in Step 1 of the tool; and b) carefully analyse whether the application of the revised tool conflicts with any of the existing applicability of methodologies.
- The revised Combined Tool was sent for Public Call at MP72.
- An information note analysing the potential issues that may conflict with the new Tool was also prepared.



Purpose

The final revised Combined Tool and the Information note analysing potential conflicts were prepared to address the mandate above.



The final revised Combined Tool

- The approach has been agreed by the Board at EB 92;
 - Applicability expanded;
 - Benchmark based approach introduced when service/product cannot only be provided by the PP;
 - Updated the Barrier analysis based previous EB decision.
- The MP is also of the opinion that the revised texts has not changed significantly the requirement in Step 1 regarding identification of baseline alternatives, thus would not incur unnecessary burdens to the PP as compared with the situation today.



Information Note analyzing the potential conflicts

- Once the proposed Combined Tool (CT) is approved, the next step is to incorporate revised CT into meths to the possible extent:
- The analysis was preformed by both the MP members and the Secretariat independently, focusing on the following 59 meths
 - Group 1: 45 meths currently referring to the Additionality Tool (AT);
 - Group 2: 7 meths currently referring to both CT and AT;
 - Group 3: 7 meths currently referring to neither CT nor AT;
- The focused areas cover both additionality demonstration and baseline emission calculation.



Information Note analyzing the potential conflicts

In summary, it was found that:

- No conceptual issues/conflicts were identified for 45 meths;
- 5 meths do not need to refer to either tool, since both baseline and additionality have been pre-defined by the methodology itself (e.g., AM0070);
- 9 meths have provided pre-defined baseline, but referred to the AT for additionality demonstration. Two options had been discussed by the Panel:
 - Option 1: maintain the current situation (i.e., keep referring to AT);
 - Option 2: Displace AT tool with CT by referring only certain steps of the CT for additionality demonstration.



Information Note analyzing the potential conflicts

Continued:

The MP prefers Option 1. However, the Panel do acknowledge that there are both pros and cons for either option above.

- Option 1
 - Pros: it is beneficial to practitioners who have already developed institutional memory. It permits that users of existing or future meths with a pre-defined baseline may apply a streamlined standard for additionality demonstration.
 - Cons: it will create burdens in terms of documentation control, i.e., whenever the CT is revised in the future, the AT will also need revision since the key content of the two tool are same;
- Option 2 would allow the CT to be applied in almost all methodologies, which ensures the consistency among different methodologies.



Subsequent work and timelines

- After approval of the revised Combined Tool, the next step is to incorporate the revised CT into meths, taking into input from the Board.



Recommendations to the Board

- The MP recommends that the Board
 - a) Adopt this final draft methodological tool, to be made effective at the time of the Board's approval;
 - b) Provide guidance on Options for considering the Additionality Tool used in those 9 meths.



Thank you



Agenda item 4.1.(b)

Paragraph 23 of the annotated agenda