## A/R CDM methodologies - Lessons Learned from Validation



Sebastian Hetsch & Juan Chang

Carbon Management Service TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH

## Background



- AR-CDM methodologies since 2006. Long time
  more methodologies than projects
- Important to improve the overall process for AR-CDM project activities based on lessons learnt from existing projects
- TÜV SÜD has validated 12 of currently 22 registered AR-CDM projects (14 more projects in validation pipeline)

## **Eligibility of lands**



- EB 35 Annex 18: Procedure to demonstrate eligibility of lands for AR-CDM project activities
- Some countries have chosen small <u>CDM forest</u> <u>definition</u> (e.g. 500 m² min area, 15% crown cover, 2 m height)
- Extremely difficult to comply with the eligibility procedure showing that there was no forest cover in 1989, as Landsat data is key resource (resolution 30x30 m)
- -> Standardize requirement for forest cover in 1989?

## **Eligibility of lands**



Quality for remote sensing analysis can differ.
 Defined steps for good practice in remote sensing analysis would be helpful. (Geometric and thematic accuracy need to be defined in standardized in all projects)

## **Additionality**



#### **Barrier analysis**

- The tool mentions various barriers, however it is unclear for several barrier how CDM can alleviate them, considering that CDM does foremost provide additional financial incentives through carbon finance:
  - Institutional barrier
  - Local tradition
  - Ecological conditions
  - -> Guidelines for barrier analysis in AR-CDM projects

## **Additionality**



#### **Investment analysis**

- The current guidance is not applicable to AR-CDM project activities. It needs to be clarified:
  - Time for investment analysis (is up to 60 year crediting period useful for an IRR calculation?)
  - How shall residual value be taken into consideration (land and timber value)
  - -> Guidelines for investment analysis would be helpful (including a template for IRR calculations)

#### Calculation of GHG removals



- Calculations for AR-CDM activities have been streamlined with new version of AR-CDM methodologies
- Still calculation spreadsheets are often complex and large Excel file (>30 MB). A simplified draft templates could be made available (only input data needed in area, growth model, BEF, D, R and CF)
- Database for input values would be helpful for project developers (IPCC already provides a good basis)

## Monitoring



- List of monitoring parameters in old (versions of) methodologies is too excessive, which implies difficulties at verification
  - -> Allow for use of monitoring parameter as per later methodologies?

## General Remarks on Methodologies

Industrie Service

- 12 large-scale and 7 small-scale methodologies are available. However differences between meth are minor. Many project activities could apply several methodologies.
  - Streamline methodologies? One methodology with options for e.g. leakage, different baseline scenarios etc might be sufficient

#### Conclusion



- AR-CDM project activities have come a long way. Sufficient methodologies are available, enough projects are registered / in the pipeline to gather experience and improve the process
- Further simplification / consolidation of methodologies necessary
- Need to streamline the registration process of AR-CDM projects to avoid administrative hurdles (due to specific AR-CDM features and requirements)

# Thank you for your attention

sebastian.hetsch@tuev-sued.de www.tuev-sued.de/climatechange

