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Main issues discussed:

- Current rule regarding investment analysis: no need to demonstrate the financial feasibility of project with CDM revenues
- Do we need to change the current rule? Why?
- Consensus: no need to change for many reasons
  a) Legal basis
  b) Practical reasons
Main issues discussed:

- Should we allow demonstration of additionality through use of CER revenues? Why? How?
- No consensus
- Supports for allowing this possibility:
  a) Already methodologies allowing this
  b) Should allow meth proponents to limit the options
  c) One alternative to demonstrate additionality for projects facing difficulties utilizing current approaches
  d) Allowing this does not mean this will be applied in future ones
Main issues discussed:

- Objections to this possibility:
  a) No basis
  b) Policy issue
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Main issues discussed:

- **How to address this policy issue and accommodate the needs of specific project types:**
  
a) Allow more flexibilities, rather than only allowing consideration of CER revenues

b) Provide more options for additionality demonstration in specific sectors other than the 3 existing approaches

c) Common practice as one possible approach in addition to barrier and investment analysis and positive list

d) Criteria to be developed to identify the sectors
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Action points / Proposals:

• Not to include CERs revenues
  • Clear message to DOE to allow PPs to demonstrate additionality without considering CER revenues in investment analysis
  • Review and revision of current methodologies
• Development of other possible approaches
• Criteria on change of positive list