

Fifth CDM Roundtable

Wrap-up session III

Improving the assessment of additionality

Langer Eugen

Bonn Germany, 10 August 2012



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

Break-out session III: *Improving the assessment of additionality*

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

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

Action points / Proposals:

- Not to include CERs revenues
 - Clear message to DOEs 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