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Increasing number of PoAs, mostly applying SSC method

PoAs entering validation

Data as of 31 March 2013
Source: UNFCCC

Notes: Trends are locally weighted regressions at a bandwidth of 0.50. PoAs entering validation can be discontinued at any stage (excl. projects that have been resubmitted).
Recent developments

• Many recommendation of 6\textsuperscript{th} RT addressed until EB 70:
  • Positive list for additionality introduced
  • Start date PoA and CPAs resolved
  • Flexibility to provide real/actual case CPA-DDs
  • Pragmatic approach to post-registration changes to PoA-DD and CPA-DD
New Issues Catalogued for 7th RT

Issue 1: Single sampling plan for a group of CPAs
Issue 2: Pragmatic approaches for reliability targets in sample survey results
Issue 3: Generic CPA-DDs per CPA type; how to define CPA type
Issue 4: Implications of changes to PDD form to the registered PoAs
Issue 5: Application of the sampling standard to early mover PoAs
Issue 6: Synchronised issuance requests of CPAs of PoA
Issue 7: Inclusion of an additional technology to an already included CPA
Issue 8: Sampling for DOE validation/verification
Issue 9: Innovative sampling (monitoring) methods
Issue 1: Single Sampling Plan

- Sampling for a group of small scale CPAs
  - Homogeneity demonstrated, or
  - Heterogeneity accounted for (e.g. via stratified sampling)
Issue 1: Single Sampling Plan

- Option 1: Mandatory stratified sampling
- Option 2: Homogeneity demonstrated, e.g. whether:
  a) Technology has comparable input/output characteristics;
  b) Technology is fixed or portable;
  c) Power rating of technologies is comparable;
  d) End-users of technology have comparable socioeconomic conditions;
  e) Geographic locations of project equipment has negligible impact on the parameter;
  f) Installation dates of CPAs are not significantly different
  • e.g. Use failure rate curves in AMS II.J
Issue 2: Pragmatic approaches to reliability targets

• Steps to follow when the required reliability is not met (e.g. additional samples) are not sufficient in many cases.

• Pragmatic conservative approaches to emission reductions are preferred by stakeholders.

• Potential approaches

  a) Lower or upper bound of 90 or 95 CI;

  b) Linear discounting (by a factor of x) for a limited period of monitoring and limited extent of deficit;

  c) Fall back on conservative default value in the methodology (e.g. 3.5 hours for lighting usage, and default failure rates in AMS-II.J).
Issue 3: Separate generic CPA-DDs for each CPA type

• A separate generic CPA-DD for each CPA type
  a) Definition of CPA type (guidance in the project Standard is not sufficient)
  b) Centre of gravity in the PoA-DD versus in generic/specific CPA-DD

• A channel to get a rapid response for the specific situation of a PoA on case to case basis (e.g. fast-track clarification)?
Issue 4: Impact of new PDD form to the registered PoAs

• Form to use for
  • CPA inclusion to PoA registered under VVM track.
  • Post registration changes

• Secretariat interpretation:
  a) for including CPAs into PoAs registered under VVM track: (i) CPA-DD form of VVS track; and (ii) Part II of the PoA-DD of VVS track shall be completed
  b) the generic CPA-DD of VVS track is additional to, and not a replacement for, the original generic CPA-DD;
  c) a new PoA-DD form is required for PRC to a PoA registered under VVM track.

• Discuss and find optimal solutions
Issue 5: Application of the sampling standard to early mover PoAs

• It is unclear if sampling standard is mandatory for PoAs registered before the approval of the sampling standard.
  a) Continue to apply validated monitoring plan in the registered PoA-DD or CPA-DD?
  b) Apply sampling standard and guidelines?
• New elements versus clarifications in the sampling standard/guidelines
  a) Relative versus absolute precision
  b) Stratification requirements
Issue 6: Monitoring of a PoAs and issuance requests

• Synchronized CPA issuance requests for all CPAs in a PoA:
  a) Verification/issuance for the entire PoA for a specific monitoring period will be delayed even if one CPA requires post registration change or requests deviation
  b) Impractical in some cases e.g. CFL PoAs with lengthy timelines for CFL distribution

• Pragmatic solutions, that also address concerns on:
  a) Overlaps and double counting
  b) Process efficiency (once registered PoAs were to function as a single project activity)
Issue 7: Inclusion of an additional measure / technology to an already included CPA

• Addition of a new specific CPA-DD for a new technology is allowed as long as the technology was indicated in the registered PoA.

• No such provisions exist for the inclusion of an additional measure / technology to an already included CPA.

• Options, pros and cons to be discussed
Issue 8: Sampling for DOE validation/verification

• Sampling requirements for DOEs
  a) With realistic, practical considerations (remote areas, dispersed regions, security, cost)
  b) Acceptance sampling is not mandatory but also may not work for all situations
     • field/onsite check of a random sample of the PPs sample records (typically 50)
     • Cannot be carried out within reasonable time for PoAs with many small units
### Issue 8: Sampling for DOE validation/verification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AQL</th>
<th>UQL</th>
<th>Sample Size (n)</th>
<th>Accept. number (c)</th>
<th>Sample Size (n)</th>
<th>Accept. number (c)</th>
<th>Sample Size (n)</th>
<th>Accept. number (c)</th>
<th>Sample Size (n)</th>
<th>Accept. number (c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issue 9: Innovative sampling (monitoring) methods

- Methodologies for dispersed activities (e.g. AMS.III-AR for LED lighting) need tracking the end users of the lamp throughout the crediting period
  a) Challenging to implement in remote rural areas of SSA where the projects under this methodology are generally located.
- Alternative solutions?
  a) Sample villages and then sample within the villages
  b) Define very conservative failure rate curves in methodologies
  c) Based on end of life components collected from the field (e.g. batteries of LED lamps)
Extra slides
Type of projects in the PoA pipeline

Number of PoAs compared to normal CDM

Source: UNEP Risoe
PoA distribution by type

- Solar: 18.3%
- Waste: 21.6%
- EE demand side: 30.5%
- Hydro: 10.2%
- Wind: 6.6%
- Biomass energy: 4.1%
- EE supply side: 2.3%
- Coal Mine Methane: 1.3%
- Transport: 1.5%
- Fossil fuel switch: 1.3%
- Fugitive: 0.8%
- Geothermal: 0.3%
- Forestry & Agriculture: 1.3%
% comparison of regional distribution of pCDM and CDM

- Latin America: 17% pCDM, 14% CDM
- Asia & Pacific: 50% pCDM, 81% CDM
- Europe & Central Asia: 1% pCDM, 1.1% CDM
- Africa: 30% pCDM, 3.0% CDM
- Middle-East: 2% pCDM, 1.1% CDM
- LDCs: 11% pCDM, 1.2% CDM

Legend:
- pCDM
- CDM
Key issues and EB decisions - Start date and crediting period

PoA lifetime = max. 28 years

Start date of PoA (e.g. notification to DNA & Sec)
Registration of PoA (Earliest start date of CP of PoA)

CPA1 → CPA2 → CPA3 → CPA4

CPA5 → CPA6

Fixed CP CPAs

7 yrs 7 yrs 7 yrs 7 - x yrs

PoA, renewal
PoA, renewal
PoA, renewal

End date of PoA

PoA lifetime = max. 28 years
Key issues and EB decisions - Start date and crediting period

- CPA renewal

PoA lifetime = max. 28 years

Start date of PoA (Date of registration at earliest)  End date of PoA

Fixed CP CPAs
Renewal CP CPAs
PoA for efficient residential lighting applying more than one methodology will need more than one generic CPA-DD (e.g. a generic CPA-DD for efficient residential lighting under AMS-II.C and a generic CPA-DD for efficient residential lighting under AMS-II.J).

PoA for energy efficiency activities applying a single methodology but including different technologies will need more than one generic CPA-DD (e.g. a generic CPA-DD for efficient street lighting under AMS-II.C and a generic CPA-DD for efficient water pumping under AMS-II.C).

PoA for treatment of domestic manure would need more than one generic CPA-DD for applying more than one combination of methodologies (e.g. a generic CPA-DD for applying the combination AMS-III.R.+AMS-I.E.+AMS-I.I. and a generic CPA-DD for applying the combination AMS-III.R.+AMS-I.I).

Separate generic CPA-DDs are not required to cover cases that do not differ in terms of emission reduction calculations (e.g. separate generic CPA-DDs are not required for installing prefabricated project stoves of efficiency N under methodology AMS-II.G by manufacturer M1 versus installing prefabricated project stoves of efficiency N under methodology AMS-II.G by manufacturer M2).