

Ninth CDM Roundtable

Wrap-up session

Bonn, Germany, 23 August 2013



Session III: Monitoring guidance for measurement issues in methodologies

Main issues discussed:

- Monitoring plan should be specified in detail at verification and have a general description at the validation.
- Accuracy vs. Conservativeness – If measurements are accurate no need for Conservativeness.
- The use of the **single conservative factor** at the end of the ER calculation could be used to ensure that there is no overestimation of ER and it's easy to present (but maybe it's not a transparent).
- Other view is to use be conservative approach on each parameter when accuracy is not achieved.



Session III: Monitoring guidance for measurement issues in methodologies

Main issues discussed (continued):

- Revision in monitoring plan may not need prior approval. Cases need to be more specific/detailed.
- Most conservative assumption is usually zero. An extrapolation with historical information could be possible to use not to be overly conservative.
- Use the concept of materiality in a broader way. If data from the source of emissions is missing and there is no material implications then DOE could accept alternatives scenarios if reasonable assurance is achieved.



Session III: Monitoring guidance for measurement issues in methodologies

Main issues discussed (continued):

- Small emissions sources** - (e.g. small flows of hazardous fuels).
Provide alternative methods to measure/deal with them

- Missing data** - for parameters when no historical information is available. Use an approximation and then if needed discount ERs from further issuances

- Leakage** - Use previous historical leakage information as proxy to determine it or a conservative leakage factor to simplify the determination

- Use the principle of subsidiarity** - Decision should be taken at the lowest appropriate level. For example if changes are within the methodology parameters then EB approval may not be required?



Main issues discussed (continued):

Other issues raised **on secretariat proposal**

- a) **Chapter 2** - Consistency - Minor editorial and non-material changes could be allowed.
- b) **Chapter 3** - Clarity on what kind of information needs to be provided for laboratory specifications.
- c) **Chapter 4.1. Project boundary** - Only main equipment and installations could defined under project boundary.

Session III: Monitoring guidance for measurement issues in methodologies

Action points / Proposals:

- *Secretariat will analyze the inputs and try to incorporate them into the work*

