



WWW.NCCLIMATECHANGE.US

Cross Cutting Issues Technical Working Group
Draft GHG Registry Design Options Matrix
May 31, 2006

Notes:

- Builds upon GHG Reporting Design Options Matrix
 - Some Reporting preferences could be outweighed by Registry preferences (e.g., if a regional registry has different specs).
1. Recording of GHG reductions (vs. emissions)
 2. A central, independent repository for credible info about emissions activities
 3. A "transaction ledger" - providing data management & accounting critical for trading (with or without a cap)
 4. "baseline protection" - enabling early action current or future credit for trading
 5. An incentive to track & manage emissions, seek productivity and energy efficiency gains, accelerate learning curve regarding competitiveness & carbon markets
 6. Enhance public recognition and demonstrate corporate citizenship
 7. Possible vehicle for regional, multi-state, & cross-border cooperation
 8. Others?

Potential Goals of GHG Registry:

	Design Element	Options	Design Considerations	Preliminary Recommendation
1.	Key Design Criteria (beyond GHG Reporting Design Options Matrix)			
1.1	Define geographical boundaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> North Carolina Regional (or broader) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Span of control Cost, economies of scale, & broader = better? 	•
1.2	Verification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State verification Third-party verification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See <i>GHG Reporting Design Options Matrix</i> 	•
1.3	Base Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single specified year Single entity-chosen year Average of multiple years Adjustment rules? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flexibility vs. Simplicity Must have good data for Base Year. 	•
1.4	Project-level submittals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes / No / Constrain 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Against what baseline? Additionality issues (what would have happened anyway?) 	•
1.5	“Offsets”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes / Some / No 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-benefits location? Nature / character? 	•
1.6	Start Date	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a “to be in operation” date? 	•
1.7	Ownership	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risk of double-counting 	•
1.8	Transparency	•	•	•
1.9	Others?	•	•	•
2.	Technical Issues			
2.1	Treatment of minority ownership	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>GHG Protocol</i> 	•
2.2	Merger & acquisition issues	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>GHG Protocol</i> 	•

	Design Element	Options	Design Considerations	Preliminary Recommendation
2.3	Quality Assurance; Uncertainty Analysis	•	• <i>GHG Protocol</i>	•
2.4	Regulatory guidance (Protocols, guidance documents, etc.)	•	•	•
2.5	Data flow; filing methods, etc.	•	• Confidential business information (CBI), legal authority, etc.	•
2.6	Others?	•	•	•
3. Ancillary, Administrative, & Operational Issues				
3.1	Location (Agency)	• NCDENR • Other?	• Regional potential	•
3.2	Software; Web Interface, etc.	• North Carolina-specific • CCAR, RGGR, CCX, ERT, EATS? • Other?	• Multiple needs (emissions inventory, allowances, mandatory, voluntary, etc.) • Rapidly changing “state of the art”	•
3.3	Cost	• Transaction fee • Publicly supported? • Other?	• Development costs • Ongoing operating costs	•
3.4	Oversight & Management	• NCDENR • Publicly appointed board • Other?	•	•
3.5	Reporting of Results; Recognition	•	•	•
3.6	Others?	•	•	•