



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

For Reference:

**WRI/WBCSD GHG Protocol's  
Principles for GHG accounting and  
reporting:**

1. Relevance
2. Completeness
3. Consistency
4. Transparency
5. Accuracy
6. Enable other goals

**Potential Goals of GHG Reporting:**

1. Identifying reduction opportunities
2. Reducing risks (e.g., start learning curve)
3. Tracking GHG emissions, assisting the state in constructing annual inventories
4. Participating in voluntary programs
5. Participating in - or preparing for - mandatory programs
6. Precursor for registry participation
7. Opportunities for recognition
8. Public reporting
9. Consistency with other programs
10. Others?

#	Design Element	Options	Design Considerations	Preliminary Recommendation
1.	<b>Type of Program</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Voluntary</li> <li>• Mandatory</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May need or want to constrain mandatory applicability to certain sectors and/or sources pending availability of accepted quantification protocols.</li> <li>• Mandatory reporting is in place in some states for permitted sources (ME, CT, etc.); anticipated soon for several others in Northeast and far West.</li> </ul>	•
2.	<b>Sectors</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All sectors eligible</li> <li>• Limited to certain sectors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation may be limited by availability of quantification methods; may need to “stage” sector participation.</li> <li>• WRI calculation protocols: Stationary combustion, mobile, electric power, cement, iron &amp; steel, aluminum, pulp &amp; paper, wood products, lime, ammonia, purchased heat or power, others.</li> </ul>	•
3.	<b>Sources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All</li> <li>• Stationary combustion emissions</li> <li>• Mobile combustion emissions</li> <li>• Process emissions</li> <li>• Fugitive emissions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could limit sources even within sectors, (e.g., via types, size thresholds, etc.).</li> <li>• Broader array promotes inventory building, public information, identification of GHG strategies, etc.</li> </ul>	•
4.	<b>Organizational Boundary</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Entity-wide (e.g., corporation-wide)</li> <li>• Facility</li> <li>• Emissions unit or source point</li> <li>• Other (?)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear definitions needed to avoid double counting where shared ownership exists.</li> <li>• Should strive to have design be consistent with possible future directions (e.g., mandatory reporting would not be enforceable above the facility level).</li> <li>• Combinations are possible (e.g., finer resolution aggregated to a greater whole).</li> </ul>	•

#	Design Element	Options	Design Considerations	Preliminary Recommendation
5.	<b>Reporting Period</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Calendar</li> <li>- Fiscal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should strive for consistency with other reporting programs.</li> </ul>	•
6.	<b>Greenhouse Gases Included</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Six “Kyoto gases” (CO<sub>2</sub>, HFCs, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, PFCs, SF<sub>6</sub>)</li> <li>• Black Carbon</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should strive for consistency with other reporting programs.</li> <li>• Broader array promotes inventory building, public information, identification of GHG strategies, etc.</li> </ul>	
7.	<b>Scope of Emissions Covered</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Scope 1”</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Indirect <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Scope 2” - Indirect from purchased Heat &amp; Electricity</li> <li>- “Scope 3” - other indirect (e.g., outsourced activities, employee travel, etc.)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Both</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May need or want to “stage” coverage (e.g., start small &amp; expand).</li> <li>• direct emissions most like current reporting requirements, but may omit GHG reduction opportunities or encourage direct-indirect trade-offs.</li> <li>• For many entities, most GHG emissions are from indirect emissions sources.</li> </ul>	•
8.	<b>Emissions Quantification &amp; Monitoring</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Calculation methods &amp; tools</li> <li>• Direct measurement (e.g., CEMs, Stack Testing)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should strive to use current best practice methods, such as <i>GHG Protocol</i> calculation tools, and to have consistency with other reporting programs.</li> <li>• Some “other” or “home grown” approaches may be necessary (e.g., Flashing emissions; IPIECA<sup>1</sup>, API’s<sup>2</sup> SANGA<sup>TM</sup> GHG Emissions Software).</li> </ul>	•
9.	<b>Verification</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State verification</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If mandatory, the state may be able to use current verification procedures for criteria pollutants.</li> </ul>	•

<sup>1</sup> IPIECA is the International Petroleum Industry Environmental Conservation Association.

<sup>2</sup> API is the American Petroleum Association.

#	Design Element	Options	Design Considerations	Preliminary Recommendation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3<sup>rd</sup> party verification</li> <li>• Self-certification</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DAQ does 3<sup>rd</sup> party verification.</li> </ul>	
10.	<b>Public Access &amp; Reports</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internet access and/or Online reports</li> <li>• Paper reports</li> <li>• Both</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Confidential Business Information” (CBI) concerns</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
11.	<b>Project Level Reporting or “Offsets”</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes/No</li> <li>• Constrain</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WRI: Raises quantification, baseline, “additionality,” secondary effects, reversibility, and double-counting issues.</li> <li>• Location of co-benefits achieved.</li> <li>• May be most useful when there is an externally-imposed constraint (e.g., a “Cap”).</li> </ul>	
12.	<b>Funding</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State-funded</li> <li>• Mandated requirement</li> <li>• Emission-based fees (would require legislative approval).</li> <li>• Other? A combination?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reporting is a necessary cornerstone for a GHG registry, so it may be appropriate to have registry participants share support costs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
13.	<b>Other?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>