

Climate Action Reserve Comments to ARB on Informal Cap-and-Trade 15 Day Discussion Drafts (January 31, 2014)

Editorial Comments on Draft Amendments to Cap-and-Trade Regulation

- 95975(k): The proposed language changes to this section seem incomplete/incorrect. We believe the intent of the proposed changes is to have the verification body assess that the offset project continues to meet all additionality requirements during the verification of the first reporting period of a renewed crediting period, but the actual language changes do not fully state this.
- 95977.1.(a): The guidance in (3) and (4) seems to contradict one another – for the purposes of determining rotation of verification bodies and offset verifiers, do multiple early action reporting periods count as one reporting period or does each count as a separate reporting period?

(3): **All early action reporting periods** for which verification was conducted for an early action offset project pursuant to section 95990(f) **may count as one Reporting Period** for the purposes of determining rotation of verification bodies and offset verifiers.

(4): ... **Each early action reporting period** verified under the Early Action Offset Program is **considered a separate Reporting Period** for purposes of this section.

Editorial Comments on Draft MMC Protocol

- Table 6.1 and Equations 5.4, 5.5, 5.9 and 5.10: There appears to be some lack of clarity (or potentially disagreement) between monitoring requirements for $C_{CH_4,t}$ as described in Table 6.1, and the proposed language added to the equations (“Average methane concentrations and flow rates must be calculated **at least hourly** with more frequent calculations permitted”). If methane concentration readings are meant to be taken every two minutes and *averaged* every hour, as indicated in Table 6.1, it may help to explicitly state that in the new text added to each of these equations.
- The same comment/concern for lack of clarity or potential disagreement applies for $C_{CH_4,t}$ as described in Tables 6.2, 6.3, and 6.4, and the proposed language added to 5.15, 5.16, 5.21, 5.22, 5.27, 5.28, 5.36, 5.37, 5.42, 5.48, 5.49 (“Average methane concentrations must be calculated **at least daily** with more frequent calculations permitted”). If methane concentration readings are meant to be taken every fifteen minutes and *averaged* daily, as indicated in Tables 6.2, 6.3 and 6.4, it may help to explicitly state that in the proposed language added to each of these equations.
- Equation 5.4, Equation 5.9, and Equation 5.10: The Reserve recognizes that the parameter $Exhaust_{VOL}$ was introduced to incorporate a recent protocol clarification issued by the Reserve on its Coal Mine Methane Protocol. However, due to the way $Exhaust_{flow}$ is defined in the

equation and in Table 6.1 (specifically footnote 2 on page 99), $Exhaust_{VOL}$ may be an unnecessary parameter that appears to lack a time component over which to be quantified, potentially introducing confusion. For example, in Equation 5.4, the proposed changes replace $(VAM_{FLOW,y} \times TIME_y)$ with " $Exhaust_{vol,i}$ " in the equation " $BE_{NO,i} = Exhaust_{vol,i} \times C_{CH4,exhaust} \times 0.0423 \times 0.000454$." To improve clarity, we suggest replacing $VAM_{FLOW,y}$ with $Exhaust_{FLOW,y}$ and retaining the time component (i.e. " $BE_{NO,i} = Exhaust_{FLOW,i} \times TIME_y \times C_{CH4,exhaust} \times 0.0423 \times 0.000454$ ") and not including the new parameter $Exhaust_{VOL}$. As discussed further below, the Reserve also recommends including the guidance on $Exhaust_{flow}$ that appears as a footnote to Table 6.1 (page 99) in Equation 5.4 or elsewhere within Section 5.1.

- Equation 5.11: There appear to be a few minor typos in the proposed changes to the equation. It seems like the proper parameters should be $P_{VAinflow,y}$ and $T_{VAinflow,y}$, not $P_{VAMinflow,y}$ and $T_{VAMinflow,y}$. Further, in the definition of parameter $VA_{actual,y}$, it seems like the unit should be scfm.
- Section 5.2.2 (l) on page 60: This section does not appear to be renumbered properly; it should now be (m).
- Section 5.4.1(o): In conjunction with the proposed change to delete 5.4.1(p), we believe the text in (o) should be changed as shown below since the comparison determining the lesser of two quantities is included within Equation 5.43:

The amount of AMM released in the baseline scenarios (tCH4) must be determined by calculating ~~and comparing:~~

- Table 6.1, Footnote 2: This footnote appears to be the only place in which the protocol acknowledges that the flow rate of exhaust gas emitted from the destruction device may not be metered, and discusses how $Exhaust_{flow}$ should be calculated in that case. As $Exhaust_{flow}$ is a newly proposed term (as well as a flow rate that has not typically been metered), the Reserve is concerned that the information in this footnote could be easily overlooked. It may improve protocol clarity if the guidance in this footnote was also added to Section 5.1.
- Section 6.2(e): The new proposed language requires "corrective action such as calibration". You may want to define or clarify what appropriate corrective actions are besides calibration. Otherwise, verifiers may have trouble verifying that an appropriate corrective action was taken.
- Section 6.2(f)(2): Please clarify that the guidance deleted from this section was deleted because it was redundant with similar guidance in 6.2(a)(2), or if the proposed deletion is meant to signal a change to protocol requirements (namely that data monitored up to two months after a check may not be verified).