



WWW.NMCLIMATECHANGE.US

CROSS CUTTING ISSUES TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP GHG REGISTRY DESIGN OPTIONS MATRIX

JANUARY 6, 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).**

POTENTIAL GOALS OF GHG REGISTRY:

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?**

	DESIGN ELEMENT	OPTIONS	DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS	PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION
1.	Key Design Criteria (beyond <i>GHG Reporting Design Options Matrix</i>)			
1.1	Define geographical boundaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Mexico 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> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Third-party verification
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. NM Executive Order 	•
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> 	•

	DESIGN ELEMENT	OPTIONS	DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS	PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION
2.2	Merger & acquisition issues	•	• <i>GHG Protocol</i>	•
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.	•	• CBI, legal authority, etc.	•
2.6	Others?	•	•	•
3. Ancillary, Administrative, & Operational Issues				
3.1	Location (Agency)	• NMED • Other?	• Regional potential	•
3.2	Software; Web Interface, etc.	• NM-specific • CCAR, RGGR, CCX, ERT? • Other?	•	•
3.3	Cost	• Transaction fee • Publicly supported? • Other?	• Development costs • Ongoing operating costs	•
3.4	Oversight & Management	• NMED • Publicly appointed board • Other?	•	•
3.5	Reporting of Results; Recognition	•	•	•
3.6	Others?	•	•	•