



[WWW.NMCLIMATECHANGE.US](http://WWW.NMCLIMATECHANGE.US)

## CROSS CUTTING ISSUES TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP GHG REGISTRY DESIGN OPTIONS MATRIX

MARCH 8, 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).**
- **KEY: ENSURE FLEXIBILITY, SO AS TO BE ABLE TO REGISTER REDUCTIONS FROM POLICIES (E.G., CAP & TRADE), PROGRAMS (E.G., STATE EE/DSM, SEQUESTRATION, ETC.), PROJECTS, AND OFFSETS.**
- **NOTE: A "REGISTRY ALLIANCE" EFFORT IS UNDERWAY.**

### **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?

GHG REGISTRY DESIGN OPTIONS MATRIX, NM CC TWG – MARCH 8, 2006

	DESIGN ELEMENT	OPTIONS	DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS	PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION
<b>1.</b>	<b>KEY DESIGN CRITERIA (BEYOND <i>GHG REPORTING DESIGN OPTIONS MATRIX</i>)</b>			
1.1	DEFINE GEOGRAPHICAL BOUNDARIES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NEW MEXICO</li> <li>REGIONAL (OR BROADER)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SPAN OF CONTROL</li> <li>COST, ECONOMIES OF SCALE, &amp; BROADER = BETTER?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>STATEWIDE AT LEAST, BUT AS BROAD AS POSSIBLE, CONSISTENT WITH BEST PRACTICES</li> </ul>
1.2	VERIFICATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>STATE VERIFICATION</li> <li>THIRD-PARTY VERIFICATION</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEE <i>GHG REPORTING DESIGN OPTIONS MATRIX</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>THIRD-PARTY VERIFICATION</li> </ul>
1.3	BASE YEAR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SINGLE SPECIFIED YEAR</li> <li>SINGLE ENTITY-CHOSEN YEAR</li> <li>AVERAGE OF MULTIPLE YEARS</li> <li>ADJUSTMENT RULES?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FLEXIBILITY VS. SIMPLICITY</li> <li>MUST HAVE GOOD DATA FOR BASE YEAR.</li> <li>NM EXECUTIVE ORDER</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNLESS OTHERWISE REQUIRED FOR A SPECIFIC PURPOSE, ALLOW ENTITY TO CHOOSE BASE YEAR. (THIS ALLOWS ENTITIES TO GO BACK AS FAR AS GOOD DATA EXISTS.)</li> </ul>
1.4	PROJECT-LEVEL SUBMITTALS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>YES / NO / CONSTRAIN</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGAINST WHAT BASELINE?</li> <li>ADDITIONALITY ISSUES (WHAT WOULD HAVE HAPPENED ANYWAY?)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>YES, KEEP AS OPEN AND FLEXIBLE AS POSSIBLE, BUT HAVE THIRD PARTY VERIFICATION AND REQUIRE SOLID QUANTIFICATION PROTOCOLS.</li> </ul>
1.5	“OFFSETS”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>YES / SOME / NO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CO-BENEFITS LOCATION?</li> <li>NATURE / CHARACTER?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>YES; DOOR SHOULD BE OPEN TO SPUR OTHERS TO ACT AND POSSIBLE REGIONAL ACTION.</li> <li>NEEDS A FRAMEWORK FIRST, THEN OFFSETS WORK IN CONCERT WITH IT.</li> </ul>
1.6	START DATE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ESTABLISH A “TO BE IN OPERATION” DATE?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MANDATORY REPORTING STARTING IN 2008; REGISTRY TO FOLLOW.</li> </ul>
1.7	OWNERSHIP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RISK OF DOUBLE-COUNTING</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MUST HAVE ADEQUATE SAFEGUARDS AND PROTOCOLS TO ENSURE NO DOUBLE COUNTING.</li> </ul>

	DESIGN ELEMENT	OPTIONS	DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS	PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION
1.8	TRANSPARENCY	•	•	• MUST HAVE ADEQUATE TRANSPARENCY TO ENSURE QUALITY.
1.9	OTHERS?	•	•	• STRIVE FOR CONSISTENCY AND COMPATIBILITY WITH RELATED PROGRAMS (SUCH AS RECS).
<b>2. TECHNICAL ISSUES</b>				
2.1	TREATMENT OF MINORITY OWNERSHIP	•	• <i>GHG PROTOCOL</i>	•
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?	•	•	•
<b>3. ANCILLARY, ADMINISTRATIVE, &amp; OPERATIONAL ISSUES</b>				
3.1	LOCATION (AGENCY)	• NMED • OTHER?	• REGIONAL POTENTIAL	•
3.2	SOFTWARE; WEB INTERFACE, ETC.	• NM-SPECIFIC • CCAR, RGGR, CCX, ERT? • OTHER?	•	•

GHG REGISTRY DESIGN OPTIONS MATRIX, NM CC TWG – MARCH 8, 2006

	DESIGN ELEMENT	OPTIONS	DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS	PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION
3.3	COST	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TRANSACTION FEE</li> <li>• PUBLICLY SUPPORTED?</li> <li>• OTHER?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DEVELOPMENT COSTS</li> <li>• ONGOING OPERATING COSTS</li> </ul>	•
3.4	OVERSIGHT & MANAGEMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NMED</li> <li>• PUBLICLY APPOINTED BOARD</li> <li>• OTHER?</li> </ul>	•	•
3.5	REPORTING OF RESULTS; RECOGNITION	•	•	•
3.6	OTHERS?	•	•	•