





CDM Standardized Baselines – from policy developments to application in Africa

The Africa Carbon Forum 2012, Addis Ababa

Roman Schibli

Senior Project Manager, South Pole Carbon

South Pole – you partner for projects and programs





- 2006: Incorporation in Zurich / Switzerland
- 2011: ten offices worldwide
- 2011: Best Project Developer*
- Over 80 carbon pros from 22 countries
- Projects in 21 countries
- Specialized in highquality "Gold Standard"
- Developing both voluntary and compliance credits

* *Environmental Finance*: Voluntary Carbon Market Survey 2011

Where do we currently stand in terms of standardization?





The EB Guidance is not the only tool for standardization

The EB Guidance on Standardized Baselines distinguishes between 4 measures





The EB Guidance on Standardized Baselines distinguishes between 4 measures, continued





Reading Xa and Xb from an existing graph to define baseline and additionality is substantially easier than existing approaches:



....but elaborating the standardized baselines according to the EB Guidelines will often be very challenging....

Main challenges:

- Data availability:
 - Very detailed data required on existing technologies, efficiencies, costs
 - Data might be confidential, not be collected
 - => Data restriction might rule out certain sectors

Aggregation/technology:

- For industrial sectors especially the definition of technology could be problematic
- Different levels of aggregation could lead to different results
- Thresholds:
 - Very high thresholds (currently 80% and 90%) could lead to exclusion of additional projects
 - Low thresholds does not catch free-riders
 - => Good compromise needs to be found

.... and for certain project types baseline/additionality is not the major challenge

Additionality:

- Other simplified approaches already exist (eg. positive list)
- ⇒For many HH project types additionality is not a main stumbling block

Emission factors:

Calculating of non-renewable biomass factor still very cumbersome & expensive

⇒For certain project types (eg. cookstove) the calculation of GEF is more expensive than baseline determination

Monitoring and verification:

THE key factor for determining success of scaling-up small scale PoAs

⇒Standardization in MRV is currently not very advanced, and not covered by the EB Guidelines

The EB Guidance is ONE important tool to achieve a standardized CDM



EB Guidelines should work well for establishing baselines of **HH projects**, eg. Cookstove, SWH,.. projects since:

- Relatively few (and homogeneous) technology options
- Efficiency data of technology available or could be collected
- Threshold setting less contentious

Standardized baseline could be combined with simplified additionality, default factors and sampling to creat CDM projects with very low transaction costs.

EB Guidelines can drastically simplify **methane destruction** projects in Africa, since often:

- No requirement to destroy methane
- EB Guidelines eliminates need to perform costly baseline studies

South Pole is looking for partners to put the conceptual (work into practice

DNAs have a key role for defining standardized baselines





Zurich Roman Schibli Phone: +41 43 501 35 50 r.schibli@southpolecarbon.com

Bangkok Patrick Bürgi Phone: +66 2 678 89 79 p.buergi@southpolecarbon.com

Beijing Caspar Chiquet Phone: +86 10 84 54 99 53 c.chiquet@southpolecarbon.com

New Delhi Thomas Camerata Phone: +91 956 018 99 91 t.camerata@southpolecarbon.com Jakarta Paul Butarbutar Phone: +62 21 720 75 67 p.butarbutar@southpolecarbon.com

Johannesburg Bruce Wylie Phone: +27 11 280 66 20 b.wylie@southpolecarbon.com

Mexico City Alberto Carrillo Phone: +52 55 55319013 a.carrillo@southpolecarbon.com Taipei Jules Chuang Phone: +886 2 8758 2911 j.chuang@southpolecarbon.com

Istanbul Phone: +90 212 274 32 25 k.kartick@southpolecarbon.com

Hanoi Marco Hirsbrunner Phone: +41 43 501 35 50 m.hirsbrunner@southpolecarbon.com

Thank you for your attention!