

Planning for a Voluntary Midwest Regional Greenhouse Gas Registry

Michael Koerber

Lake Michigan Air Directors Consortium

April 5, 2006

Midwest States



Why a Midwest Registry?

- Registries exist in other parts of the country (Eastern Climate Registry and California Registry)
- Recognize benefits of a Midwest registry
 - Facilitate corporate GHG management
 - Consistency in reporting and accounting with other registries
 - Encourage and certify voluntary emission reductions
 - Promote economic development

Funding

- Received grant for \$100K from Joyce Foundation on July 21, 2005
(project period: Aug 2005 – Aug 2006)
- Pursuing additional funding from several private foundations to continue planning and, possibly, initial implementation activities
 - Availability of new money essential to moving forward

Project Overview

- Goal: prepare framework (plan) for a voluntary Midwest registry
- Two-Phase Work Effort
 - Phase 1 (Nov 2005 - Feb 2006): Options paper
 - Phase 2 (March – Aug 2006): Program specifications and stakeholder interactions

Accomplishments

- Formed workgroup of state representatives (IA, IL, IN, MI, MN, OH, WI)
- Consulted with Eastern Climate Registry and California Registry
- Hired contractor (WRI) to provide technical support
- Prepared options paper addressing key design issues

Options Paper

(February 17, 2006)

- Provides context and discussion framework
- Identifies registry goals, objectives, and principles
- Identifies strategic and technical design issues
 - Analyzes pros-cons of various design options
 - Identifies Eastern Climate Registry and California Registry approaches
- Educates states on GHG reporting and accounting concepts

Options Paper: Key Issues

Issue	Options
Collaboration w/ other registries	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stand-alone registry 2. Registry Alliance 3. Use existing registry (join ECR or CCAR, or use CCX)
Accounting approach	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Entity-based 2. Project-based
Geographical boundaries	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. State-level 2. Regional-level 3. National-level
Reporting Entity	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Corporate-level reporting 2. Facility-level reporting 3. Unit-level reporting
Reporting Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * What information to report * What information will be made public * How will information be made public
Protocols	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use existing quantification methods and tools 2. Customize existing methods and tools 3. Develop new methods and tools
Reporting Software	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use existing software 2. Develop hybrid of existing software 3. Develop new software
Verification	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Require 3rd party verification 2. 3rd party verification for first year, random audits in following years 3. Risk-based approach

Guiding Principles

- **Strive for consistency with other registries**
 - Consider Eastern Climate Registry and California Registry approaches in assessing design issues
 - Consider existing requirements of other registries and GHG Protocol Standards
- **Maintain Midwest identity**
 - Sector-specific calculation protocols (e.g., agriculture)
 - Relevant to region's economic, policy, and business context (i.e., create Midwest “hooks”)

Next Steps

- Meet with interested stakeholders
- Develop program specifications based on existing requirements (Eastern Climate Registry and California Registry)
- Continue to work with NESCAUM and California
 - Support Registry Alliance (informally)
 - Participate on technical workgroup(?)
- Explore availability of funding

Stakeholders Meeting

(April 12, 2006 @ LADCO Office)

- Purpose: Provide information on current project, and receive input on planning work
- Agenda Items
 - Project Background and Overview
 - Registry Alliance
 - Options Paper
 - Issue: Collaboration with Other Registries
- Invitees: Business and citizens groups in Midwest, private foundations, and other interested parties