



Ref: AIB-2008-MC01-08

Date: 17 September 2008

Location: Vienna

Meeting paper: Harmonisation of the RECS and GoO Res-E Schemes

Introduction

One of the long term goals of AIB is to harmonise the PRO Chapters in order to create one integrated set of criteria for certificates. With this set of criteria we will be able to create a single instrument for the market, with different associations.

A first step towards a uniform set of criteria could be harmonising the Chapters where possible. As RES-E GOs and RECS certificates are often combined, these seem to be the first Chapters to harmonise.

Of course, there are some differences between RES-E GOs and RECS certificates that originate from the different legal background of both certificates – RES-E GOs being a legal instrument and RECS certificates being a voluntary one. Harmonising these differences is of course not appropriate. Those issues could be harmonised as soon as all domains use RES-E GOs, but then RECS certificates will have become redundant. But for now, the point is to achieve harmony where we can, and where it is sensible and required. In other words, the two chapters should be as near as possible identical in all except legal requirements and interpretations.

A first quick scan of the GoO RES-E and the RECS Chapters reveals some discrepancies that could be harmonised.

Common date handling

A first and important point is harmonising the handling of dates between the RECS and GoO RECS-E chapters. Harmonisation of these dates was decided upon during the General Meeting of AIB in December 2007 (Change Request 0709, annex 1 to this document: the long term solution was agreed).

Redemption statements

The content of redemption statements is dictated by the RECS Chapter, but not the GoO RES-E Chapter. In the Domain Protocol Template, an Annex 6 is added as the required format of a redemption statement. This could be harmonised, either by removing the rules for redemption statements or by using the existing format for RES-GOs as well. An additional question would be whether redemption statements could be traded internationally.

Qualification criteria

The qualification criteria of RECS and RES-GOs differ quite a lot, mainly due to the legal/voluntary differences. Additionally, the RECS Chapter adds provisions for publication of data and for preventing the producer from receiving other tradable evidence which represents the benefit of renewable electricity generation. This might be added to the GoO RES-E Chapter if this is desirable. On the other hand, this is actually a detail of the uniqueness clause in the PRO, and therefore it might be preferable to delete it from the RECS Chapter.



Ref: AIB-2008-MC01-08

Date: 17 September 2008

Location: Vienna

Production device registration

Again, the requirements of the RECS Chapter concerning this matter are more extensive than those set out in the GoO RES-E Chapter. The major difference, again, is the requirement that a producer shall not receive other tradable benefits for production. Also there is a provision for conducting audits of RECS (but not GoO Res-E) every 5 years.

Nominated capacity

According to the RECS Chapter, a RECS certificate should indicate the nominated capacity. The GoO RES-E Chapter lacks a similar clause.

When the PRO was drafted, the capacity of a production device was omitted from the data comprising an EECS certificate. This was because while capacity is obligatory under the RECS scheme, the RES Directive (2001/77/EC) only requires the inclusion of capacity for hydroelectric production devices. However, the Commission proposals of 23 January 2008 for a new RES Directive contain a significant proposal in this respect: the mandatory inclusion of capacity in each RES-GO.

The harmonisation of the RECS and GoO RES-E schemes will be furthered by adopting a common approach to this matter, and it is therefore proposed that capacity should be a mandatory feature of all EECS certificates.

This proposal will be treated in the Vienna General Meeting in September 2008 (as Change Request 0801). Subsequently, Subsidiary Document 03 of the PRO and Chapter 1 (GoO RES-E) should be adapted accordingly.

Proposal for next steps

1. The Market Committee is asked if it can see more differences between the RECS and GoO RES-E GO chapters that should or could be harmonised.
2. The Market Committee is invited to share its view on how harmonisation should take place: should RECS certificates become more like GoO RECS-E or vice versa?

Suggestions would be very welcome. Subsequently, AIB will develop its proposals for harmonisation of both Chapters. A timeframe of a couple of months should be anticipated.

Gina van Dijk
Chairperson, Workgroup Internal Affairs
8 September 2008