

D4.4**Short list of items reported by policy makers****1 Introduction**

During the second policy maker workshop of the BioGrace-II project on March 6, 2015, the “long list of items reported by policy makers” was presented and discussed. After this workshop some follow-up actions were taken.

The conclusion after the March 6 workshop is that none of the seven issues from the “long list” has yet been resolved. This “short list” describes the discussions on these topics and how the topics should be addressed further. The information from document D4.2 “Long list of items reported by policy makers” is not repeated, so this document can best be read together with the former document.

2 List of items (for harmonisation) after the second policy maker workshop and follow-up actions

This list is based on the “long list of items reported by policy makers” that was made from input that was given (a) on the first policy maker workshop (March 19, 2014); (b) meetings between project partners and policy makers; and (c) e-mail exchange between project partners and policy makers. Comments made at a meeting with Danish policy makers and stakeholders on February 16, 2015 in Copenhagen were added to the first draft of this document.

The issues from the “long list of items reported by policy makers” are repeated below, with updates on the status of the issue.

2.1 Policy makers would like the methodologies for biofuels/bioliquids and solid/gaseous biomass to be harmonised

At the March 6 policy maker workshop, policy makers from Belgium, Denmark, Netherlands and UK expressed – again as they did so earlier - that they would like the methodologies for biofuels/bioliquids and solid/gaseous biomass to be harmonised. The BioGrace-II coordinator asked at the 6 March workshop whether DG ENER could release their methodological working document (which was prepared first half of 2014 but was never published). After some further correspondence this question was replied to positively allowing BioGrace to include, in the latest version of the Methodological background document, an Annex with the methodology as it was used by JRC to calculate the default values as published in July 2014. This document has been published as part of the version 3 of the BioGrace GHG calculation tool.

This resolves part of the issue, the second part is in the hands of national policy makers, who can now use this methodological annex when implementing sustainability criteria in national legislation or when preparing guidance to national legislation. The Netherlands will do so and follow this methodology.

2.2 iLUC and carbon debt are topics that policy makers (plus stakeholders) discuss

iLUC and carbon debt were shortly discussed at the second BioGrace-II policy maker workshop (March 6, 2015 in Brussels). At the workshop it was clear to all participants that iLUC and carbon debt will not be included in GHG calculations on the short or medium term. So, for the further development and inclusion of GHG sustainability criteria into national legislation, iLUC and carbon debt need no further attention.

2.3 European or national fossil fuel comparators?

The fossil fuel comparators as given in the July 2014 Staff Working Document were questioned by national policy makers, and some of them (during the first public workshop and also at the meeting in Denmark) questioned whether or not to use own (national) FFC's.

This issue was discussed at the second policy maker workshop. It is clear that this is a choice (influencing harmonisation with Europe) that has to be taken at the national level.

2.4 For complying with GHG sustainability criteria, can (disaggregated) default values be used?

Also this issue was discussed at the second policy maker workshop and also for this issue it is clear that this is a choice (influencing harmonisation with Europe) that has to be taken at the national level. Feedback from policy makers in member states that have introduced, or are currently implementing biomass sustainability criteria into national legislation suggests that Denmark, Netherlands and UK will probably all allow the use of disaggregated default values.

2.5 Classify materials either as (co-)product or as waste/residue

From reactions at the second policy maker workshop it was clear that both policy makers and companies agree that this will need at least some attention when implementing biomass sustainability criteria into national legislation. Again, however, the questions "who will classify materials" and "what are the criteria for such classifications" need to be answered nationally. As a similar point of attention exists for biofuel legislation (where biofuels produced from wastes/residues count double for meeting biofuel obligations), where regulators from Denmark, Netherlands and UK exchange information when they receive requests from companies to classify a certain material as residue or waste. This information exchange is leading to harmonisation in choices made, and could be repeated by the regulators responsible for proper implementation of solid/gaseous biomass sustainability criteria.

2.6 If several GHG calculation tools are around, they should give the same result

During the second policy maker workshop the Wallonian participant remarked that the Wallonian GHG calculator "*Logiciel de calcul des certificats verts*" serves another function as compared to the BioGrace GHG calculation tool and the UK "Solid and Gaseous Biomass Carbon Calculator". The Wallonian GHG calculator is used to determine the amount of financial support, and the BioGrace-II and UK tools serve to show compliance with a minimum GHG threshold in order to classify the bio-energy as sustainable. Therefore, it is improbable that the Wallonian tool will be harmonised with the other two tools. Harmonisation of the BioGrace-II tool and the UK Solid and Gaseous Biomass Carbon Calculator will be subject of further meetings between UK, NL (and DK) policy makers.

2.7 Management of the BioGrace-II tool has to be stable

This is formally not a harmonisation issue, however, as it was told to be important by Danish policy makers and stakeholders it is included here. They commented that the management of the BioGrace-II tool has to be stable to ensure maintenance/service of the tool in case of EC updates.

This issue has partly been solved as RVO has proposed, and the BioGrace-II consortium has agreed, that RVO will take over the management and ownership of the BioGrace-II GHG calculation tool. In practice this will mean that incoming questions can be answered (and any improvements made or errors corrected) over the next years. Funding of such activities will not be a problem until a large update of the tool is needed, for instance when the Commission and/or JRC come with an update of their 2014 "sustainability of solid/gaseous biomass" reports.

3 Conclusion

At the March 6, 2015 policy maker workshop the seven elements or "main topics" that have earlier been identified, were discussed with policy makers. Some issues have been brought one step further, but the general conclusion is that the policy makers will have to make decisions at the national level to cause harmonisation. BioGrace has helped to identify these issues and put them on the agenda.

BIOGRACE II

Harmonised Greenhouse Gas Calculations
for Electricity and Heat from Biomass

Align biofuel GHG emission calculations in Europe (BioGrace)

Project funded by the Intelligent Energy Europe Programme

Contract number: IEE/11/733/SI2.616371

Project coordinator: John Neeft – RVO (Netherlands Enterprise Agency)

info@biograce.net

www.biograce.net



**Co-funded by the Intelligent Energy Europe
Programme of the European Union**

The sole responsibility for the content of this publication lies with the authors. It does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Union. Neither the EACI nor the European Commission are responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

www.biograce.net



Co-funded by the Intelligent Energy Europe
Programme of the European Union