

Assessing the environmental impact of electricity from renewable energy sources (RES)

Agenda

- 1 Goal setting
- 2 Choosing a method
- 3 Applying the chosen method
- 4 Real world insights & summary





Agenda

1 Goal setting





Today's goals: choose method, apply method & provide recommendations

- 1. Choose method that is best suited for assessing a company's electricity-related emissions
- 2. Apply method to different contractual setups of company electricity procurement
- 3. Provide recommendations for companies on:
 - a. Reporting and
 - b. Mitigation of electricity-related emissions





Agenda

2

Choosing a method





Market-based and locational method are alternatives for calculating emission factors

Approach A:

For companies procuring electricity exclusively from renewable energy sources (RES), electricity related emissions should be calculated using the emission factor for these RES (*market-based method*).

Approach B:

For companies procuring electricity exclusively from renewable energy sources (RES), electricity related emissions should be calculated using the grid average emission factor (*location-based method*).



Which method is more appropriate?





GHG Protocol states that companies should employ both methods



Link

- Standard protocol for assessing corporate greenhouse gas emissions.
- Scope 2 emissions: "Emissions from the generation of acquired and consumed electricity, steam, heat, or cooling."
- Reporting requirement:

"Companies [...] shall report scope 2 emissions in two ways [...]: one based on the location-based method, and one based on the market-based method."



No preference for either method





Research studies challenge the assumptions of the market-based method



Underlying assumption of the market-based-method:

"[...] If demand for low-carbon energy [...] begins to approach existing supply, the pressure or <u>incentive to build additional</u> <u>supply</u> grows, with <u>certificates</u> also serving as an additional revenue stream to help signal that demand." Challenge assumptions *"Financial contributions to existing renewable capacity are unlikely to result in the supply of additional public goods."* [1]

"[The market for RECs] has currently very low, or **no**, **impact on investor decisions**." [2]

"[...] Explicit choice for [RES] does, for the time being, **cause no pressure** for building new [RES] in order to mitigate climate change." [3]

"[The market-based method] […] is likely to lead to a misallocation of climate change mitigation efforts." [4]

"[RECs] currently provide little or no incentive to increase the production of green electricity." [5]



[1] Gillenwater, 2008 | [2] Raadal et al., 2012 | [3] RE-DISS II, 2015 | [4] Brander et al., 2018 | [5] Wimmers & Madlener, 2020



Own assessment necessary to judge methods' appropriateness



Which method is more **appropriate**?







First step: define assessment criteria



Consumer's emissions are determined by their contractual setup.

Consumer's emissions are determined by their location.

Which method is more appropriate?

Define criteria to assess "appropriateness".

Assess appropriateness of each method.

Apply appropriate method to different cases.

These criteria describe aspects a method should consider to ensure a correct assessment of electricity-related emissions.





An appropriate method should consider these five criteria



 \odot

11

(†)

BY SA

(CC)

flexess

All but one criterion directly relate to additionality





CC () () BY SA 12

Additionality describes additional supply caused by additional demand





flexess

Without additionality, RES supply remains unaffected by demand





6.07.2020 | Jour Fixe | Malte Schäfer

flexess

Oversupply of RECs causes lack of additionality









Only location-based method considers additionality



BY

Burden-shifting describes emission offloading onto others





fle

ess

By avoiding burden-shifting, other consumers' emissions remain unaffected





6.07.2020 | Jour Fixe | Malte Schäfer

fle

ess

Purchase of RECs causes burden shifting to non-purchasers







[1] <u>Grexel, 2020</u> | [2] <u>AIB, 2021</u>



Only location-based method considers burden-shifting



Double-counting describes a unique good claimed twice



flexess

Two or more companies *claiming the same* RES for themselves.





Only without double-counting, the sum of all claims matches the supply





6.07.2020 | Jour Fixe | Malte Schäfer

flexess

Purchase of RECs leads to double-counting of RES



6.07.2020 | Jour Fixe | Malte Schäfer

ΒY

SA

REC = renewable energy certificate

Only location-based method addresses double-counting





flexess

Skewing incentives describes a misalignment of effectiveness and attractiveness





ess

Skewing incentives hinders emission reductions





flexess

With skewed incentives, (effective) energy efficiency appears cost-ineffective





*Conservative (high) estimate from [1] and [2] [1] <u>RE-DISS II, 2015</u> | [2] <u>Wimmers & Madlener, 2020</u>



Only location-based method avoids skewing incentives





6.07.2020 | Jour Fixe | Malte Schäfer

flexess

Temporal match describes the alignment of supply and demand profiles



6.07.2020 | Jour Fixe | Malte Schäfer

ΒY

SA

Only with 100 % temporal match can a consumer claim 100 % RES





6.07.2020 | Jour Fixe | Malte Schäfer

flexess

Temporal mismatch means that REC holders rely on electricity from conventional sources



6.07.2020 | Jour Fixe | Malte Schäfer

flexess

energy-charts.info, screenshot from July 3rd, 11:00 h



Only location-based method allows an assessment of the temporal match





flexess

Second step: assess appropriateness of each method







Location-based method considers all five criteria





6.07.2020 | Jour Fixe | Malte Schäfer

flexess

Location-based method is the more appropriate method







Agenda

3 Applying the chosen method





Third step: apply location-based method to different cases





Which method is more appropriate?







There are six different setups for RES supply



Apply appropriate method to different cases.



There are **six different setups** for RES supply.





RE = renewable energy; PPA = power purchase agreement; REC = renewable energy certificate



Own RE installation: on-site RE combined with grid-supply



flexess

RE = renewable energy; PPA = power purchase agreement; REC = renewable energy certificate



Own RE installation: meets all but one criterion



Evaluation							
Additionality	+	Yes 🗹					
Burden-shifting	6	No 🗹					
Double-counting	2x	No 🗹					
Skewing incentives	(CD)	No 🗹					
Temporal match	9	No 🗶					

New RES ensure additionality, avoid burden-shifting (when RES expansion matches the consumer's demand), and reflect the real cost of RES capacity expansion, thus avoiding skewed incentives.



RE = renewable energy; PPA = power purchase agreement; REC = renewable energy certificate



Equity in RE installations: off-site RE, owned by consumer



flexess

RE = renewable energy; PPA = power purchase agreement; REC = renewable energy certificate



Equity in RE installations: may lead to double-counting





New RES ensure additionality, avoid burden-shifting (when RES expansion matches the consumer's demand), and reflect the real cost of RES capacity expansion, thus avoiding skewed incentives. Grid-connected RE may be counted towards electricity statistics, reducing electricity-related emissions for all other electricity consumers as well (double-counting).



RE = renewable energy; PPA = power purchase agreement; REC = renewable energy certificate



High quality PPAs: long-term supply contract stimulating new RE generation capacity





RE = renewable energy; PPA = power purchase agreement; REC = renewable energy certificate



High quality PPAs: may lead to double-counting





New RES ensure additionality, avoid burden-shifting (when RES expansion matches the consumer's demand), and reflect the real cost of RES capacity expansion, thus avoiding skewed incentives. Grid-connected RE may be counted towards electricity statistics, reducing electricity-related emissions for all other electricity consumers as well (double-counting).



RE = renewable energy; PPA = power purchase agreement; REC = renewable energy certificate; RES = renewable energy supply



Premium for new RE capacity: consumer pays supplier to expand RE capacity





RE = renewable energy; PPA = power purchase agreement; REC = renewable energy certificate



Premium for new RE capacity: may lead to double counting





New RES ensure additionality, avoid burden-shifting (when RES expansion matches the consumer's demand), and reflect the real cost of RES capacity expansion, thus avoiding skewed incentives. Grid-connected RE may be counted towards electricity statistics, reducing electricity-related emissions for all other electricity consumers as well (double-counting).



RE = renewable energy; PPA = power purchase agreement; REC = renewable energy certificate; RES = renewable energy supply



Supplier-generated RECs: consumer pays supplier with own RE generation capacity





RE = renewable energy; PPA = power purchase agreement; REC = renewable energy certificate



Supplier-generated RECs: meet none of the criteria





Since no new RE generation capacity is added, RECs lack additionality. Grid-connected RE may be counted towards electricity statistics, reducing electricity-related emissions for all other electricity consumers as well (double-counting). Since no new RE generation capacity is added, RECs lack additionality. Static RE generation capacity combined with REC purchases lead to a burden-shifting from REC holders to non-holders. Low prices of RECs compared to the cost of RE capacity expansion lead to skewed incentives.



RE = renewable energy; PPA = power purchase agreement; REC = renewable energy certificate



Other RECs & low-quality PPAs: consumer purchases electricity and RECs separately





RE = renewable energy; PPA = power purchase agreement; REC = renewable energy certificate



Other RECs & low-quality PPAs: meet none of the criteria





Since no new RE generation capacity is added, RECs lack additionality. Grid-connected RE may be counted towards electricity statistics, reducing electricity-related emissions for all other electricity consumers as well (double-counting). Since no new RE generation capacity is added, RECs lack additionality. Static RE generation capacity combined with REC purchases lead to a burden-shifting from REC holders to non-holders. Low prices of RECs compared to the cost of RE capacity expansion lead to skewed incentives.



RE = renewable energy; PPA = power purchase agreement; REC = renewable energy certificate



Summary of all cases

	Ĵ		I SI		*	₽
	Own RE installation	Equity in RE installations	High quality PPAs	Premium for new RE capacity	RECs: supplier- generated	Other RECs and low- quality PPAs
Additionality +	Yes 💽	Yes 💽	Yes 💽	Yes 💽	No 🗶	No 🗶
Burden-shifting	No 💽	No 💽	No 💽	No 💽	Yes 🗶	Yes 🗶
Double-counting 2x	No 💽	Yes 🗶	Yes 🗶	Yes 🗶	Yes 🗶	Yes 🗶
Skewing incentives	No 💽	No 💽	No 🗹	No 🗹	Yes 🗶	Yes 🗶
Temporal match	No 🗶	No 🗶	No 🗶	No 🗶	No 🗶	No 🗶
Verdict	Recommen	nded			Not ree	commended



RE = renewable energy; PPA = power purchase agreement; REC = renewable energy certificate



Third step: apply location-based method to different cases





Which method is more appropriate?





SA 52

ΒY

Agenda

4

Real world insights & summary





How corporations report their electricity-related (= scope 2) emissions

6.07.2020 | Jour Fixe | Malte Schäfer



Companies **vary widely** in their efforts to report and reduce scope 2 emissions. All of them report using **both the market-based and the location-based** method.



Apple, 2021 | Google, 2021 | Microsoft, 2021 | DB, 2021 | BASF, 2021



renewable energy (supply) agreement, purchase power RE(S) certificate, = greenhouse gase = renewable energy GHG REC

Summary: location-based method for reporting, RES with additionality for mitigation

1. Choose method that is best suited for assessing a company's electricity-related emissions





* See section 6.9 in <u>GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance</u> | **<u>Google white paper on 24/7 carbon-free energy</u>









Appendix



Some counter-arguments

Consumers are not responsible for expanding RES.

 \rightarrow True, but then they do not get to claim low emissions from RES which they did not finance.

It is the responsibility of policy-makers to make sure incentives are aligned.

 \rightarrow True, but even within the current regulatory framework it is already possible for consumers to reduce the environmental impact of electricity supply (e.g. on-site RE, PPAs).

RECs certainly won't hurt either, so why shouldn't companies purchase them?

 \rightarrow Because it only generates revenue for REC traders, but does not contribute to RES expansion. Also, it wastes money on ineffective measures, which may be better spent on effective ones (e.g. energy efficiency).

REC purchasers are not to blame for burden-shifting and double-counting. Consumers without RECs are responsible to sort his out.

 \rightarrow True, but REC purchasers can help to avoid burden-shifting and double-counting, by pursuing options with additionality instead (e.g. on-site RE, PPAs).

Temporal match is a criterion impossible to achieve.

 \rightarrow (Mostly) True, so it is good to be transparent about the fact that virtually every consumer relies on electricity from the grid, at least some of the time.





Differentiate between different RE supply typologies





RE = renewable energy; PPA = power purchase agreement; REC = renewable energy certificate

