

**Draft Protocol Review Session April 1, 2009**  
**Summerfallow Reduction Draft Protocol Review**

ATTENDEES:

Name	Affiliation
Jessica Goforth	Blue Source
Amanda Stuparyk	Climate Change Central
Sheilah Nolan	Alberta Agriculture
Kerriane Koehler-Munro	Alberta Agriculture
Dennis Haak	AAFC
Xiaomei Li	Highmark
Rob Janzen	ClimateCHECK
Robyn Kuhn	Alberta Environment
Eric Bremer	
Invite - Not Attend	
Regis Karamanos	
Rob Dunn	
Brian McConkey	
Len Krysnowski	
Susan Crump	
Reynald Lemke	
Rheanna Sand	

1. **Introductions - Protocol Developer**
  2. **Why We're Here – Alberta Policy Context – Amanda Stuparyk, C3**
    1. Alberta Regulatory Framework
    2. Offsets – Carbon Market in AB
      - Projects start after Jan 1, 2002
      - Real, demonstrable, quantifiable
      - Not regulated by law
      - Clearly defined ownership (verifier will seek clear ownership)
      - Generated in Alberta - **investment** / project **undertaken** in Alberta
      - Not double counted (only serialize on one system)
      - Verified by 3<sup>rd</sup> party (chartered account/certified engineer)
    3. Ex Poste Verification
    4. The Protocols are based on the ISO 14064 Part 2 Standard.
  3. **Principles to Guide Protocol Decisions/Development**
    1. Environmental Integrity
    2. Usability/Practicability
    3. Adapting Precedents
    4. Life Cycle Analysis
  4. **Introduction to the Protocol - (Slow walk through/introduction of the protocol) Protocol Developer**
    - Overview of the Protocol
  5. **Review of the Protocol - Protocol Developer - Review of Draft Alberta Protocol: (Section by Section)**
    - Run-through of the Protocol elements, basis for the flow diagrams, identification of SSs, rationale for exclusion or inclusion, quantification approaches and appendices, discussion points.
- **Section 1.0**

- 1.1. Scope and Description / Protocol Approach

Q: Why 5 consecutive years were chosen for project implementation? What is the reasoning behind?

Did not want people to pick and choose a year. Encapsulate one crop rotation length. Errored on the higher side of amount of years. Detail in the protocol a little background of why 5 years was chosen.

It is a long term process and ongoing, the 3 years is an indicator of past practice (how long can you go back for baseline) - it is consecutive years prior to project start date

The second sign up project eligibility is irrelevant for this protocol and will not be applicable, so it is the first 8 year project period – with change of wording of ‘continuous cropping’ there may be applicability of reassessment of baseline and project eligibility for second period

5 year reflects a rotation – makes sense as we do not want fallow in a year to year basis (continuous cropping is a decision each year that a farmer makes so having a minimum project length ensures permanence)

Project condition – continuous crop proportion of farm – DH continuous cropping termed to mean no fallow at all – suggest ‘stubble cropping’ proportion of fallow in project compare to baseline – (all in crop and none in fallow)

\*wording: decrease proportion of summerfallow on farm – remove wording of ‘continuous cropping’ with a proper definition in glossary

\*flush out reasoning behind 5 year project period

Q. Co-implementation with Tillage –Why not have the Tillage and Summerfallow combined in one protocol to make easier to use

-Will consider in future, possibly at the 5 year review period of protocols, there are some fundamental differences with the protocols so those would have to be dealt with also. Currently projects are dealt with by separate protocols.

- Protocol Applicability

Q. Farm records are required?

Yes, in addition to affirmation by project developer.

\*\*Add a definition in glossary for Farm Records and examples.

- Flexibility Mechanisms

What is defined as ‘atypical’ – provide some examples that may be considered ‘atypical’

\*\*Rationale for 3 years could be argued – rotation length? The 3 years could be chosen for greater fallowed areas

Comment: Fallow has been declining since 1971 (census data)

What is adoption rate? DH: depends on soil zones – dry (still a lot of fallow), once every 4 or 5 years (dark brown), black soil zone not a lot of fallow.

- Definitions

\*\*Will add definitions as discussed

- Project SS Diagrams
- Section 2.2. Baseline Identification
- Table 2.2 Assessment of Baseline Scenarios

\*\* Provide justification for all scenarios

- Table 2.4. Comparison of SSs for Project and Baseline

P9 and B1 are included in Quantification but does not reflect in Table (say exclude)

Discussion and rationale for exclusion of Fertilizer use – and others – where is the justification for exclusion and increase fertilizer use in project condition

Updated emission factors from Holos (excluded machinery) will have to look at factors if they are upstream (for herbicide production- are they only upstream herbicide production then can exclude) \*\*revisit numbers

\*\*upstream SSs – if they are embedded in the factors, should included them

\*\*Apply information and justification on why SS were “Included”

Inconsistent SS in operations – i.e. harvesting operations? Etc. \*\*need to revisit Holos and what is included in factors – RJ and DH: energy use on farm is included in the numbers, include Harvest

\*\*Remove Pesticide Production

\*\*Include SS B6 and P14 Farm Operations as embedded in Holos numbers

- Section 2.6 Quantification
- Table 2.5 Quantification Procedures

\*\*Include footer or references for factors – Campbell et al. research are more concise than NIR – closer than Century model

Parkland factors – are same as Dry Prairie? Q. is there applicability in the Parkland region? DH, SN: Not really.

\*\*Only applicability to Dry Prairie region in Alberta and modify coefficients provided

\*\* Default to Reduced Till factors for conservativeness

\*\*Add Appendix with list of references

\*\*Insert in ‘Areas’ quantification sections - of land and *legal land location* under ‘reduced till’

\*\*Wording of ‘Cropping Field’ for quantification – need to clarify what area is included in project and baseline conditions

- Table 2.5 Contingent Data Collection

Default is GPS data and records are considered the contingency

\*\*What about remote sensing (interpretive satellite imagery) is the best available measurements – determine activity – Add within the beginning of protocol in Applicability, Glossary, and Tables through protocol

- Appendix A
- Appendix B

Outstanding Items:

- 3 year baseline – was chosen due to consistency with other protocols and sufficient length of time to adjust for variability – was considered acceptable and applicable for this protocol – in reality there should not be much variability within the generally (1999-2001 years), crop insurance will show termination of crop growth and therefore qualification of land areas – specify within definition
- 20% buffer pool for permanence – risk of permanence is after project period – during the project period there is accountability each year
  - \*\*NEED to compile research and details of how or what market based approach would be feasible and how to implement

**6. Next Steps**

- Reconvene to discuss changes made to protocol and buffer pool/holdback (within next week)