Mondial Advisory

Qustion	Response
1.Do you agree with the definitions of biogas, biomethane,	
renewable hydrogen and other renewable gases outlined in the	Yes
paper in Section?	
If not, what should they be?	
2.Do you agree with an initial focus on biomethane and	Yes
renewable hydrogen?	
If not, why not?	
3.Should the pilot be open to other renewable gases?	No
If so, which and why?	
4.Do you agree with the eligibility criteria proposed in Section 4?	
If not, why?	
5.Are there other eligibility criteria that should be included, and	
what would they achieve?	
6.Which technologies and production processes should be	
included in the pilot?	
7.What factors do you consider essential when defining best	
practice planning compliance and environmental management?	
8.Do you agree that only projects that displace network gas use	
should be eligible to participate in the pilot?	
If not, why not?	
9.Should behind the meter production and use projects without a	
network connection be able to participate in the pilot, and why?	
10.If behind the meter projects without network connection	
were eligible, how could metering and other verification activities	
be done?	
11.Are there any barriers to injecting renewable gas into the	
network in your jurisdiction that GreenPower should be aware of	
for the pilot?	

12.Do you agree with the proposed national network boundary	
approach allowing the sale of certificates across Australia?	
If not, why?3	
13.Do you agree with the pilot aligning eligible feedstocks with	
the ERF methodology?	
14.Should any other feedstocks be included? Which ones, and	
why?	
15.Do you see any risks of unintended consequences from	
incentivising anaerobic digestion of waste-derived feedstocks and	
landfill gas capture?	
If so, which risks and are there any risk mitigation options?	
16.Should the use of energy crops be permitted?	
Why or why not?	
17.If energy crops were eligible, what conditions and	
considerations would ensure these projects still adhere to the	
principles of Ecological Sustainable Development?	
18.Should methane produced using hydrogen methanation of the	
carbon dioxide in biogas be included?	
19.Do you agree that, for project assessment, the pilot should	
use the cradle to gate approach?	
Why or why not?4	
20.Do you agree with the definition of the gate being the gas	
network injection point?	
If not, why not and do you have a recommendation for what it	
should be instead?	
21. Are there any other LCA standards or requirements other than	
those outlined in Section 5 that should be considered?	
22.Should there be different requirements for biomethane and	
hydrogen projects?	
If so, what should they be?	
23.Do you agree that fugitive emissions from gas network	
pipelines are not considered in the projects LCA?	
If not, how should fugitive emissions be treated?	

a certificate can be created? if not, why? SS Should other carbon offsets other than ACCUs be permitted to offset upstream emissions? Zo Do you agree that renewable gas no longer being available for its current use does not need to be assessed as part of a project's true true any schemes other than the CER's ERF methodology, the Australian Government's hydrogen GO scheme, and the Smart Energy Council's Zero Carbon Certification Scheme with which the pilot may interact? SW Mat linkages between these schemes and the pilot should be considered? SU Mat linkages between these schemes and the pilot should be considered? SU Mat linkages between these schemes is needed for the pilot to provide value for customers? SU Not greet with the programs and schemes? SI Do you agree that ny displacement ACCUs should be surrendered before an RSC is created? If not, why not? SU Mat RENE Struet Australian Guernment for the displacement ACCU being surrendered betore an SC is created?	24.Do you agree that producers must offset any emissions before	
If not, why? If not, why? 25. Should other carbon offsets other than ACCUs be permitted to offset upstream emissions? If not, why? 26. Do you agree that renewable gas no longer being available for its current use does not need to be assessed as part of a project's LCA? If not, why? 27. Are there any schemes other than the CER's ERF methodology, the Australian Government's hydrogen GO scheme, and the Smart Energy Council's Zero Carbon Certification Scheme with which the pilot may interact? If not, why? 28. What linkages between these schemes and the pilot should be considered? If not, why? 29. What recognition by existing schemes is needed for the pilot to provide value for customers? If not, which step should be changed and why? 31. Do you agree that ny displacement ACCUS should be surrendered Before an RGC is created? If not, why not? 32. Do you sere and RGC is created? If not, why not? 33. Do you sere any ricks with the alternative approach of the gialacement ACCU being surrendered before an RGC is created? If not, why not? 33. Do you sere any ricks with the alternative approach of the gialacement ACCU being surrendered at the same time as the RGC is surrendered? If not, why not?		
25.Should other carbon offsets other than ACCUs be permitted to offset upstream emissions? 26.Do you agree that renewable gas no longer being available for iscurrent use does not need to be assessed as part of a project's ICA? if not, why? 27.Are there any schemes other than the CER's ERF methodology, the Australian Government's hydrogen GO scheme, and the Smart Energy Council's Zero Carbon Certification Scheme with which the pilot may interact? 28.What linkages between these schemes and the pilot should be considered? considered? 29.What recognition by existing schemes is needed for the pilot to provide value for customers? considered? 30.What design elements of the pilot are most crucial for recognition by other programs and schemes? considered? 31.Do you agree with the proposed approaches in Section 7 for mon-ERF and ERF projects? considered? 32.Do you agree that any displacement ACCUS should be changed and why? considered? 32.Do you agree that any displacement ACCUS should be changed and why? considered? 32.Do you agree that any displacement ACCUS should be changed and why? considered? 33.Do you agree that any displacement ACCUS should be changed and why? considered? 33.Do you agree that any displacement ACCUS should be changed and why? considered? 33.Do you agree that any displacement ACCUS should be changed and why? considered?		
offset upstream emissions?Image: construct a set of the set of		
26. Do you agree that renewable gas no longer being available for its current use does not need to be assessed as part of a project's LCA? if not, why? 27. Are there any schemes other than the CER's ERF methodology, the Australian Government's hydrogen GO scheme, and the Smart Energy Council's Zero Carbon Certification Scheme with which the pilot may interact? 28. What linkages between these schemes and the pilot should be considered? 29. What recognition by existing schemes is needed for the pilot to provide value for customers? 30. What design elements of the pilot are most crucial for recognition by expresent and schemes? 31. Do you agree that any displacement ACCUs should be surrendered before an RGC is created? if not, why not? 32. Do you agree that any displacement ACCUs should be surrendered? if not, why not? 33. Do you see any risks with the alternative approach of the displacement ACCU being surrendered at the same time as the RGC is surrendered?		
its current use does not need to be assessed as part of a project's ICA? If not, why? Z-X ret here any schemes other than the CER'S ERF methodology, the Australian Government's hydrogen GO scheme, and the Smart Energy Council'S Zero Carbon Certification Scheme with which the pilot may interact? 28. What linkages between these schemes and the pilot should be considered? 29. What recognition by existing schemes is needed for the pilot to provide value for customers? 30. What design elements of the pilot are most crucial for recognition by other programs and schemes? 31. Do you agree with the proposed approaches in Section 7 for non-ERF and ERF projects? If not, which step should be changed and wh? 32. Do you agree that any displacement ACCUB should be surrendered before an RGC is created? If not, why not? 33. Do you agree that any displacement ACCUB should be surrendered before an RGC is created? If not, why not? 33. Do you agree any risks with the alternative approach of the displacement ACCU being surrendered at the same time as the RGC is surrendered?		
LCA?Image: Constant of the set		
If not, why? 27.Are there any schemes other than the CER's ERF methodology, the Australian Government's hydrogen GO scheme, and the Smart Energy Council's Zero Carbon Certification Scheme and the Smart Energy Council's Zero Carbon Certification Scheme 20. 28.What linkages between these schemes and the pilot should be 20. considered? 29.What recognition by existing schemes is needed for the pilot 29.What recognition by existing schemes is needed for the pilot 20. 30.What design elements of the pilot are most crucial for 20. recognition by other programs and schemes? 21. 31.Do you agree with the proposed approaches in Section 7 for 21. 32.O you agree with the proposed approaches in Section 7 for 21. 32.Do you agree with the proposed approaches in Section 7 for 21. 32.Do you agree with the proposed approaches in Section 7 for 21. 32.Do you agree with the proposed approaches in Section 7 for 21. 32.Do you agree that any displacement ACCUs should be 21. surrendered before an RGC is created? 21. If not, why not? 23. 33.Do you see any risks with the alternative approach of the 23. displacement ACCU being surrendered at the same time as the 26. <td></td> <td></td>		
27.Are there any schemes other than the CER's ERF methodology, the Australian Government's hydrogen GO scheme, and the Smart Energy Council's Zero Carbon Certification Scheme with which the pilot may interact? 28. What linkages between these schemes and the pilot should be considered? 29.What recognition by existing schemes is needed for the pilot to provide value for customers? 30.What design elements of the pilot are most crucial for recognition by other programs and schemes? 31.Do you agree with the proposed approaches in Section 7 for non-ERF and ERF projects? If not, which step should be changed and why? 32.Do you agree that any displacement ACCUs should be surrendered before an RGC is created? 33.Do you see any risks with the alternative approach of the displacement ACCU being surrendered at the same time as the RGC is surrendered?	LCA?	
methodology, the Australian Government's hydrogen GO scheme, and the Smart Energy Council's Zero Carbon Certification Scheme with which the pilot may interact? 28.What linkages between these schemes and the pilot should be considered? 29.What recognition by existing schemes is needed for the pilot to provide value for customers? 30.What design elements of the pilot are most crucial for recognition by other programs and schemes? 31.Do you agree with the proposed approaches in Section 7 for non-ERF and ERF projects? If not, which step should be changed and why? 32.Do you agree that any displacement ACCUs should be surrendered before an RGC is created? If not, why not? 33.Do you see any risks with the alternative approach of the displacement ACCU being surrendered at the same time as the RGC is surrendered?	If not, why?	
and the Smart Energy Council's Zero Carbon Certification Scheme with which the pilot may interact? 28.What linkages between these schemes and the pilot should be considered? 29.What recognition by existing schemes is needed for the pilot to provide value for customers? 30.What design elements of the pilot are most crucial for recognition by other programs and schemes? 31.Do you agree with the proposed approaches in Section 7 for non-ERF and ERF projects? If not, which step should be changed and why? 32.Do you agree that any displacement ACCU should be surrendered before an RGC is created? 1f not, why not? 33.Do you see any risks with the alternative approach of the displacement ACCU being surrendered at the same time as the RGC is surrendered?	27. Are there any schemes other than the CER's ERF	
with which the pilot may interact?Image: set ween these schemes and the pilot should be considered?28. What linkages between these schemes and the pilot should be considered?Image: set ween these schemes is needed for the pilot to provide value for customers?29. What recognition by existing schemes is needed for the pilot to provide value for customers?Image: set ween these schemes and schemes?30. What design elements of the pilot are most crucial for recognition by other programs and schemes?Image: set ween these schemes?31. Do you agree with the proposed approaches in Section 7 for non-ERF and ERF projects?Image: set ween these schemes?If not, which step should be changed and why?Image: set ween these schemes?32. Do you agree that any displacement ACCUs should be surrendered before an RGC is created?Image: set ween these schemes?33. Do you see any risks with the alternative approach of the displacement ACCU being surrendered at the same time as the RGC is surrendered?Image: set ween the set ween	methodology, the Australian Government's hydrogen GO scheme,	
28. What linkages between these schemes and the pilot should be Image: considered? 29. What recognition by existing schemes is needed for the pilot Image: considered? 29. What recognition by existing schemes is needed for the pilot Image: considered? 30. What design elements of the pilot are most crucial for Image: considered? 31. Do you agree with the proposed approaches in Section 7 for Image: considered? 11 for to, which step should be changed and why? Image: considered? 12. Do you agree that any displacement ACCUs should be Image: considered? 11 fort, why not? Image: considered? 33. Do you see any risks with the alternative approach of the Image: considered? 33. Do you see any risks with the alternative approach of the Image: considered? 33. Do you see any risks with the alternative approach of the Image: considered? 33. Do you see any risks with the alternative approach of the Image: considered? 33. Do you see any risks with the alternative approach of the Image: considered? 36. Surrendered? Image: considered?	and the Smart Energy Council's Zero Carbon Certification Scheme	
considered?Image: considered is needed for the pilot29. What recognition by existing schemes is needed for the pilot to provide value for customers?Image: considered is needed for the pilot30. What design elements of the pilot are most crucial for recognition by other programs and schemes?Image: considered is needed for the pilot31. Do you agree with the proposed approaches in Section 7 for non-ERF and ERF projects?Image: considered is needed for the pilot1f not, which step should be changed and why?Image: considered is needed for ear NGC is created?32. Do you agree that any displacement ACCUs should be surrendered before an RGC is created?Image: considered is needed for the pilot1f not, why not?Image: considered is needed for the pilot are approach of the displacement ACCU being surrendered at the same time as the RGC is surrendered?Image: considered is needed for the pilot are approached is needed for the pilot are approached is needed for a needed for a needed for the pilot approached is needed for the pilot are approached for the pilot are approached for the pilot are approached for the pilot approached at the same time as the RGC is surrendered?Image: considered is needed for the pilot approached is needed for the pilot approached for the	with which the pilot may interact?	
29. What recognition by existing schemes is needed for the pilot to provide value for customers?	28.What linkages between these schemes and the pilot should be	
to provide value for customers?Image: customers?30.What design elements of the pilot are most crucial for recognition by other programs and schemes?Image: customers?31.Do you agree with the proposed approaches in Section 7 for non-ERF and ERF projects?Image: customers?If not, which step should be changed and why?Image: customers?32.Do you agree that any displacement ACCUs should be surrendered before an RGC is created?Image: customers?If not, why not?Image: customers?33.Do you see any risks with the alternative approach of the displacement ACCU being surrendered at the same time as the RGC is surrendered?Image: customers?	considered?	
30. What design elements of the pilot are most crucial for recognition by other programs and schemes? 31. Do you agree with the proposed approaches in Section 7 for recognition by other projects? 1f not, which step should be changed and why? recognition by other and ERF projects? 32. Do you agree that any displacement ACCUs should be surrendered before an RGC is created? recognition by other and the alternative approach of the displacement ACCU being surrendered at the same time as the RGC is surrendered?	29.What recognition by existing schemes is needed for the pilot	
recognition by other programs and schemes? Image: schemes in Section 7 for non-ERF and ERF projects? If not, which step should be changed and why? Image: scheme schem	to provide value for customers?	
31.Do you agree with the proposed approaches in Section 7 for	30.What design elements of the pilot are most crucial for	
non-ERF and ERF projects?Image: Constraint of the same time as the	recognition by other programs and schemes?	
If not, which step should be changed and why?If not, which step should be changed and why?32.Do you agree that any displacement ACCUs should be surrendered before an RGC is created?If not, why not?If not, why not?If not, why not?33.Do you see any risks with the alternative approach of the displacement ACCU being surrendered at the same time as the RGC is surrendered?If not, why not?	31.Do you agree with the proposed approaches in Section 7 for	
32.Do you agree that any displacement ACCUs should be surrendered before an RGC is created?If not, why not?33.Do you see any risks with the alternative approach of the displacement ACCU being surrendered at the same time as the RGC is surrendered?	non-ERF and ERF projects?	
surrendered before an RGC is created?If not, why not?If not, why not?If not, why not?33.Do you see any risks with the alternative approach of the displacement ACCU being surrendered at the same time as the RGC is surrendered?If not, why not?	If not, which step should be changed and why?	
If not, why not?If not, why not?33.Do you see any risks with the alternative approach of the displacement ACCU being surrendered at the same time as the RGC is surrendered?Receive a construction of the cons	32.Do you agree that any displacement ACCUs should be	
33.Do you see any risks with the alternative approach of the displacement ACCU being surrendered at the same time as the RGC is surrendered?	surrendered before an RGC is created?	
displacement ACCU being surrendered at the same time as the RGC is surrendered?	If not, why not?	
RGC is surrendered?	33.Do you see any risks with the alternative approach of the	
	displacement ACCU being surrendered at the same time as the	
34. Do you agree with the decoupled approach being applied for	RGC is surrendered?	
	34.Do you agree with the decoupled approach being applied for	
the pilot?	the pilot?	
35.Please specify why you think one or the other is more	35.Please specify why you think one or the other is more	
suitable, and if any other options should be considered.	suitable, and if any other options should be considered.	
36.Do you agree with the proposed approach of using an existing	36.Do you agree with the proposed approach of using an existing	
registry for the pilot?		
	If not, why not?	

37.Is it important for customers to be able to access the registry	
and manage their own surrenders?	
38.Is there a particular registry functionality other than those	
mentioned in Section 8 of the paper that you think should be	
included in the pilot, and why?	
39.Do you agree with the proposed attributes listed in Section?	