



Changes Document

CNG Certification Program

This document summarizes all major changes to the Program Documents, based on the feedback received from key stakeholders during ROUND 1 (Stakeholder Event - 25th of June, 2024). Text in bold represent changes with substantial impact on the content of the Program

#	Version 0.1 (previous version)	Version 0.2 (new version)	Reason for change	
Proposition Paper - Reduction Criteria	1	Vs 0.1 provides brief explanation of 'On Track Program'. included one example.	Vs 0.2, section 3, describes in more detail what the 'On Track Program' entails.	To clarify
	2	In vs 0.1, there is no reference to 'additionality' and 'double-counting'	Added to vs 0.2, in the blue tekst box in section 2: "These internal reductions should be 'additional', and the achieved reductions may not be double-counted, e.g. for other compliance targets or nation's own targets (Nationally Determined Contributions, EU Emissions Trading System)."	This is always a basic condition for any internal reduction, likewise for external reduction.
	3	Vs 0.1 refers to the term 'Life Cycle Analysis' (LCA).	In vs 0.2, the term 'Life Cycle Analysis' (LCA) is replaced with the term 'Footprint of a product or service'	Life Cycle Analyses are calculated, interpreted and used in many different ways. Also, conducting a full Life Cycle Analysis is a very complex and elaborative task, especially if a product is composed of many ingredients and/ or if many supply chain actors are involved. If the CNG Standard would require such a detailed and complex assessment, it would distract us from the objective of the CNG Certification Program, which is to achieve GHG reductions to create impact. It is therefore proposed that the CNG program encourages the calculation of a reasonably accurate footprint of a particular product or service, with focus on highest emitters and highest chance to reduce, rather than a complex and detailed Life Cycle Analysis.
	4	Vs 0.1 lists two different claims for 'Certification of the Organisation': ON TRACK + CLIMATE NEUTRALITY	Vs 0.2 lists the CLIMATE NEUTRAL claim only, but final decision depends on general consensus of a wider stakeholder audience during 1st Online Stakeholder Consultation (ROUND 2).	During the Stakeholder Event, several stakeholder representatives indicated that a separate ON TRACK claim is not needed: If the purpose of this ON TRACK claim would be to make the program more accessible to newcomers, then this probably won't work, for the bar is per definition higher: That is, clients would need to meet the reduction targets anyways, also to make the CLIMATE NEUTRAL claim. Two claims could potentially only be confusing for end users.
	5	Vs 0.1 contains section 5 (specifying which emissions to include in the footprint calculation) and section 6 (specifying which type of reductions qualify to meet the reduction target)	In vs 0.2, the previous section 5 and 6 are included as part of section 4.	To facilitate easier reading
	6	The 'scenario 5 graph' in vs 0.1 contains an error.	In vs 0.2, in the same scenario 5 graph, the target for 2030 is changed from 49% to 51%. Consequently, also the annual reduction targets are corrected to 4,9% p/yr (before 2030) and 2,55% p/yr (after 2030)	The target for 2030 is not 49% but should be 51% (total reduction achieved between baseline year and 2030 should be 49%, so remaining level of emissions is 51%).
	7	Vs 0.1 contains section 7 (specifying some flexibility rules).	In vs 0.2, section 4, these flexibility rules are included.	To facilitate easier reading
	8	Vs 0.1 requests for stakeholder input on the different scopes and boundaries for calculating a product's footprint.	In vs 0.2, section 4, all options are permitted, i.e. 'Gradle-to-Gate', 'Gradle-to-Shelf', and 'Gradle-to-Grave', and conditions are listed.	During the Stakeholder Event, several stakeholders mentioned that the option 'Gradle-to-Gate', 'Gradle-to-Shelf', and 'Gradle-to-Grave' should be permitted, provided that clients clearly communicate ON PACK (next to the logo) about the product's scope and its boundaries.
	9	Vs 0.1 provided some flexibility regarding product certification (e.g. 'Mass Balance approach' and '80% materiality rule')	In vs 0.2, section 4, the explanation of 'Mass Balance approach' and '80% materiality approach' is further worked out. Added two new options: 'Tier approach' and 'Gradual improvement approach'.	One of the main outcomes of the Stakeholder Event is that more flexibility is needed for product certification. There is no single straight forward approach, and it's a real challenge to A) produce an accurate product footprint and B) to reduce emissions in the supply chain if there is little influencing power.
	10	Vs 0.1. included one example.	In vs 2.0, section 5, example 1 is rewritten and example 2 is added.	To facilitate understanding of some of the flexibility rules and different scenarios
Proposition Paper - Insetting Criteria	11	Vs 0.1 refers to the term 'Life Cycle Analysis' (LCA).	In vs 0.2, the term 'Life Cycle Analysis' (LCA) is replaced with the term 'Footprint of a product'	See change # 3
	12	Vs 0.1, section 3.1, describes the '80% materiality rule' and the 'Mass Balance approach'.	Vs 0.2, section 3.1 only short-lists the 4 options clients can choose from.	In addition to the '80% materiality rule' and the 'Mass Balance approach, two other options are offered that clients can choose from to calculate a credible product footprint. All 4 options are now described in detail in 'Proposition Paper - Reduction Criteria', hence not explained anymore in this Insetting document.
	13	Vs 0.1 - n/a	Vs 0.2, section 3.1 includes new section on 'timing of the investment'	To facilitate two investment options for CNG clients: before the reduction is achieved and after the reduction is achieved.
Assurance Protocol	14	Vs 0.1, figure 1, does not take into account the component of 'ambitiousness'.	In vs 0.2, figure 1 is updated.	To add the component of ambition as a major consideration when developing the content of the CNG Certification Program.
	15	Vs 0.1 refers to the term 'Life Cycle Analysis' (LCA).	In vs 0.2, the term 'Life Cycle Analysis' (LCA) is replaced with the term 'Footprint of a product or service'	See change # 3
	16	Vs 0.1, table 1 (Explanation Certification scope and Emission scope) contained some explanation on a few flexibility and stringency rules.	In vs 0.2, table 1 is updated and aligned with 'Proposition Paper - Reduction Criteria'.	To assure that both the Assurance Protocol and the Standard are consistent with each other. The actual rules for footprint calculations (e.g. which emissions can be included or excluded) are part of the Standard, hence for now included in the 'Proposition Paper - Reduction Criteria'.
	17	Vs 0.1 - n/a	Vs 2.0, section 2.2, step 10, added: "If the client makes claims in such way that they correspond with and clearly refer to the emission scope and its boundaries (meaning: client does not overclaim, especially in the case of product certification where different flexibility rules may influence the footprint calculation)"	To make sure that claims are representative for the efforts made by clients.
	18	Vs 0.1 - n/a	In vs 0.2, refrased section 2.3 and 2.4 with clearer explanation of the different types of NCs, when they can be issued and what the (potential) consequences of NCs could be.	CBs commented that: - clear definition/ explanation of major and minor NCs is needed - there should still be the option to correct a major NC (i.e. should not lead to non-certification by default)
	19	Vs 0.1, definition of 'Good Performers' is: "clients who have not had any major + minor NCs for the past two years in a row, or who had reduced internally more than required for the 'on track claim' for the past two years in a row, may decide for audit exemptions".	In vs 0.2, changed definition to: "clients who have not had any major NCs for the past two years in a row, and who had reduced internally more than required to be 'on track' (see definition in 'Proposition Paper - Reduction Criteria') for the past two audit cycles in a row, may decide for audit exemptions".	CBs commented that it should not be the case that client reduces but still have a lot of NCs To align with change # 17 (changes in definition of major and minor NCs) and change # 4 (on track claim removed)
	20	Vs 0.1 - Table 5, 6, 7 were prescriptive	Vs 0.2 - Table 5, 6, 7 are now 'guiding'	CBs requested to use these tables as guidelines for best practise, not as prescriptive (for now). Tables are subject to change, once the standard is finalised.
	21	Vs 0.1, section 3.1: Eligibility criteria for Footprint Calculators (FCs) were prescriptive	In vs 0.2: Eligibility criteria for Footprint Calculators (FCs) are now 'guiding'. Also, reviewed step 2 and 3 of section 2.2.	So that also clients themselves can also make their footprint calculations. After all, there is no risk, because the CB will review the quality of the footprint calculation, including the method and data input.
	22	Vs 0.1 refers to the term: 'Certifier'	Vs 0.2 refers to the term: '2nd Reviewer'	The term certifier is used in different ways by several schemes. To be really clear about its role, CBs suggested to change the term to '2nd Reviewer'.
	23	In vs 0.1, it seems the office audit and additional CB performance checks are two separate activities, whereas they are all part of the Annual Performance Review of the CB.	In vs 0.2, refrased oversight activities and added 'CB Calibration Sessions', as an additional oversight activity	Requested by CB

