A6.4-INFO-MISC-006

Information note

Summary of the comments received from stakeholders on the draft methodological tool “Determination of the technical lifetime of equipment” from the call for public inputs to annexes of the MEP010

Version 01.0

United Nations
Framework Convention on
Climate Change

TABLE OF CONTENTS **Page**

1. Introduction

1. This note provides a summary of the views submitted by stakeholders in response to the call for public inputs to the draft version of the methodological tool "Determination of the technical lifetime of equipment" prepared by the Methodological Expert Panel (MEP) at its tenth meeting.

2. The call for public inputs was open between 10 to 31 December 2025, and a total of two submissions were received.

2. Summary of inputs received on the draft methodological tool "Determination of the technical lifetime of equipment"

3. The following sections summarize the views expressed in the submissions.

2.1. General

4. Stakeholders noted the substantial improvement over the CDM tool by establishing a clear hierarchy of approaches (manufacturer data, expert evaluation, default values), explicitly addressing uncertainty and conservativeness, and enabling use of lifetime parameters for both baseline emissions estimation and lock-in risk analysis.

5. The prioritization of manufacturer-specified technical lifetime is considered to be methodologically sound, but may face constraints in some developing countries due to missing or outdated documentation, refurbished or relocated equipment, and defunct original manufacturers. The Supervisory Body may consider allowing the use of regional or technology-class reference lifetimes derived from credible international datasets where manufacturer data is unavailable.

6. Option (b) requires assessment by a certified or suitably qualified expert and may involve detailed testing and documentation. In many developing countries, such expertise and testing infrastructure are limited or costly. It is proposed to define minimum competency criteria in addition to formal certification, allowing experienced utility engineers or regulators to act as experts, and providing standardized assessment templates. Desk-based expert assessments with conservative adjustments could be permitted where physical testing is infeasible.

7. The default values in table 2 assume average operating conditions and do not explicitly account for factors common in developing countries, such as high ambient temperatures, fuel quality variability, grid instability, and deferred maintenance. It is proposed to consider introducing adjustment factors or differentiated default ranges based on operating conditions (e.g. cycling intensity, fuel quality, maintenance practices).

8. The draft tool provides limited guidance on accounting for partial retrofits or life-extension measures, which are common in developing countries and often affect only specific components of large assets. It is proposed to consider explicitly allowing component-level lifetime determination for large and complex assets, supported by guidance on weighted remaining lifetime calculations and documentation of which failure modes are addressed by retrofits.

9. The tool focuses on technical lifetime, while in practice, equipment retirement is often driven by regulatory requirements, environmental standards, fuel supply constraints, or economic viability. Explicit recognition of national policies (e.g. emission standards or coal phase-down plans) as legitimate constraining factors would improve realism and environmental integrity.

2.2. Methodological terms and definitions

10. The application of the tool to a system (such as a coal fired power plant) as against associated equipment should also be clarified. Alternatively, the tool could as well be extended to cover systems/plants rather than being restricted to equipment.

3. Applicability

11. Noting that the same methodology(ies) and associated application of the tool may be applied at project and Programme of Activities (PoA) level, the need for such distinction should be clarified or the clause for interim until the PoA specific tool emerges may be excluded.

12. In some cases, it is not just one piece of equipment that would justify the lifetime of the complete process/system but rather than multiple, and usually it is the one that involves the most cost or has the highest lifetime. It is proposed that in case of activity types that include technology/measures/practices including but not limiting improving energy efficiency, fuel switch, the remaining lifetime may be based on the key equipment with the highest CAPEX or highest system reliance.

5.1.1 General requirements for all uses of this tool

13. The application of the tool for all relevant pieces of equipment for assessment of a system/plant may not be appropriate.

5.1.3 General requirements for determining the remaining technical lifetime

14. This as general requirement fits perfectly for Option a) and Option c), however, this could be one of the reasons that an activity proponent uses option b) to determine the lifetime. Proposal is to remove text.

5.2 Use of the manufacturer's specified technical lifetime

15. Where lifetime defined in the technical specifications/operations manual of the equipment are in range (e.g., 10 - 15 years), the activity proponent may choose the lowest value of the range (e.g., 10 years). Through assessment by the manufacturer, attest technical life of value specified within the range (e.g., 14 years).

5.3 Use of an expert evaluation

16. It is proposed to clarify what is meant by suitably qualified expert. Relevant education qualification/training with 3 years of relevant work experience or 5 years of relevant work experience.

5.4 Use of default values

17. The default values seem to be conservative enough. An already conservative value should not be further subjected to uncertainty reductions.

Appendix. List of submissions

1. Table 1 provides the list of submissions used in this information note.

Table 1. List of submissions received

Submission #	Stakeholder	Submission date
1	Climate Spring	28 December 2025
2	World Bank	30 December 2025

- - - - -

Document information

Version	*Date*	*Description*
01.0	29 January 2026	Compilation of inputs from stakeholders by the secretariat.

Decision Class: Operational
Document Type: Information note
Business Function: Methodology
Keywords: A6.4 mechanism, call for inputs, lifetime of equipment, methodologies