How to keep Emission Trading Schemes simpler(?)

- **Simplicity** in ETS helps to
  - Reduce transaction costs for installations and regulator/authority
  - Increases transparency
  - Communicate to policymakers and stakeholders
- ETS should provide a **level playing field**
  - Cover very simple to very complex emitters
  - Provide the right incentives (e.g. no substitution of fuels by electricity, waste gases, etc.)
  - Rules too simple may lead to more work later in application
  - ETS rules result from political process

How to keep ETSs user friendly?
Lessons learnt from implementation of mandatory Swiss ETS

How to keep it simple for about 50 installations and regulator/authority:

- ETS authority (FOEN) provided services of calculation of allocation to installations – immediate feedback to allocation rules
- Copy-paste of EU-ETS Guidance Documents with minor simplifications (including benchmark values)
- Close informal cooperation with EU experts
- Build on data from existing control/financial reporting systems in installations (e.g. SAP, audited accounting systems)
- Offer choices to installations in MRV: simple and conservative versus more elaborated and less conservative
- Small design and implementation team