

EB 40

Relations with Designated Operational
and Applicant Entities

DOEs Regional Calibration Meetings – proposed dates

- China
 - Beijing – 1 day between 24 and 26 September
- Latin America
 - Sao Paulo – 1 day between 27 to 31 October

Forum inputs to Meth Panel

- The Board has asked the Meth Panel to look at the implications of excusing renewable energy projects from using common practice step while applying additionality tool to demonstrate additionality.
- The Panel asked for inputs from DOEs on this aspect based on their field experience.
- Inputs sent on 11/06/2008

Timelines taken by DOEs and PPs

- Typical steps for a validation/verification process
 - PDD/MR completeness check
 - PDD/MR upload
 - Documental review
 - Site visit
 - Issuance of draft validation/verification report
 - Evaluation of proposed corrective actions
 - Issuance of final draft validation/verification report
 - Internal Technical Review
 - Issuance of final validation/verification report
 - Request for registration/issuance

Timelines taken by DOEs and PPs

- Such statistics may provide an inappropriate picture as cases differ.
- For validation there is a wide range of 3 to 30 months for verifications from 1 to 12 months.
- DOEs establish a timeline in their proposals that states exactly how many days are necessary for each step, based on what, they plan their resources.
- This includes that the client gets back to DOE accordingly.
- If that is not the case, the whole timeline falls apart and DOEs can not make any guarantee of a further timeline once the first has fallen through.
- In addition DOEs have to ask the Board for clarifications, deviations and revisions without a clear timeline as to when a response can be expected.
- Nevertheless, some DOEs provided some examples.
- The Forum would like to have a better understanding about what the Board is looking for, so that the Forum can tailor the analysis to its intended use.
- Secretariat could support.

Contractual arrangement between PP and the DOE

- Para 37 of CDM M&P states that “The designated operational entity selected by project participants to validate a project activity, **being under a contractual arrangement with them**, shall review the project design document and any supporting documentation to confirm that the following requirements have been met:...”
- Some of the cases, the contractual arrangement is between DOE and consultant, as is the Forum understanding that it does not precludes PPs from delegating contractually to a single PP (or consultant) to appoint the DOE.
- The Forum requests clarification from the Board, towards accepting contractual arrangements between DOEs and consultants.

Pending issues

- Starting date of the project activities – Input to EB37
- Approval of already operational project activities – Input to EB37
- Affidavit by top management of Project Participants – Input to EB37
- Liability of DOEs in Programme of Activities – Input to EB39

Next interactions with the Board and the secretariat

- AE/DOE Workshop on Elaboration of CDM Accreditation Standards
 - 07/07/2008
- EB 41

Thank you!