

EB 44

Relations with Designated Operational
and Applicant Entities

Last interaction with the Board and the secretariat

- DOE/AIE regional calibration meeting – Sao Paulo – 27/09

Main achievements in 2008

- DOEs as extended arms of the Board want to be part of the body
- DOE/AIE Forum moved from a chasing to a collaborative approach
- Never before, Board, DOEs and secretariat had so many interactions (VVM, Accreditation Standard, regional calibration meetings, etc.)

Important issues discussed in 2008

- VVM
- “Rejections by DOEs” statistics
- Starting date of project activity
- Investment analysis for projects in China
 - Validation of figures from official feasibility studies
- Seriousness of CDM consideration
 - After “12 months DOEs rule”
- Important changes in the Accreditation Procedure (witnessing opportunities)
- Grid emission factors published by DNAs

Challenges for 2009

- Important discussions were postponed to a second version of VVM (e.g. “materiality”)
- DOEs liabilities in PoAs
 - Refer to DOE/AIE Forum inputs to EB39
- DOEs timelines to perform validations and verifications
- Conclusion of changes in the Accreditation Procedure
- BRING DOWN NUMBER OF REQUEST FOR REVIEWS, REVIEWS AND REJECTIONS

Incoming Chair

- According to DOE/AIR Forum statute chairs may change every year
- Incoming chair: Siddharth Yadav

DOE Forum in 2009

- Take actions to bring down the request for reviews to a bare minimum through:
 - Unambiguous guidance
 - Increased communication between DOE and Secretariat (not necessarily Request for Reviews)
 - Root cause analysis and corrections at system level (Measures suggested in EB43)
 - Enhanced confidence of the EB in the DOE's approach to validation/verification (incl. materiality, level of assurance)
- Enhance participation & Increased dialogue with new entities
- Earmark CDM structure for Copenhagen 2010 & Beyond 2012

Input to EB44

- Retroactive application of revisions to approved methodologies for registered project activities
 - During issuance stage, projects registered in the early phases of the CDM continue to use the original version of the monitoring methodologies and monitoring plans, which in some cases may become obsolete in the context of revisions/latest versions or cases where the approved methodology has been merged into a consolidated methodology.
 - During verifications, DOE's can strictly adhere to the guidance in EB35 annexure 13, para 16 i.e. a revision to an approved methodology or tool referred to in a methodology shall not affect the registered CDM project activities during their crediting period.

Input to EB44

- The CDM EB may wish to issue further guidance on “suggested best practice”.
- Projects registered against an earlier version of an approved methodology should assess the impact of the changes that would occur if the revised monitoring methodology was applied to their project activity and report the same in the monitoring report.
- The impact of a revision of an approved methodology shall however be addressed at the time of renewal of the crediting period unless otherwise notified by the EB in separate guidance on specific cases.

Next interactions with the Board and the secretariat

- EB45
- Workshop for discuss re-occurring issues raised in requests for review (idea ventilated in Bali)



Thank you!