



### Annex 3

## DRAFT CONSULTATION PAPER ON IMPROVEMENTS TO METHODOLOGY PROCESS

### I. BACKGROUND

1. At the nineteenth meeting and twentieth meetings of the Board there was consensus on a number of measures to improve the methodology process. The discussion did, however, not conclude on all issues.
2. The Board entrusted Ms. Gertraud Wollanski with preparing a comprehensive proposal for improving the methodologies process, in collaboration with colleagues (the Chair of the Board, Ms Sushma Gera, Mr. Jean-Jaques Becker, Mr. John Kilani, Mr. Hans Jürgen Stehr, Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sethi, Mr. José Domingos Miguez and Mr. Lu Xuedu).
3. The issues outlined in this paper were discussed by the Executive Board at its twentieth meeting, based on the draft paper prepared by Ms. Wollanski, and which need further consideration by the Board at its twenty-first meeting.

### II. UP-FRONT PAYMENT FOR SUBMISSION OF A PROPOSED NEW METHODOLOGY

4. The Board, at its nineteenth meeting, discussed and nearly agreed on an up-front payment by project participants (PPs) when submitting a new methodology. A submission payment of US\$1000 was mentioned with the provision that if the project for which the methodology was submitted was approved, the registration fee would be reduced by this amount. Some Board members felt that this charge might be a barrier to new methodologies in scopes where no approved methodologies exist.
5. The discussion on the margins of the twentieth meeting of the Board showed a continuing divergence of views. Some members opposed a fee (for different reasons). Others favoured a higher up-front payment, in the range of US\$3000 to US\$5000, to ensure that methodologies are submitted well prepared.
6. It was suggested that at registration a higher discount than the upfront payment (e.g. up-front payment US\$3000 - refund US\$5000) could be given as a reward for successful work. On the other hand, in the context of a general revision of the fees, the registration fee for project participants (PPs) who use an approved methodology submitted by another PP could be higher.
7. After its deliberations at its twentieth meeting, the Board retained the following options for further discussion:

#### Option 1:

(a) An advance payment of [US\$1000][ US\$5000] should be made by proposed new methodologies in areas where approved methodologies exist (AM or ACM [or AMS]). If the project activity that was submitted as an example to demonstrate the application of a proposed methodology that is approved (AM, ACM [or AMS]) requests registration, the registration fee will be reduced by the advance payment. If the advance payment would be larger than the registration fee the difference shall not be reimbursed. Exceptions to the advance payment rule could possibly be defined (e.g. linked to availability of approved methodologies).



(b) If the methodology is not approved (becomes “C”) no refund will be made for the advance payment. If a “C” case is resubmitted a new advance payment is to be made. Only the advance payment[(s)] made leading to an A case will be reimbursed in accordance with the general rule.

(c) If a methodology is resubmitted (“B” cases) a [further][no] advance payment is needed. The total amount of advance payments made will be deducted as described in paragraph (a) above.

Option 2: For each initial proposal of a new methodology a non-reimbursable fee of US\$1000 has to be paid.

### III. PRE-ASSESSMENTS OF PROPOSED NEW METHODOLOGIES:

8. [On the procedure for pre-assessment of proposed new methodologies the current discussion shows some convergence of opinions on the following solution:

9. The PP can (voluntarily) mandate the DOE/AE that submits the methodology to the Meth Panel to do a pre-assessment to guide the project participants.

*Note: If DOE did pre-assessment what documents are to be submitted and made public? Initial proposal, pre-assessment and final proposal?*

10. After submission of the methodology to the secretariat one member of the Meth Panel does a ½ day to pre-assessment which covers completeness as well as substance [and shall be paid ½ day fee]. [However, in cases where the DOE has done the pre-assessment and submits its report along with the proposed new methodology, the commissioning of a MP member to do another pre-assessment might not be necessary.]]

*Note: The Meth Panel has recommended to the Board revised criteria as basis for the pre-assessment which was not considered by the Board at its twentieth meeting pending agreement on this section.*

### IV. NUMBER OF TIMES THAT B CASES CAN BE RESUBMITTED:

11. At its nineteenth meeting the Board agreed that the number of times that “B” cases can be resubmitted should be considered at its twentieth meeting. A balance has to be found between the workload of the Board and the interests of the project participants. In this regard, [1][2] times after the original submission, so [2] [3] times in total would be an appropriate number. There is not yet agreement on the number of resubmissions.

### V. RESOURCES

12. [Translation to all UN languages could also be considered. However, the benefit of this should be considered in relation to the costs. ]

13. [Another idea is possible “training” by web cast of simple explanations (i.e. online presentations) which could be further reinforced by developing e-learning training packages.]