

1. DRAFT PROCEDURES FOR REQUESTS FOR ISSUANCES OF CERTIFIED EMISSIONS REDUCTIONS (version 01)

B. Procedures for Submitting a Request for Issuances of CERS

It is stated under sections 5, the DOE shall submit the request for issuances of CERS only after it verifies the – following and meeting the requirements prescribed in and other CDM requirements. It verifies the quantity CERs claimed in the monitoring reports. This may have an implication about the identified project activities seems operational, if not this has to be included how the proposed or the identified CDM has a potential to reduce GHG emission from the point of view of the GHG emission inventory verification process during project identification or the monitoring reports as to how CDM could realize the GHG abatement potential. It therefore that under part B, sections 5 requires an additional statements, in such a way to incorporate the potentials of the CDM to abate emissions as this verified during the inventory process, and the applicability of the CDM in reducing emissions from the monitoring reports. Both have to be compromised and put in place Part C, sections 8 of the “Guidelines on Completeness Check of Requests for Issuances”. What is the geographical coverage of the proposed CDM in reducing emission, if the CDM may go beyond to cover an additional of one country, how the participants would be represented?

Part D

Section 12, if the secretariat does not receive a request for review from a party involved or at least three members of the within 21 calendar days stated in section 13 go to the pending account, is there any possibilities to be indicated if the pending accounts may come back again with latest CDM. How this kind of approach that may face would be treated.

DRAFT PROCEDURS FOR REIVEW AND REQUESTS FOR ISSUANCES

B Request a review.

Under section 6, if the CDM encompasses more than one country how we set a designated national authority is designated; and this also refers to section 10, (c)

C. Assessment of responses

The secretariat is entrusted to review the request for review, as indicated in the issuance review for and the CDM requirements, and further communicate project participants and DOE for further clarification and additional information. After receiving of these enquires, the secretariats prepare a final assessment and recommendation for the consideration of the executive board no later than 12 weeks after the notification of the review to the project participants and the DOE. However in Part D, section 15 says that an independent technical assessment shall be entrusted to assess the recommendation of the secretariat technically and check their compliances accordingly.

In this junctions it has to need to rectify the following key points .

- The secretarial already submitted their assessment on the executive board for review, under part C, section 14, so when the Executive Board provides responses on the submitted assessment of the secretariat.
- Who is responsible to provide the assessment of the secretariat and the response on the assessment to be provided by Executive board to the technical assessment team, duration is not stated; rather the team is responsible to conduct technical assessment on the secretariat so as to its technical feasibility as this evaluated against of the review of the Executive board.

Sections 17 says the secretariat shall make its recommendation available to board members after the secretariat received the technical assessment report of the team, as this noted with the statement indicated in sections 14, what is the necessary to submit two reports to the executive board. Or who will be responsible to submit the reports of the technical team to the Executive Board. No direction is stated.

As to my personal view, the time allotted for finalizing the process and the requirements to be accounted the statement above, is so considerable. Shortening the time required in this process can be possible if the assessment to be made by the secretariat and the technical team is communicated directly to the project participant and DOE, and then the response of the participants and DOE is checked and verified and submitted to the Executive board for consideration as this stated in Part E. Consideration by the Executive Board.

**DRAFT PROCEDURS FOR REQUESTS FOR REGISTRATION OF A
PROPSOED CDM PROJECT ACVTITY
(Version 01)**

No Comment

**DRAFT PROCEDURS FOR REVIW FOR REQUESTS FOR REGISTRATION
(Version 01)**

Part A Background

Section 3, (c), the statement stated an Include a process for the Executive Board to consider objections raised by member of the executive Board to outcomes of assessments. I think this statements may seems to have a gap, who provide the technical assessment made by an independent technical assessment, but the draft request for issuance, does not indicate any clues about the Executive board to receive the technical assessment, this has to be seen very well. The secretariat has a responsibility to combine its assessment with that of the assessment made by the team for submitting the Executive Board about the assessment findings they reached on. At this point, members of the Executive Board may be acquitted with full information for their decisions – Objections or Accepting.

Part C Assessment of Response

Section 11 the secretariat prepare an assessment of response by the project participants and the DOE in the context of reasons for the request for review and the CDM requirements, but this has to a need to further to account assess issues relating to observances of modalities and procures for the CDM by the project participants and or operational entities, is the baseline assessment, monitoring plans, and project boundaries are also to be assessed. Because this aspect neither managed by the Secretariat or the an independent technical assessment team specified in Part D for official communication to the project participants or the DOE for further clarification and responses before they submit to the Executive Board for its considerations as stated in Part E.