

The EB at its 52nd meeting decided to seek inputs on the draft revised review procedures for registration and issuance prepared by the secretariat.

My inputs are following:

1. In the Para. 17. of Draft Procedures for Review for Requests for Registration: “The RIT member shall finalize their assessment no later than one week after receipt of the assignment”, it is suggested to extend to two weeks after receipt of the assignment, due to RIT members are usually very busy.
2. In the Para. 21 of the document: “21. If a final ruling approves the registration of the project activity without corrections to the project documentation the secretariat shall register the project activity as a CDM project activity on the first working day subsequent to the finalization of the ruling. The effective date of registration in such cases shall be day after the end of the original period for requesting a review”. Please clarify clearly in the Para. 21, which is the original period for requesting a review.
3. In Para 23 of the document: “The secretariat shall undertake an assessment of the corrected documentation within three weeks and inform the Chair of the Executive Board whether the corrected documentation complies with the ruling”. Please clarify from what point of time the three weeks start to account. (The same for the case of request for issuance).
4. In Para.6 of Draft Procedures for Requests for Registration of a Proposed CDM Project Activity: Typo error “latest” should be deleted. In Para. 7, the footnote No.2 seems wrong in content.
5. In Para. 8 of Draft Procedures for Requests for Issuance of Certified Emissions Reductions: “After submission” should be “Following the receipt”
6. During the processes of the request for review for request for registration and issuance or under review, the issues and/or scopes raised by EB members should be narrowed down and/or substantiated, avoiding in broadly general manner.
7. It is a dilemma for the RIT members that if he does not get into the insight in detail of the validation report with attachments prepared by the DOE, and the PDD with support documents and Excel spreadsheets provided by the PP, he would not be in full self-confidence to justify that the CDM requirements reflected in the VVM and EB guidance have been in compliance with, and if doing so, it would be much time consuming. Please note, the PDD and the validation report normally need a couple of months even more for finishing by the PP and DOE respectively. Therefore the working days assigned to the RIT members should be increased appropriately and preferably be rated in three levels according to the extent of the complex of the methodologies applied in the PDD.

Kind regards,

Liu Deshun, RIT members