

Call for public inputs – Template for inputs**Document: “Draft procedure for the development, revision and clarification of baseline and monitoring methodologies and methodological tools” (ver. 02.0)****Name of submitter: __Thomas Grammig****Affiliated organization of the submitter (if any):****Contact email of submitter: _trgram@compuserve.com****Date: 23rd October 2012**

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
#	Para No.	Line Number	Type of input ge = general te = technical ed = editorial	Comment (including justification for change)	Proposed change (including proposed text)	Assessment of comment (to be completed by UNFCCC secretariat)

Call for public inputs – Template for inputs	Document: “Draft procedure for the development, revision and clarification of baseline and monitoring methodologies and methodological tools” (ver. 02.0)
---	--

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
#	Para No.	Line Number	Type of input ge = general te = technical ed = editorial	Comment (including justification for change)	Proposed change (including proposed text)	Assessment of comment (to be completed by UNFCCC secretariat)
1	25		ge	<p>The core of the meth procedure is partially hidden in this para since the interaction MP/WG - proponent is reduced to a double loop of submission – draft.recomm. – clarification or modifications – final recommendation. The number of variables, their combinations and linkages requires multiple iterations.</p> <p>In practice the exchanges between MP/WG and proponents often fail to define, separate, consider and weigh all major issues and instead just allow to define the make-or-break issues. Methodologies’ usability is lost because the MP/WG – proponent interaction is too limited to consider and weigh all major issues. As Mrs Terblanche stressed at 5th CDM Roundtable “the communication is limited to teleconferences” and flexibility is needed to overcome reductionist short-cuts.</p> <p>The meth procedure can add specific steps for MP/WG and proponent to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. mutually explain and agree that the mayor issues list is complete and comprehensive, 2. mutually explain and agree which alternatives are realistic for each issue and what is the proponent’s capacity to create projects along each alternative, 3. clarify which policy criteria are important for each issue. <p>Increasing the MP/WG – proponent interaction to establish common understanding on the number, substance and relations between all major issues can significantly reduce the necessity for the secretariat to hack through Gordian knots and defend the outcome to surprised proponents. The secretariat could significantly improve its decisions when Gordian knot hacking is really necessary and use guidance on how to do so transparently.</p> <p>Finally blogs or listservers are particularly adequate to increase the iterations between the MP/WG and the proponent because individuals from each side can speedily focus on a longer series of variables, allowing others to go directly to the last views on each variable.</p>	<p>MP/WG, secretariat or proponent can each request a maximum of two teleconferences with a maximum length of xx.</p> <p>Prior to each teleconference MP/WG, secretariat and proponent shall agree on the teleconference agenda and MP/WG, secretariat and proponent can add items. Any parameter, variable or criteria in the meth can be made an agenda item.</p> <p>MP/WG, secretariat and proponent decide for each side whom and what number of individuals participate in the teleconferences.</p> <p>After each teleconference a report on the agenda shall be written by the secretariat that notes for each agenda item whether there was agreement, disagreement or uncertainty on</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) likely impact of each issues’ alternatives on a meth’s projects, and b) nature of policy concern of each issue. <p>Following each teleconference, MP/WG, secretariat and proponent can provide any data or other input on each of the agenda items to the others in addition to the original submission or the draft recommendation. The secretariat chooses among this material what to publish on the proposed meth’s Webpage.</p> <p>In-meeting teleconferences can also be held without agenda.</p>	

Call for public inputs – Template for inputs	Document: “Draft procedure for the development, revision and clarification of baseline and monitoring methodologies and methodological tools” (ver. 02.0)
---	--

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
#	Para No.	Line Number	Type of input ge = general te = technical ed = editorial	Comment (including justification for change)	Proposed change (including proposed text)	Assessment of comment (to be completed by UNFCCC secretariat)
2	26		ge	<p>“The proponent shall confirm that the reformatted new meth is acceptable”, is a generous but yet a “right” for the proponent that forces him to concentrate on make-or-break issues, again reducing the ability to address the complexity of meths.</p> <p>It would be more informative to the EB if the proponent can qualify his views on the differences between his own and MP/WG’s judgments.</p> <p>Generally the draft procedure defines additional steps for the proponent and eliminates steps by the MP/WG which on balance does not increase the flexibility of the procedure.</p>	<p>The proponent shall qualify his view on each modification from the original submission as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - enlarging/reducing potential scope of meth applications - adding/reducing conservativeness - diluting/concentrating additionality - adding/reducing project costs - adding/reducing delays 	
3			ge	<p>The meth procedure refers in the bottom-up process IV.A. only to methodologies and not to tools, while in the top-down process IV.B to methodologies and tools. Does this imply that tools can not be proposed bottom-up and what would be the reasons that others notably industry associations or academic institutions would not be able to initiate innovative tools ?</p>		