

Name of submitter: Christopher Brandt

Affiliated organization of submitter (if any): Climate Concept Foundation

Email address of submitter: brandt@climate-concept-foundation.org

Date of submission: 22 April 2014

#	Para No./ Annex / Figure / Table	Type of input ge = general te = technical ed = editorial	Comment on the paragraph	Proposed change (including proposed text, if any)
1	Para 13 (b)	te	The consequence of not choosing a possibility that is recommended by the use of the word “should” is unclear. The requirement should be made more specific.	(b) “Should” is used to indicate that among several possibilities, one course of action is recommended as particularly suitable. In case an intended user would like to use a possibility other than the recommended one, satisfactory reasons should be provided explaining why the recommended possibility is unsuitable or less suitable within the project-specific context.
2	Para 19 (3 rd sentence)	ge	Generally, the “...information used to determine additionality...” usually contains commercially sensitive data (e.g. the pricing of an abatement technology applied within the project activity). Business practice up to now generally was to only disclose such information to the validating DOE. The current draft should greatly improve transparency. However, intended users may have justifiable interests in not disclosing certain information. In these cases, transparency is nevertheless of paramount importance, but disclosure could be limited to those stakeholders that are actively involved in the specific project and agree to handle the relevant information confidentially.	3 rd Sentence: “In this context, information used to determine additionality, to describe the baseline methodology and its application, and to support an environmental impact assessment shall in general not be considered as proprietary or confidential. In exceptional cases, disclosure of such information shall be limited to those stakeholders that (a) have been or are actively involved in the project activity, e.g. have provided a comment during the global stakeholder consultation and (b) agree to handle the information in question confidentially.”

Call for public inputs – Template for inputs	Document: Draft CDM project standard (PS)
---	--

#	Para No./ Annex / Figure / Table	Type of input ge = general te = technical ed = editorial	Comment on the paragraph	Proposed change (including proposed text, if any)
3	Section 6.1; paras 20 & 21	te	<p>This section should contain a provision on under which circumstances revised / new standards can be applied retroactively. Such measure must balance investor confidence against environmental integrity of project based mechanisms.</p> <p>Investor confidence shall not be regarded as a relevant parameter in cases where the intended user did not apply this Standard, the applicable tools and documents diligently (e.g. when negligently omitting a technological option when assessing baseline emissions, the intended user shall have to accept a subsequent revision / clarification to the methodology as retroactively applicable to the project activity if this revision / clarification makes it compulsory to take the omitted technological option into account).</p>	<p>New 22. (as last para of section 6.1): Generally, this Standard, all applicable tools and documents (Applicable Regulation) adopted by the CMP and the Board that are relevant for a project's registration shall apply in their respective version as valid at the day on which the registration request is submitted to the Secretariat. With regard to Monitoring Reports, all Applicable Regulation shall be applied as valid as on the day on which the Issuance Request is submitted to the Secretariat. A revision of Applicable Regulation or a new element of Applicable Regulation therefore shall not be applied retroactively, unless (a) such retroactive application would enhance conservativeness in the assessment of emission reductions by sources or removal by sinks achieved by the project activity in question and (b) the intended user knew or negligently did not know the underlying circumstances giving cause to the changes in Applicable Regulation when the registration / issuance request was submitted.</p>
4	Para 27	ed	<p>Wording of this para could be made clearer.</p>	<p>We suggest the following revision of this para's wording...: "...shall inform the host Party's designated national authority (DNA), if the DNA exists, and the secretariat..."</p> <p>...and the addition of a 3rd sentence to this para: "In cases where no DNA exists or the existing DNA is not operational, informing the Secretariat shall be regarded as sufficient."</p>
5	Para 28	te	<p>We suggest that the intended user must also demonstrate that there is an "exit possibility", i.e. a chance of abandoning the project activity's implementation (and cancel all implementation related legal obligations) in case it cannot be registered as a CDM project activity.</p> <p>In case an investor has no scope for abandoning the project's implementation at the time at which the project activity is to be registered, this strongly indicates that the project activity is non-additional, i.e. is implementable regardless of the availability of revenues from the CDM.</p>	<p>Suggested wording for new sub-para "(d) The project participants must demonstrate that the project activity's implementation will be abandoned in case the project cannot be registered as a CDM project activity. Inter alia, project participants must demonstrate that all implementation related legal obligations are contingent on the project's registration."</p>

Call for public inputs – Template for inputs			Document: Draft CDM project standard (PS)	
#	Para No./ Annex / Figure / Table	Type of input ge = general te = technical ed = editorial	Comment on the paragraph	Proposed change (including proposed text, if any)
6	Para 29	te	We do not see a convincing reason, why a prior consideration of the CDM shall not be relevant in the context of a PoA.	We suggest re-wording para 29 as follows: "The above paragraphs 26-28 also apply to CDM PoAs."
7	Para 31	te	Two sub-paragraphs (a) on the local / global stakeholder consultation and (b) on how the comments received from stakeholders have been taken into account should be added.	Suggested wording: "(f) The conducting of an appropriate local stakeholder consultation and the global stakeholder consultation, both terminated before the on-site validation visit by the validating DOE." "(g) An explanation by the project participants as to how comments received have been taken into account. In cases where comments received claim the CDM regulations have not been observed by the project participants, the burden of proof for regulatory compliance lies with the project participants."
8	Para 31	ed	The present draft version specifies the mandatory contents of a PDD / PoA-PDD in Section 7.1, namely in paras 31-34. Sections 7.2.1 and 7.2.2 may to some degree be regarded as redundant to Section 7.1. Also, the content of para 31 (e) _{bis} could be regarded as part of the baseline scenario determination as explained in para 41. We believe that merging these sections could contribute towards enhancing clarity. If the Secretariat is interested in receiving more detailed input to this suggestion, we would kindly ask you to contact us.	
9	Section 7.2.1; paras 35 & 36	ed	Our comment #3 could also be integrated into this section of the Standard draft.	
10	Para 41	ed	See comment #8.	

Call for public inputs – Template for inputs			Document: Draft CDM project standard (PS)	
#	Para No./ Annex / Figure / Table	Type of input ge = general te = technical ed = editorial	Comment on the paragraph	Proposed change (including proposed text, if any)
11	Para 45 (b)	te	<p>We disagree with the notion that the baseline scenario determination may abstain from taking into account E- policies. Although a state may implement legal measures lowering GHG emissions thus furthering the aims of the Convention, we believe that the project participants should not be credited for such measures. We therefore strongly suggest that E- policies must be taken into account when establishing the baseline emission scenario for a specific project.</p> <p>While we agree that the approach suggested by us may avert the implementation of new legislation reducing GHG emissions, such legislation would be loop-holed by each CDM project registered with a baseline neglecting this legislation.</p> <p>Not taking such legislation into account shall be reserved to cases where existing laws are systematically not enforced. The host country DNA shall confirm such systematic non-enforcement of these laws and their hypothetical relevance to the project activity in question.</p>	<p>We suggest the following wording: (b) National and/or sectoral policies or regulations described in paragraph 44(b) above that have been implemented since the adoption by the COP of the CDM M&Ps (decision 17/CP.7, 11 November 2001) need not be taken into account in establishing a baseline scenario (i.e. the baseline scenario could refer to a hypothetical situation without the national and/or sectoral policies or regulations being in place). must be taken into account by project participants when establishing a project's baseline scenario. Project participants may choose not to take such policies or regulations into account, if they (a) can prove that the respective policies / regulations are systematically not enforced and (b) provide a written confirmation on such systematic non-enforcement from the host country DNA.</p>
12	Para 50	te	<p>Generally, a calculation of emission reductions should not be based exclusively on ex-ante estimates of leakage emissions, unless this is permitted by the methodology applied. Where required by the applicable methodology, leakage emissions should be monitored and integrated into the assessment of emission reductions achieved by a project activity.</p> <p>In addition, efforts should be undertaken to further sharpen and integrate the assessment of leakage emissions in the determination of emission reductions achieved by a project activity.</p>	<p>The author submitted a draft suggestion on how leakage emissions could be monitored / taken into account in a file named "Export Tool" along with NM00339, see http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/pnm/byref/NM0339. This could serve as an example for one specific project type (N2O reduction in nitric acid and caprolactam production facilities). For other project types, methodology specific approaches could be worked out as well.</p>
13	Section 7.4	te	<p>We believe that some project types (e.g. N₂O reduction in nitric acid and caprolactam plants) could be exempted from having to conduct an environmental impact assessment, because there are no negative environmental impacts associated with this project type.</p> <p>This could help reducing project implementation costs.</p>	<p>Suggestion to add a third para in Section 7.4: "The Board may decide to exempt certain project types from the necessity to conduct an environmental impact assessment."</p>
14	Para 70 (a)	ed	<p>This para could be deleted, because a Party that is not a Party to the KP would not have a designated national authority (DNA).</p>	<p>Suggestion: delete para 70 (a)</p>

Call for public inputs – Template for inputs			Document: Draft CDM project standard (PS)	
#	Para No./ Annex / Figure / Table	Type of input ge = general te = technical ed = editorial	Comment on the paragraph	Proposed change (including proposed text, if any)
15	Section 7.6	te	<p>There have been incidents with human rights issues in a few registered CDM projects. We suggest that the DNA should be entitled to qualify a Letter of Approval by making its validity depended on preliminary conditions that the project partners have to meet throughout the Crediting Period, in so far as such preliminary conditions appear suitable and appropriate for maintaining basic justified interests of local stakeholders.</p> <p>In case the project participants violate these preliminary conditions, the Letter of Approval can be suspended, until the violation is ended. As a matter of sanctioning such violations, project participants shall not be entitled to CERs for emission reductions achieved during suspension of the Letter of Approval.</p>	<p>Suggestion of a some further paras in Section 7.6:</p> <p>(5) “A DNA can make a letter of approval contingent on the project participants meeting specified preliminary requirements throughout the crediting period of the project in so far as such preliminary conditions appear suitable and appropriate for safeguarding local stakeholder interests or the compliance with local laws and regulation. Any such preliminary conditions should be worded in a clear, concise and specific manner in order to ensure predictability.</p> <p>(6) In case the DNA decides that a project participant has violated the preliminary conditions specified in the letter of approval intentionally or in gross negligence, it may suspend the validity of the letter of approval until remedy for the violation has been provided.</p> <p>(7) During the suspension of the letter of approval, emission reductions achieved by the project in question are not entitled to issuance of CERs.</p> <p>(8) The Board may grant investors a right to appeal against a DNA’s decision to suspend the letter of approval. In case a suspension was unjustified, the appeal decision may also rule that the previous para does not apply.</p> <p>(9) The Board may further specify rules and procedures for such appeal.</p> <p>Alternatively, stakeholders should be granted a direct right to appeal against project participants, whose actions violate their rights.</p>

Call for public inputs – Template for inputs			Document: Draft CDM project standard (PS)	
#	Para No./ Annex / Figure / Table	Type of input ge = general te = technical ed = editorial	Comment on the paragraph	Proposed change (including proposed text, if any)
16	Para 76	te	<p>There is, in our view, a strong case for restructuring the selection and the mandating of DOEs by project participants. DOEs are economically depended on being selected by project participants. For this reason, there have been some cases where DOE validated CDM projects on questionable findings.</p> <p>A DOE is not really free to interpret and apply a methodology or tool in a way that is very conservative with regards to the interpretation's effect on the issuance of CERs, because competitors interpreting such regulatory requirement in a less stringent manner would gain competitive advantage.</p> <p>This could be countered by mandating a UNFCCC body (e.g. the CDM AP) with the selection and the mandating of a suitable DOE for each project that is entering the registration pipeline. In order to finance this, the registration fee would need to be increased accordingly.</p> <p>This should apply accordingly to verification audits.</p>	
17	Para 78	ed	Redundant (see para 19) and our comment #2.	
18	Section 12.4	te	A para should be added after para 196 adding that the substitution of damaged / worn out components of a monitoring system is deemed not to violate the specifications of the registered monitoring plan, if the substitute part is of the same or better technical quality as the substituted part.	New para after 196: <p>"The exchange of worn out / damaged parts of the monitoring system is permitted. Project participants must ensure that the substituted parts are replaced in aequivalent or better technical quality."</p>
19	Para 198 (a)	te	<p>The use of default values – such as IPCC default values – should be restricted to cases, where measurements cannot be taken in a technically / economically viable manner.</p> <p>In addition, default values must be seen within their original teleological context: e.g. the use of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (see http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl) should not be used for establishing baseline emissions, because the purpose of these values employs conservativeness in the "opposite direction".</p> <p>The IPCC will have applied conservativeness to counter uncertainties in a manner that increases assumed emissions, so that inventories rather overstate than understate factual emissions. When establishing a baseline, the conservativeness principle must be applied in a way that underestimates factual emissions, because an overstatement would lead to a surplus issuance of CERs.</p>	<p>Suggestion: Take the last sentence of para 198 (a) and begin a new subsequent para with it as follows:</p> <p>"For default values (such as an IPCC value), where it is ex post confirmed, the most recent value shall be applied. Default values can only be used when the use of conservativeness in establishing them is aligned with the application specific context within the CDM project activity."</p>

Note: Please add rows as necessary.