## TABLE FOR COMMENTS

Name of submitter: Stephan Hoch, Axel Michaelowa

## Affiliated organization of the submitter (if any): PoA Working Group

Contact email of submitter: <u>hoch@perspectives.cc</u>, <u>michaelowa@perspectives.cc</u>

0	1	2	3	4	5
#	Area*	Related CDM regulatory document (if any)	Para no. (if any)	Issue (Description of an issue concerning a specific CDM rule or operation that you consider results in unnecessarily high burdens or transaction costs on stakeholders, together with a description of the observed burdens or costs and their implications)	Proposed change (Description of an idea for simplification/streamlining of a particular CDM rule or operation and expected implications on the efficiency and integrity of the CDM)
	General	CDM-EB82-AA- A02	<b>3.</b> 56.	Many CDM projects and PoAs have experienced costs, barriers and resulting delays relating to issues that are non-material in nature. The risks, costs, uncertainties and timelines relating to these activities are therefore increased unnecessarily and their effective implementation is undermined due to issues that have no material impact on environmental integrity.	Application of the materiality principle in all aspects of the CDM, including validation and post-registration changes.
	Registration	CDM-EB82-AA- A02	<b>3.</b> 9.	The validation and registration process, including additionality assessment, is a costly and time-consuming step in the CDM cycle. Since activities that qualify as automatically additional do not require additionality assessment during validation, it is possible to reduce transaction costs and timelines by simplifying the validation and registration process for such activities without compromising environmental integrity of these activities, provided that such simplified procedures include sufficient safeguards to ensure appropriate stakeholder consultations and environmental integrity.	Allow simplified registration as an option for activities that are automatically additional and qualify either as micro-scale or are eligible to apply standardised baselines, including (1) allowing for validation of PoAs without specific CPA-DDs for CPAs where the individual unit size qualifies as micro-scale; and (2) inclusion of the basis of pre-approved standardised inclusion template CPAs involving certain types of activities with individual unit size that satisfies the micro-scale activities thresholds directly by the CME without prior validation by a DOE. This would only apply provided that the global and local stakeholder consultations are appropriately carried out.
	General	CDM-EB82-AA- A02	<b>3.</b> 9.	The existing rules have emerged bottom-up through project-based approaches and thus have not been designed to take into account the specific features of PoAs, including their dynamic and diverse nature and consequent need for flexibility (besides manageable transaction costs) in design and implementation. A fresh look at the existing rules from the perspective of PoAs can identify opportunities to develop streamlined, consolidated and consistent rules and procedures specifically customised for PoAs.	Prepare separate PoA standards and procedures (rather than PoA sections in the CDM standards and procedures); this option is preferred to reflect PoAs as opposed to projects.

0	1	2	3	4	5
#	Area*	Related CDM	Para no.	Issue	Proposed change
		regulatory document (if any)	(if any)	(Description of an issue concerning a specific CDM rule or operation that you consider results in unnecessarily high burdens or transaction costs on stakeholders, together with a description of the observed burdens or costs and their implications)	(Description of an idea for simplification/streamlining of a particular CDM rule or operation and expected implications on the efficiency and integrity of the CDM)
	General	CDM-EB82-AA- A02	<b>3.</b> 1011.	The existing rules have emerged bottom-up through project-based approaches and thus have not been designed to take into account the specific features of PoAs, including their dynamic and diverse nature and consequent need for flexibility (besides manageable transaction costs) in design and implementation. Adjustments based on a fresh look at PoAs are urgently needed to inform negotiations and allow PoA design to evolve to take advantage of its full potential, while providing sufficient stability for registered PoAs.	<ul> <li>Implementation of CMP guidance by Q 2 2015 with regards to application of micro-scale thresholds at the unit level rather than at the CPA level.</li> </ul>
					<ul> <li>Develop criteria (possibly at methodology level) for applying small-scale thresholds at the unit level rather than the CPA level, as appropriate.</li> </ul>
					<ul> <li>Allow for the option for simplified validation and registration for micro-scale, automatically additional activities without specific- case CPA using standardised inclusion by CME without prior validation by DOE.</li> </ul>
					<ul> <li>Allow for unlimited flexibility for verification schedules for individual CPAs within a PoA.</li> </ul>
					<ul> <li>Conduct a systematic analysis to identify unnecessary barriers (restrictions, costs, uncertainties, timelines) to post-registration changes of PoAs and options to address them. This assessment should include a systematic analysis of the PoA rules and procedures.</li> </ul>
-					

\*Area: Please choose from the following categories: General; Registration; Issuance; Post-registration changes; Renewal of crediting period; Other project cycle step; Methodology development; Methodology revision; Methodology clarification; Accreditation; Other specific process.

Please divide your inputs on issue by issue using different rows. Please create as many rows as needed.