



**PROJECT
DEVELOPER
FORUM**

Session II: CDM Project Cycle R&I Processes and VVS

10 April 2011, Bangkok

Leo S. Perkowski
Co Vice Chairman, Project Developer Forum

The Project Cycle - Perspectives

- Perspectives on the Project Cycle
 - Continues to be too long, too complex
 - 2010 queue resolved but slowly growing again
 - We continue to see delays due to minor issues
 - The DOEs now own the largest portion of the timeline
 - Original vision for CDM was so any person could submit a PDD -- that vision has been lost
 - Too much duplication
 - Monitoring Report is now as large as the PDD
 - Documents audited twice for same VVM rules– let's fix our auditing and reporting issues
 - The cycle continues to be unpredictable and is increasingly more expensive

The Project Cycle

- Perspectives on the Project Cycle (Cont.)
 - CC&R and CC@I
 - Referencing of issues better but not consistent
 - At times, issues beyond scope of CC checklist
 - Reviews
 - Issues are not always well communicated – references - direct talks on specific issues a must (Session IV)
 - Formal timelines clearer exception: scheduling reviews
 - Review outcome – why the secrecy?
 - VVM to VVS
 - How will it differ as a standard, vs. a manual? Impact?
 - Tighten up the gaps in rules which create more questions and interactions, more delays
 - Training: Invite PPs.
 - Ensure issues are appropriate to the specific audit

The Project Cycle

- Perspectives on the Project Cycle (Cont.)
 - Project Participant Standard
 - We welcome clear guidance and the UNFCCC acknowledgement of vital role PPs have in the process
 - Need better understanding of goals
 - PP involvement essential early on in the process
 - Document consolidation
 - Fully support consolidation of Val/Ver procedures
 - Many other documents make good candidates for a similar effort, especially in the verification – deviation – MP change processes

The Project Cycle

- Perspectives on the Project Cycle (Cont.)
 - DOEs
 - Now consume the greatest portion of the project timeline with TR backlog and multiple document reviews
 - The secretariat has made internal improvements but their extended arm (DOE) appears to be treated as an outsider. We see the DOEs as part of the regulatory body
 - Although referencing same guidelines, interpretations are clearly not in sync. Hence, timelines and responsiveness suffering and will get worse.
 - DOEs not building staff – senior management sees no demand beyond 2012.

The Project Cycle

– Priorities

- Fix the relationship with DOEs
 - Reach out to key personnel
 - Train all personnel
- Reduce timelines and transaction costs
 - Consolidate procedures where appropriate – reach out to stakeholders – it’s in our interest too
 - Automate/digitize the process where appropriate to eliminate CCs
- Ask for what is necessary and nothing more
 - Distinguish between “must have” and “like to have”
 - Distinguish between “major” and “minor”

THANK YOU !!