The following table presents the status of the inputs from stakeholders gathered at the 4th CDM Roundtable on 8 June 2012.

This table constitutes the **reporting format for tracking stakeholder inputs to CDM roundtables**, with the purpose of **reporting on the latest status of consideration of those inputs**.

Such a table is to be reported at each subsequent roundtable event, and made publicly available, to update on inputs received via prior events. It is envisaged to be updated as the work on the specific topics progresses.

STAKEHOLDER INPUT	STATUS OF CONSIDERATION OF INPUT
MATERIALITY	NB: Guideline has been adopted at EB 69
Include the concept of extrapolation of errors identified in sampling to remaining dataset	Accepted. See examples
Include an example/flowchart in guidelines on the application of materiality in the context of sampling	Accepted. Section including flowchart incorporated in Section VI.
Clarify reporting concept/provisions: 1. Reference ISO 14064-3 where there is additional information on implementation of materiality 2. That verification opinion is on 100% of the data set even though 100% has not been tested	 Accepted. See footnote 3 Accepted. See para. 14
Elaborate examples and clarify wording in areas identified by stakeholders: 1. Provide guidance/examples on the relationship between (immaterial) errors and representative samples (when to expand samples to get the level of confidence) 2. Clarify what is meant by "majority of effort" or provide examples 3. Clarify what is meant by "timing"	 Accepted. See examples Accepted. See examples Accepted. See footnote 6
Consider developing further guidance on how to handle and assess post-registration changes (deviations): 1. Make clear the connection of post-registration changes/deviations and application of materiality to post-registration changes 2. Deviations for detected omissions – links to VVS/PS – and potential need for a review/enhancements of these requirements – this issue as with all issues to be noted in the workshop report	 Accepted. See paras. 7 and 15 Noted. See cover note to EB 68 Annotations Annex 8
Note to the Board the stakeholders' recommendations regarding application of materiality in the verification of CPAs (PoAs where all CPAs are verified vs. sample of CPAs in verification) and in validation of data and parameters fixed ex ante, reporting on the application of materiality by the DOE and post-registration changes	Noted. Reflected in presentation delivered at EB 68

STAKEHOLDER INPUT	STATUS OF CONSIDERATION OF INPUT
SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT CO-BENEFITS TOOL	NB: Version 0.5 of the tool was considered at EB 68
Keep the criteria relevant, considering applicability to specific countries, sectors/technologies, project types (including the exploration of the positive list for microscale projects), and methodologies	This is an ongoing consideration in the development of the tool.
Consider the level of detail provided in the tool, balancing the need to be comprehensive versus being user-friendly enough for project participants	This is an ongoing consideration in the development of the tool.
Explore the linkages between reporting sustainable development and the process of local stakeholder consultation	The secretariat is aware of and exploring the linkages with the local stakeholder consultation process. The work being undertaken on local stakeholder development may impact on the design of the voluntary tool.
Explore the possibility of incorporating additional documentation or multimedia, as either an add-on or alternative reporting format to the tool	The secretariat is assessing how additional documents/multimedia may be incorporated as an addon.
Provide worked-out examples to illustrate use within a real project	This is an ongoing consideration in the development of the tool.
Provide the tool in languages other than English	It is intended that the final tool will be available in languages other than English. See question 1 of https://www.research.net/s/SD_tool_vers5. Version 0.5 of the tool was considered at EB 68

STAKEHOLDER INPUT	STATUS OF CONSIDERATION OF INPUT
SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT CO-BENEFITS TOOL	
Define roles in terms of responsibility for reporting/uploading (i.e., uploading rights should be consistent with a project's modalities of communication)	The role is defined by reference to the modalities of communication submitted for the project. See https://www.research.net/s/SD_tool_vers5
	Version 0.5 of the tool was considered at EB 68
Include in data fields "not applicable" entry where relevant	Included "not relevant" as an option for SD declaration and "not known" for step 3 "No Harm". See for example question 5 and question 17, respectively, of https://www.research.net/s/SD_tool_vers5
	Version 0.5 of the tool was considered at EB 68
Need greater clarity between sections on sustainable development criteria and section on safeguards against negative harm. The sections should be clearly distinct.	An attempt has been make these two sections distinct. See "About" section (following question 1) of <https: s="" sd_tool_vers5="" www.research.net=""></https:>
	Version 0.5 of the tool was considered at EB 68
Investigate further internationally recognized information sources and indicators, including those used by the World Commission on Dams (WCD) (EU website), the Climate, Community, and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA), and Agenda 21	Additional sources were included in the development of version 0.5 of the tool.
	Version 0.5 of the tool was considered at EB 68
Provide opportunity for further consultation/evaluation as criteria are developed (for example, via online survey) to gather follow-up input from DOE, DNA, and project participants	Ongoing opportunity to comment on the tool will be available once live (format not finalized); it is anticipated that ongoing review/revisions of the tool will be built into next year's management plan
Launch a public call for inputs following the next draft version	A call for inputs was launched after EB 68

STAKEHOLDER INPUT	STATUS OF CONSIDERATION OF INPUT
SAMPLING STANDARD AND BEST PRACTICE EXAMPLES	NB. The sampling standard and guidelines were adopted at EB 69
Add a footnote in the standard so that switch between the two options (i.e. p or (1-p)) for proportions in the sample size calculation should be possible in any monitoring period during the crediting period without revising the monitoring plan	Accepted. See paragraph 11 (a) of the sampling standard.
Clarify how to apply the requirements in the standard afterwards to an existing sampling plan in an already-registered PDD and PoA-DD, for example the case when PPs wish to use a single sampling plan across CPAs of a PoA	Clarified. Board issued guidance at EB 69 See footnote 1 of the sampling standard as well as paragraph 93 of EB69 meeting report.
Consider the possibility to allow PPs to design a sampling plan ex-post (not before validation/registration stage).	Noted. The work to improve sampling standard and guidelines will continue in 2013, and the issue will be considered as a part of our work plan.
Modify the values proposed for minimum sample sizes, including clarifications on preconditions for 30 and rationale for using 50 and 100. Consider the possibility to differentiate the minimum sample size by parameter	Clarified. Minimum sample size proposed is 30. See paragraph 12 and footnote 15 of the sampling standard.
Include an amendment in the standard clarifying whether every monitoring report requires its own sample and whether parameters determined bienially can be used for two years	Clarified. Additional guidance in some methodologies will be required. See footnote 6 of the sampling standard.

STAKEHOLDER INPUT	STATUS OF CONSIDERATION OF INPUT
SAMPLING STANDARD AND BEST PRACTICE EXAMPLES	
Reconsider Section V (i.e. validation and verification of sampling plans) in the sampling standard, including i) Options for document review instead of field/on-site checks to validate/verify the PP's sampling; ii) Options for focusing on a specific region instead of covering the whole project area iii) Sample points are chosen by the secretariat not by DOEs	Use of acceptance sampling is now optional; see paragraph 24 of the sampling standard, which uses "may". The work to improve sampling standard and guidelines will continue in 2013, and the issue will be considered as a part of our work plan.
Provide further guidance to project participants on dealing with failure to achieve reliability in sample data, for example, consideration of the use of discount factor or the use of conservative numbers from existing samples (e.g. lower/upper end of confidence interval)	Clarified. See footnote 17 of the sampling standard.
Provide further best practice examples in other areas for both DOEs and project participants	Noted. Work to provide/improve more examples will continue. The work to improve sampling standard and guidelines will continue in 2013, and the issue will be considered as a part of our work plan.
Incorporate examples illustrating precedence from registered / successful activities with household-level technologies	
Make current examples more coherent, to apply not only to a specific parameter but to a complete project following the CDM project cycle.	

STAKEHOLDER INPUT	STATUS OF CONSIDERATION OF INPUT
POSITIVE LIST AND MICROSCALE GUIDELINES	
Do away with SUZ requirements and allow the microscale technology criteria to apply to any host country. If we do define criteria for SUZ, then: can we ensure that the benefits go those in the zones? The definitions will include political as well as technical criteria	This input was presented to the Board at EB 68. See power point presentation (starting at slide 33) for annotated agenda item 4.1d of EB 68 available at http://unfccc4.meta-fusion.com/kongresse/cdm68/pdf/4.1d_80_89_EB68_SSCWG%20outcome-consolidated_TG.pdf . After an extensive discussion (view webcast of annotated
	agenda item 4.1d of EB 68 at: http://unfccc4.meta-fusion.com/kongresse/cdm68 /templ/ovw_small.php?id_kongressmain=220), the Board adopted the new definition of SUZ providing further qualitative and quantitative criteria; see annex 26, EB 68 "Guidelines for demonstrating additionality of micro scale projects"
Provide more clarity in the small scale additionality guidelines on the definitions of: • End users • Rural • Isolated/distributed	The board approved the texts of the positive list in para. 2(c) and 2(d) in annex 27, EB 68 "Guidelines for demonstrating additionality of small scale projects". In case further clarification is needed, stakeholders are encouraged to submit it to us.
Provide a decision tree/flow chart which would be a more user-friendly tool for determining additionality using microscale or small scale additionality guidelines	The flow charts were presented to the Board while presenting the item on SSC additionality. The flow charts will be incorporated into the Guidelines (Microscale and small scale) in their next revisions.