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Break-out session I: Improving local / global stakeholder consultation

Main issues discussed:

- **LSC**
  - Feedback round
  - Grievance mechanism

- **GSC**
  - Time allocated for comments
  - Translation of documents in local language

- **Stakeholders concerns raised after registration**

- **Length of time after initial consultations and registration of projects**
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LSC

- Feedback round
  - Stakeholders welcome this proposal

- Grievance mechanism
  - Stakeholders welcome this round--however they asked that it should be clarified that the outcome of the process may not be always in favor of the complainant depending on the issue.
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➢ GSC

• Time allocated for comments
• Stakeholders agreed that the clarifications proposed and the strengthening proposed in the LSC would address the issues raised by stakeholders.
• There may be no need to extend the timing for GSC as the stakeholders will have their voice heard and provided opportunities to raise their comments/concerns appropriately at the LSC stage.
• Stakeholders agreed that extending the time for GSC will add additional and unnecessary delays in the project cycle
• Stakeholders agreed that if the Board allows comments at the issuance stage, there is no need to extend the time allocated for submitting comments by stakeholders
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➢ GSC

- Translation of project documents in local language
  - It is very expensive to have the PDD and project documentation translated and it may not be very productive given the very small number of comments received during the GSC

- If the option of translating documents is chosen:
  - Have only a summary of the PDD that contains all necessary and relevant project information translated
  - Specify that the documentation in English is the legally binding one
  - Translate the document only to the prevailing language in the project location. PP to choose a language and the DOE to approve it

- Submitting comments in the local language
  - Stakeholders welcome the proposal
  - It should be in the prevailing language at the location of the project
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➢ Stakeholders concerns raised after registration

• Consensus that it is an issue that need to be addressed

• Many implementation challenges:
  • Role and scope of the Board, DOE, DNA has to be well defined
    • Liability of the DOE and their role: DOEs cannot take legal decisions on local issues. Process has to follow national process.
  • Sovereignty issues of the DNA: raise issues of negative impact to DNAs to decide and DOE include their decision in the verification report
  • Overlap with national laws?
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- Stakeholders concerns after registration

  - What implications are there on the project:

    - If no implications on the project, then no incentive to do it
    - If implications on the issuance of CERs, then what would be the process:
      - DOE to raise CAR and not submit verification report with positive opinion until the issues resolved? Would result in delay of issuance
      - DOE to raise a FAR and submit a verification opinion, the board to decide on issuing or withholding CERs based on the gravity of the issues raised
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➤ Other comments:

• Consensus that the time when MR is published may be good starting point.
• Option 2 to be ignored as would require DOE to put in place additional infrastructure
• Clarify clearly the scope of comments eligible at this stage: have a template for stakeholders to use
• Define what falls under the scope of a negative impact
• DOE cannot take legal decisions on local issues/national regulations. Process has to follow national regulations/process.
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- **Length of time after initial consultations and registration of projects**
  - Delink conducting new consultation from the time elapsed between the initial consultation and the registration
  - Link the conduct of new consultation to significant changes in the project design occurring
  - Have a requirement for the PPs to conduct new consultation when significant changes has occurred.
  - If change occur and PPs do not conduct new consultations, DOE shall question that and PPs have to justify why.
  - If justifications by PPs are not satisfactory, the DOE shall raise a CAR requiring new consultations to be carried-out.
  - Preferred option to have LSC repeated as it has better impact and outcome.
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Additional input welcome until Monday COB, especially proposals for addressing stakeholders concerns after registration of the CDM project: practical solutions on how to deal with the issue

To be sent to: ftaibi@unfccc.int