

# Fifth CDM Roundtable

## Wrap-up session I

### Improving the stakeholder consultation process

Langer Eugen

Bonn Germany, 10 August 2012



### 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**



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

---

### ➤ 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.



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

---

### ➤ 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



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

---

### ➤ 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



### ➤ 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?

### ➤ 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

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

---

➤ Other comments:

- Consensus that the time when MR is published may be good starting point.
- Option 2 to be ignored as would require DOEs 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
- DOEs cannot take legal decisions on local issues/national regulations. Process has to follow national regulations/process.





### ➤ 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.

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

---

**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](mailto:ftaibi@unfccc.int)**

