

## STAKEHOLDER INPUTS TO SESSIONS AT 5<sup>th</sup> CDM ROUNDTABLE

The following table presents the status of the inputs from stakeholders gathered at the 5<sup>th</sup> CDM Roundtable on 10 August 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 inputs from 5<sup>th</sup> CDM Roundtable: **Improving the guidelines of first-of-its-kind (FOIK) and common practice**

STAKEHOLDER INPUT	STATUS OF CONSIDERATION OF INPUT		
	INCORPORATED INTO ONGOING WORK/DOCUMENT/PRODUCT	NOT INCORPORATED INTO ONGOING WORK / DOCUMENT/PRODUCT	OUTCOME IN PROGRESS
<b>General items</b>			NB. The revised guidelines on FOIK and common practice were adopted at EB 69.
Consider a separate approach for LDCs for both FOIK and CP			Will be considered in future improvement.
Consider developing similar guidelines for A/R projects		All the A/R methodologies refer to either A/R additionality tool or combined tool.	
In cases where there is a significant time lapse between GSC/start date and the end of validation, allow DOE the flexibility to request the PP to reassess the FOIK and CP analysis		The additionality of the project activity should be demonstrated based on the information available at the time of the investment decision/starting date of the project activity as per current additionality tool/guideline on the investment analysis.	
Reflect the rationale for statements, similar to the investment analysis guidelines	Accepted. Rationale for unit cost and more examples for the definitions have been included. Refer to the revised guidelines.		
“Geographical area”- Rethink the definition of “default”	Accepted. Refer to paragraph 1 of both guidelines.		
“Measure” - Include a paragraph/footnote to clarify that industrial gases and transport and AR are not defined as “measures”	Accepted. Refer to footnote 1 of both guidelines.		

Stakeholder inputs from 5<sup>th</sup> CDM Roundtable: **Improving the guidelines of first-of-its-kind (FOIK) and common practice**

STAKEHOLDER INPUT	STATUS OF CONSIDERATION OF INPUT		
	INCORPORATED INTO ONGOING WORK/DOCUMENT/PRODUCT	NOT INCORPORATED INTO ONGOING WORK / DOCUMENT/PRODUCT	OUTCOME IN PROGRESS
<b><i>Common practice items</i></b>			
“Unit cost” – Add an example to rationalize the provision	Accepted. Refer to paragraph 4 (e) of the revised guideline on the common practice.		
“Unit capacity” – Maintain the old text which refers to project capacity	Accepted. Refer to paragraph 5 of the revised guideline on the common practice.		
<b><i>Regarding the Stepwise Approach</i></b>			
Scrap the steps and re-introduce a more flexibility common sense approach (CP is a qualitative test)		Going back to previous common practice approach will not be in line with the CMP. 5 (para 24(b) and CMP. 6 (para 37) mandates.	
Keep the option of applying the steps but with refinement (based on CL_Tool_15), specifically related to ‘sector’ and ‘unit capacity’	Accepted. Refer to paragraphs 5 & 6 in the revised guideline on the common practice.		
Look for the possibility to introduce the penetration rate of the technology as an alternative approach to conduct the common practice analysis		This concept is already in the current guideline on common practice. Refer to paragraph 9 in the revised guideline on the common practice.	

Stakeholder inputs from 5<sup>th</sup> CDM Roundtable: **Improving the assessment of additionality**

STAKEHOLDER INPUT	STATUS OF CONSIDERATION OF INPUT		
	INCORPORATED INTO ONGOING WORK/DOCUMENT/PRODUCT	<u>NOT</u> INCORPORATED INTO ONGOING WORK / DOCUMENT/PRODUCT	OUTCOME IN PROGRESS
Not to include CER revenues			Accepted.  NB. Work on additionality will continue in the context of the review of the CDM modalities and procedures. Future stakeholder consultation is planned.
Provide DOEs with a clear message to allow PPs to demonstrate additionality without using investment analysis, as in practice DOEs do not accept PDDs without investment analysis			
Develop other possible approaches to demonstrate additionality (e.g., sector-specific approaches, co-benefits, top-down probability analysis, common practice, etc.)			
Change/expand the criteria on positive list			

Stakeholder inputs from 5<sup>th</sup> CDM Roundtable: **Improving the stakeholder consultation process**

STAKEHOLDER INPUT	STATUS OF CONSIDERATION OF INPUT		
	INCORPORATED INTO ONGOING WORK/DOCUMENT/PRODUCT	NOT INCORPORATED INTO ONGOING WORK / DOCUMENT/PRODUCT	OUTCOME IN PROGRESS
<b>Regarding GSC</b>	NB. The concept note was considered at EB 69, as Annex 22 to the annotated agenda		
<p>If the option of translating documents is chosen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Have only a summary of the PDD containing necessary and relevant project information translated</li> <li>- Specify that the documentation in English is the legally binding one;</li> <li>- Translate the document only to the prevailing language in the project location (with the PP choosing the language and the DOE approving it)</li> </ul>	Accepted. Refer to Table 2: Detailed proposals for the improvement of the GSC, Documents required for GSC to be submitted in local language in addition to English and paragraph 47 (b) (ii).		
Submission of comments in a language other than English should be permitted; this should be the prevailing language at the project location.	Accepted. Refer to Table 2: Detailed proposals for the improvement of the GSC, Documents required for GSC to be submitted in local language in addition to English and paragraph 47 (b) (ii).		
<b>Regarding concerns raised after registration</b>			
Further reflect on implications on the project (i.e., on issuance of CERs) if negative impacts or grievances are reported and define a process addressing DOE requirements for assessing such scenarios	Accepted. Refer to paragraph 41 Options 1 and 2.		

Stakeholder inputs from 5<sup>th</sup> CDM Roundtable: **Improving the stakeholder consultation process**

STAKEHOLDER INPUT	STATUS OF CONSIDERATION OF INPUT		
	INCORPORATED INTO ONGOING WORK/DOCUMENT/PRODUCT	<u>NOT</u> INCORPORATED INTO ONGOING WORK / DOCUMENT/PRODUCT	OUTCOME IN PROGRESS
<b><i>Regarding concerns raised after registration (cont'd)</i></b>			
Ignore “Option 2” proposed in the draft concept paper under this section, as this would require additional DOE infrastructure	Accepted.		
Clarify clearly the scope of comments eligible at this stage	Accepted: Comments eligible only those related to negative impact of the CDM project activity		
Provide a template for stakeholder comments to use at this stage			To be considered when revising the regulatory documents once the Board agrees on a way forward
Define what falls under the scope of “negative impact”			To be considered when revising the regulatory documents once the Board agrees on a way forward
<b><i>Regarding length of time after initial consultations and registration:</i></b>			
Delink the requirement of conducting a new consultation from the time elapsed between the initial consultation and registration	Accepted (refer to chapter 5).		

Stakeholder inputs from 5<sup>th</sup> CDM Roundtable: **Improving the stakeholder consultation process**

STAKEHOLDER INPUT	STATUS OF CONSIDERATION OF INPUT		
	INCORPORATED INTO ONGOING WORK/DOCUMENT/PRODUCT	<u>NOT</u> INCORPORATED INTO ONGOING WORK / DOCUMENT/PRODUCT	OUTCOME IN PROGRESS
<i>Regarding length of time after initial consultations and registration (cont'd):</i>			
<p>Link the requirement of conducting a new consultation with occurrence of significant changes in the project design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Have a requirement for the PPs to conduct new consultation when significant changes has occurred;</li> <li>- If a change occurs and the PPs do not conduct new consultations, the DOE shall question that and PPs would have to justify why;</li> <li>- If justifications by PPs are not satisfactory, the DOE shall raise a CAR requiring new consultations to be carried out.</li> </ul>	<p>Accepted. Refer to paragraph 34.: “in case of a significant change in the design of the project after the initial LSC, the LSC should be repeated.” and paragraph 36</p>		