

DOE/AE Forum | *Werner Betzenbichler* | *May 2011*

EB-61

Relations with Designated Operational and Applicant Entities

Topics

- Inputs to EB-61
- AP-54 interaction
- Comments to the annotated agenda
- DOE timelines

Inputs to EB-61

- 2 inputs made via dedicated upload tool since EB-60
 - Consideration of Waste Gas Prices
 - Outline of a Procedure on Excess Issuance

AP-54 interaction

- Very useful interaction creating common understanding of several issues
- Key topics:
 - DOE scarcity in complex technical areas
 - Objectivity in the accreditation process
 - Accreditation timelines
 - “Initial Verification”
- Missing AP report (one week before EB) retards our reaction by coordinated, up-to-date input to meetings

Comments to the annotated agenda

- Annex 2: Analysis Report of the DOE Performance Monitoring
 - We welcome the conclusions with regard to recommendations on needs for further guidance, changed procedures, trainings for DOEs & reviewers, harmonization
 - Evaluation of issues for small and large scale meth should be kept separately
 - Special treatment for re-occurring issues requested
 - We offer our cooperation when developing a DOE survey in the context of investment analysis (para. 17)
 - We strongly emphasize that action should be developed and implemented immediately, saving scarce human resources in 2012

Comments to the annotated agenda (cont.)

- Annex 4: Recommendations related to PoA
 - We welcome the solution-oriented workshop report
 - Issue of liability for erroneous inclusion has correctly been reported as major DOE concern (section II-A)
 - Both optional mid-term solutions are perceived as tremendous improvement compared to the current situation
 - We wish to emphasize that this issue needs to be consistently embedded in the topic of liability for excess issuance (no doubling, no higher risks for PoAs, reflection of missing insurability)

Comments to the annotated agenda (cont.)

- Annex 5: Project Cycle Operations
 - A minimum length of monitoring period is not favored by DOEs (para. 11); frequency should be left to the market. Nonetheless some kind of limitation around the end of the KP period is recommendable e.g.:
 - only one verification per project from Oct 2012 till Mar 2013
 - Verification of a split Monitoring Period (divided at 31.12.2012) with two issuance requests
 - We do not see the necessity to combine aspects of a risk-based approach with the *“importance of the implementation of the DOE liability provisions”* (para. 14)

Timelines for validations and verifications

- Complex topic which needs careful handling when considering revision of existing or introduction of new regulations
- Many aspects which influence time demand in assessments:
 - Quality of input documents
 - Missing evidences
 - Time demand for responding to CARs and CRs
 - Internal procedures (e.g. dispatching of resources)
 - Project specific situation
 - LoA procedures of some DNAs
 - Need for updates reflecting changed standards/guidance
- Some DOEs consider speed as competitive advantage

Timelines for validations and verifications (cont.)

- Improvements require holistic approach
- A developer standard might deliver better input quality
- Fixation of assessment timelines would require reopener clause
- Clear regulations on assessment stop / contract termination required
- No retroactive application of any new regulations
- Not considered as most urgent issue before end of KP but might be useful for post-2012 business environment

Thank you for your attention!

Werner Betzenbichler
Chair of the DOE Forum
on behalf of TÜV NORD

Werner.Betzenbichler@bece-experts.com