

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

EB-63

Relations with Designated Operational and Applicant Entities

# Topics

- Inputs to EB-63
- Reminder on interaction with AP
- Comments to the annotated agenda
- Other issues

## Inputs to EB-62

- One written input made
  - TÜV Nord:  
Treatment of prior consideration when a project started validation twice,  
once before and once clearly after 02 August 2008

## **Reminder on interaction with AP**

- Accreditation procedures & accreditation costs
- Timelines in accreditation
- Any needs from updated standards and procedures

# Comments to the annotated agenda - in general

- Unfortunate start of procedure to trigger a call for input once annotations are available
  - Little time for too many topics
  - Publication of important documents after closing call for input
- Improvable time management (drafts – workshop – revisions – re-publishing – commenting)
- Publication on Friday cob with comments by Friday cob would be preferred

# **New Standards and Procedures - in general**

- The fact of consolidation and revisions is very much appreciated
- Revision of CDM Glossary of Terms to be done in parallel
- Most documents are not considered being ready for decision
  - Inconsistencies
  - Omissions (e.g. responsibility sharing CME / DOE)
  - Contradictions to discussions at workshop
- Request to delay decisions and continue work (decisions by EB-55 enabling auditor trainings in Dec 11 / Jan 12)

## New Standards and Procedures - in general (2)

- Issue of implementation ( validity, 'grace period' etc.)
  - We suggest mandatory applicability only to new activities (verification, validation) after entering into force
  - Inclusion in existing activities as a 'may' not as a must
  - Reduce interference with ongoing assessment as far as possible
  - Arrange immediate training workshop(s) for DOE management staff, train the trainers (issue of harmonization)
  - Consider the release of explanatory documents incl. best practice examples and templates

## **New Standards and Procedures - in general (3)**

- Feedback to the 'Integrated Workshop'
  - Excellent working atmosphere
  - Good representation of expertise in all technical areas
  - Time constraints in discussions and in preparation
  - Importance of some standards would have deserved individual workshops and not a time slot in a bundle of topics
  - Target met?

# Additionality in PoA - in general

- The validation of the suitability of eligibility criteria to demonstrate additionality is not embedded in the treatment of erroneous inclusion
  - impact on other procedure(s)
- Eligibility criteria for demonstrating additionality are considered as matter for possible ex-post changes (amendments, revisions) in case the practical implementation shows such needs
  - impact on other procedure(s)
- If approved now, consistency issues can be resolved within other procedures

# Development of Eligibility Criteria - in general

- Responsibility sharing by DOEs and CMEs is mentioned several times but not regulated anywhere  
→ impact also on other procedure(s)
- Aspects on the validation of the suitability of eligibility criteria are not treated within the VVS  
→ impact on other procedure(s)
- From our recent viewpoint, this standard is not ready for approval at EB-63

# Application of multiple meths - in general

- Inconsistencies with VVS: Who proposes the combination  
→ impact also on other procedure(s)
- If this rectified, this standard should be ready for approval  
at EB-63

# Standard for sampling and surveys - in general

- Good guidance for project development and monitoring when information has to be collected based on sampling and surveys
- But:  
The DOE section of this draft neither matches the actual situation when DOEs apply sampling methods nor provides complete guidance how to assess documents referring to sampling and surveys
- Development of this standard was made without essential inclusion of the DOE viewpoints
- The DOE section is not considered ready for approval at EB-63

# Project Standard - in general

- The separation in post-registration changes requiring EB approval and those not requiring approval is unclear, leaves too much space for interpretation, and will lead unavoidably to numerous requests for review in case no more guidance is provided
- Several solutions have been discussed during the integrated workshop
  - White lists
  - Variations within the sensitivity analysis

## VVS - in general

- Inconsistencies to other revised documents
- Inconsistencies within the document
- Should include results of recent actions (e.g. call for input on validation of stakeholder comments)
- Special attention to implementation timeline required (already explained)
  
- From our recent viewpoint, this standard is clearly not ready for approval at EB-63
- Any further revision of the draft should be reviewed by stakeholders again

# Project Cycle Procedure - in general

- Response time of 2 days was considered too short
- Procedure on erroneous inclusion is misplaced
- Consensus on several aspects within this procedure is not reflected at all
- Reporting of assessment status is incomplete
- Adjustment to project reality to be made now (e.g. not the DOE prepares a revised methodology but the PP)
- From our recent viewpoint, this standard requires further revision before approval

# First-of-its-kind and Common Practice

- If VVS is not approved at EB-63, the implication of deciding on an update of the additionality tool should be considered in the ongoing work on the VVS
- For ensuring a harmonized understanding by auditors the common practice analysis needs significant further guidance when it comes to the assessment of “similar” technologies, specifically with regard “size of installation” and “investment climate” (could be placed in the VSS as well). Furthermore the latter is linked to “E- policies” which are left in limbo.

# Submission of Standardized Baselines

- Paragraph 8.(a) (ii) introduces the payment of a DOE by the secretariat (for validation of information) while a contract is made with the DNA
  - Considered problematic from a legal point of view
  - Prefer payment by ordering DNA and reimbursement of DNA by Secretariat
- Discuss conflict of interest for state-owned DOEs (could be implemented in VVS or accreditation standard)

# Significant deficiencies

- Information note provides a fair picture of recent discussions
- Key elements of the DOE's position:
  - 'significant deficiencies' should be related to cases of fraud and gross negligence
  - No involvement of a second DOEs
  - No automatism in conclusions (like suspension in case of fraud)
  - Inclusion of an appeals process
  - Commensurateness of measures (not endangering the whole entities' operation)
  - Restrict the procedure to exceptional cases
- We also prefer this topic coming to a final conclusion soon , but continuing interaction is a must

**Thank you for your attention!**

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

[Werner.Betzenbichler@bece-experts.com](mailto:Werner.Betzenbichler@bece-experts.com)