

## Agenda item 4.2

Paragraph 53 of the annotated agenda

# CDM project cycle procedure

**CDM EB 65**

Durban, South Africa, 20– 25 November 2011



# Overview

---

1. Mandate to revise the draft project cycle procedure
2. Work carried out
3. Main changes from previous draft
4. Stakeholders comments for consideration
5. Proposed further changes
6. Expectation from EB 65



# 1. Mandate to revise the draft PCP

---

- At EB 63, the Board requested the secretariat to revise the draft taking into account comments from stakeholders that help improve the clarity as well as improving the consistency of the document
- At EB 64, the Board made additional comments based on the table tracking requirements from existing documents



## 2. Work carried out

---

- Improved consistency of the project cycle procedure with:
  - Project standard (PS)
  - Validation and verification standard (VVS)
  - Glossary of CDM terms
  - PoA standards
- Addressed comments from stakeholders that improve clarity or consistency of requirements
- Addressed comments received from the Board at EB 64
- Conducted an editorial review



### 3. Main changes from previous draft

---

1. Relocating the list of documents to be superseded to the history box at the end
2. Adding definitions of “shall”, “should” and “may”, being consistent with PS and VVS
3. Filling the gap overlooked in the previous draft:
  - Provision on recommencing the validation through a new or revised contract with a different set of PPs
  - Provision on confidentiality regarding publication of deviation requests
4. Modifying based on EB 64 guidance:
  - Provisions based on new PoA standards adopted at EB 63, removing outdated PoA provisions
  - Phrase regarding “risk-based approach” in checking submissions (“may, in accordance with the guidance of the Board” → “shall, subject to the guidance of the Board”)
  - Removal of email addresses
  - Specifying the timeline for DOE (30 days) to submit a review report for erroneous inclusion reviews



### 3. Main changes from previous draft (cont.)

---

5. Clarifying the effective date of registration in case of no request for review
6. Relocating the entire section on inclusion of CPAs in PoA from registration section to post-registration section
7. Clarifying the post-registration change cases requiring pre-approval by the Board and the cases requiring submission together with issuance requests
8. Modifying some MoC requirements
9. Elaborating the process of renewal of crediting period based on the current practice
10. Addition of appendix 1 (fee provisions) and appendix 2 (Board's decision making criteria on cases)
  - Fee provisions modified to cover PoA cases
  - Board's decision making criteria modified to cover renewal of crediting period cases and to improve consistency when to proceed with a vote
11. Relocation of some sub-sections to other sections, correction of errors (e.g. reference errors) and editorial improvement



## 4. Stakeholders comments for consideration

---

- Specifying time for scheduling the commencement of completeness check of requests for registration/issuance? (paras 39, 60, 138, 186, 208)
    - Maximum 15 days after submission of requests (para 60 of decision 3/CMP.6)
  - Increasing the timeframe for DOE's responding to issues of editorial nature? (paras 41, 62, 65, 140, 188, 191)
    - 3 days
  - Providing additional opportunity of direct communication between the secretariat and DOE or PPs after issuing final ruling of rejected requests of registration/issuance? (after paras 104, 232)
    - Telephone call from the secretariat to clarify the reason for rejection
  - Modification of review of erroneous CPA inclusion process? (paras 123, 128)
    - Replacing another DOE with other body to review the case
    - Compensation by including DOE only for professional negligence or fraud
  - Modification of re-submission of rejected requests for issuance? (para 232)
    - Removing the step of EB approval of re-submission before actual re-submission of request of issuance
- 



## 4. Stakeholders comments for consideration (cont.)

---

- Modification of withdrawal of request for registration? (paras 105-110)  
→ Make it applicable also to withdrawal of CPAs from PoA
- Addition of a case where reporting the validation status may refer to (para 22)



## 5. Proposed further changes

---

### Secretariat proposes the following further changes

- Specify the role of CMEs in PoA cass
  - CME instead of PPs (para 13...)
- Corrections of remaining errors
  - CME instead of DOE (para 54)
  - Reference errors (para 132, para 2 of appendix 1)



## 6. Expectation from EB 65

---

### Board may wish to

- Adopt the PCP
- Decide on the effective date based on the consideration of implementation plan for PS, VVS and PCP

