

Chairman and Members of the CDM Executive Board
Mr. Clifford Mahlung
Chairman
UNFCCC Secretariat
Martin-Luther-King-Strasse 8
D 53153 Bonn
Germany

Project Developer Forum Ltd.
100 New Bridge Street
UK London EC4V 6JA

Mailing address:
Schulstrasse 25
CH 3256 Dieterswil BE

t: +44 20 3286 2520
office@pd-forum.net
www.pd-forum.net

CO VICE CHAIRMAN

Your contact:
Leo Perkowski
m: +1 321 432 3081
leo.perkowski@pd-forum.net

To cdm-info@unfccc.int
From leo.perkowski@pd-forum.net
Date 24 August 2010
Page 1/3
Subject **Call for public inputs on focus areas for future practitioner workshops for CDM stakeholders**

Dear Mr. Mahlung,

Honourable Members of the CDM Executive Board,

The Project Developer Forum welcomes the opportunity to make suggestions for technical areas on which our members would wish to engage in discussions and consultations with the secretariat, members of relevant Panels and/or Working Groups via workshops. The Project Developer Forum members would welcome working with the EB, secretariat, and associated panels and working groups on two levels:

- A: To discuss some of the following specific topics and to establish and maintain a current list of topics for further consultation and discussion in workshops; and
- B: To design and implement alternative ways of engaging with stakeholders via workshops.

A: Below is a list of specific topics which PD-Forum members have initially identified as being areas of interest. We note that this list includes topics for discussion as well as items for extension and training:

1. Materiality and Level of Assurance
 - a. How do PPs deal with changes in equipment, standards and procedures between project planning, meth approvals, registration and issuances?
 - b. How can stakeholders deal with uncertainty and still meet the spirit of the PDD?
2. Perform and interpreting a reference tariff calculation
3. Approach to Quality Assurance as it relates to monitoring of CDM projects' emissions
 - a. What are good monitoring practices that will be acceptable at all levels of the process, PPs, DOE, DNA, UNFCCC checks, and EB?
 - b. Quality Assurance
 - i. Calibration routines
 - ii. Uncertainty
 - iii. Sampling Frequency
 - iv. Treatment of data gaps
 - v. QA audits (e.g., EN 14181) and their significance for enhancing monitoring quality
 - c. How do CDM monitoring standards/expectations compare with other emissions monitoring programs such as the US EPA SOX/NOX, or ISO14000 series for monitoring emissions of industrial facilities?

Date 24 August 2010
Page 2/3
Subject **Call for public inputs on focus areas for future practitioner workshops for CDM stakeholders**

4. Preparation of a proposed new methodology
 - a. What are the key ingredients?
 - b. What makes a methodology successful?
 - c. How does the EB prioritise methodologies for consideration at Meth Panel meetings?
5. Do DOEs continue to bring value to the validation/verification process; is there another way to ensure environmental integrity with less actors, less cost and less delay?
 - a. The trend has been to add more steps, more people, more oversight; how can we make the process more constructive and reliable?
 - b. How can we learn lessons from the validation and verification of other projects?
 - c. How can we build capacity within stakeholders such that projects have a higher chance of successful and delay free registration and issuance?
 - d. What do other schemes do?
6. The relative strengths and weaknesses of large scale, small scale and micro scale CDM projects and the role of PoA
 - a. The workshop would explore the different methodological requirements for each of these categories and draw conclusions on their long term viability.
7. Addressing methodological challenges of small-scale projects
 - a. Principles for simplified SSC methodologies, so as to distinguish them from full-scale methodologies (e.g., may baselines be fixed during the crediting period?). This means defining what is meant by “simplified”.
 - b. Options to reduce fixed CDM transaction costs (related to Point 5 above, but particularly critical for SSC activities)
 - c. Baseline benchmarking principles and identification of critical benchmarking needs for top-down work
 - d. Good practice with respect to survey instruments to obtain common types of baseline data, such as fuel use, hours of operation, etc. – and provision of templates
 - e. Baselines for “new equipment” (individual pieces of equipment) or “new construction” (systems, buildings)
 - f. Procedures for revising SSC methodologies
 - g. Methodologies for industrial electric motor systems (pumps, fans, compressors...)
 - h. Methodologies for whole buildings (particularly use of building energy simulation and benchmarking approaches)
8. Enhancing regional distribution, development dividends and access to CDM for LDCs, SIDS and Africa, specifically discussing operational aspects related to:
 - a. Identification of priority project activity types for which viable CDM methodologies are lacking. Outcome should inform the priorities for top-down methodology development.
 - b. Suppressed demand and/or unmet demand
 - c. Putting the micro scheme in operation – what’s missing to get it started yesterday?
 - i. DNA/DOE infrastructure (in particular DNA capacity for making recommendations on specific RE technologies)
 - ii. Establishing positive additionality lists
 - iii. Clarifications around guidance e.g. use of the scheme for PCDM, definition of ‘Special Underdeveloped Zone’ etc.
 - iv. Reducing transaction costs (in particular DOE costs)
 - v. Project financing
 - vi. Ensuring that the micro scheme does really lead to projects in LDCs – what else is needed?

Date 24 August 2010
Page 3/3
Subject **Call for public inputs on focus areas for future practitioner workshops for CDM stakeholders**

9. How to improve the quality of submissions and speed up the registration/ issuance process
 - a. Feedback from Secretariat on common reasons for failing completeness check and improved guidance
 - b. Presentational issues – MoCs, LoAs, project view page
 - c. Using the VVM and getting the right level of detail in validation reports and PDDs

PD-Forum members would be pleased to assist the Secretariat and EB members to elaborate further on any of the above topics and help to identify and define objectives and outputs from such workshops and consultations. Furthermore, we would be pleased to continue to provide suggestions for further topics for discussions and consultations.

B: PD-Forum would like to open a discussion on the format of the workshops in question. We observe that some of the items listed above are akin to items on an agenda rather than themes for an individual workshop, and at the same time, we recognise that running workshops consumes a significant amount of resources both on behalf of the secretariat and for those stakeholders who are invited to attend the workshops. At the same time, limitations on attendance cause frustration for other stakeholders.

In view of these considerations, PD-Forum would like to propose that some of the workshops take the form of a regular (e.g. weekly) webinar where individual topics are presented to stakeholders. Topics of interest could include new and revised guidelines, procedures, consolidated methodologies, tools etc., such that stakeholders could benefit from an explanation from the Secretariat of the purpose and application of such documents.

As these webinars would be run electronically, it would significantly increase the audience whilst at the same time reducing the costs of participation for all concerned.

We are available to provide further comments or clarifications at any time during your consideration of the above suggestions. Please feel free to contact us at any time.

Kind regards,



Leo S. Perkowski
Co-vice Chairman
Project Developer Forum