
Communication with private sector

CDM reform category: 2. Need for procedural improvements and provision of adequate resources

CDM reform sub-category: c. Enhance communication patterns between regulator and regulated

Examples:

- Communication during completeness check phase, requests for reviews and reviews
- General blame-game

-
- The CMP made it clear in Poznan that they want more interaction between the EB//Panel/Secretariat and the private sector.
 - The EB currently sits on over 20 million US \$ and has spent only 13 000 \$ for communication and 191 \$ for communication (see annex 53 to EB 50 report).
 - We have many examples of the secretariat requesting things that are not required by the written rule of law i.e. previously agreed UN/EB guidance or procedures. When commented on it, the secretariat in some cases called the DOE and forbid them to take the project participant's position (even though they did not deny that their position was wrong). Sometimes, they simply ignore emails for months. They hardly ever pick up the phone, the voice mail is often full. Examples include
 - Asking for LoAs from a certain country whereas it is the buyer's prerogative to decide that,
 - Asking for new guidance to be included from subsequent EB meetings, even though the project was submitted long before;
 - Asking for new MoC forms whereas the old form is still valid,
 - Asking for the host country acknowledging a bundle, whereas it is a) clear in the name of the project and b) this rule came only after the project was submitted for registration
 - Some Accreditation panel members forbid DOEs to speak up against them, simply because they are from the UN and used to more respect (intercultural communication issue). Some EB members forbid private sector participants during conferences to speak up freely, threatening that they have gone too far. RIT members have been thrown out from the RIT without justification after they dared to speak up against the EB. There is serious belief that the projects of companies who dared to go public and use their right to freedom of speech with their concerns were delayed or rejected more easily.

Impact:

- Months of delay for no good reason. 90% of the requests for reviews are non-issues or could have been resolved by means of in-person meetings. The EB claims that conflict of interest and time required prevents them from direct interaction with DOEs. This is not true. Had the EB and Secretariat been trained better beforehand, they did not have to ask the questions during the request for review phase, which is then time consuming for all participants and stalls projects

which eventually mostly get registered i.e. deserve the credits, for no good reason.

- Environmental integrity is at risk: Many projects in LDC are difficult to implement. Regulatory uncertainty and increased transaction costs prevent these projects from even making it to validation, for no good reason.

Improvement recommendation:

- Stop the blame game and get back to working together based on trust and the principle of presumption of innocence. Name and shame participants who endanger environmental integrity.
 - Independent appeal mechanism to be set-up
 - Use the budget to professionalize the regulatory body i.e. 100% mandate for the whole EB to avoid conflict of interest and politicking
-