



Annex 11

MEASURES FOR ENHANCING COMMUNICATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS

I. Background

1. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP) at its fifth session through its decision 2/CMP.5, paragraph 8 requested the Executive Board (hereinafter referred to as the Board) of the clean development mechanism (CDM) to enhance its communication with project participants (PP) and stakeholders, through the establishment of modalities and procedures for direct communication between the Board and project participants in relation to individual projects.
2. The CMP at its sixth session (CMP 6) reiterated the request to the Board and further specified in its decision 3/CMP.6, paragraph 22 that these modalities and procedures for direct communication with stakeholders should cover issues related to registration, issuance and methodologies work streams; and provide for:
 - (a) Direct communication that can be initiated by the secretariat, as needed, with project proponents, on issues related to registration, issuance and methodologies work streams;
 - (b) Stakeholder consultations on general issues, and the publication of the outputs thereof;
 - (c) Intensified use of public calls for input in relation to major regulatory decisions, including the possibility to make submissions.
3. The CMP decision 3/CMP.6, paragraph 59, further, requested the Board to ensure that editorial errors which will not affect the assessment of compliance with validation and verification requirements do not lead to a determination that the request for registration or issuance is incomplete, while ensuring environmental integrity.
4. Furthermore, the CMP decision 3/CMP.6, paragraph 17 requested the secretariat to further increase the transparency of its work by, inter alia, publishing on the UNFCCC CDM website information related to the current and historic status regarding the processing of case-specific matters and methodologies, including requests for clarification, deviation and revision and for changes to project design documents.
5. Based on these mandates, the Board held an initial discussion at its fifty-ninth meeting and has requested the secretariat to:
 - (a) Launch a call for public input on areas and means for direct communication with the Board and the secretariat;
 - (b) Define categories of relevant stakeholders and prepare an analysis of the areas and sub-areas for direct communication with each stakeholder categories within the registration, issuance and methodology processes and an analysis of the need for establishment of new forums, recognizing representatives of stakeholder groups and/or exploring alternative ways for facilitating communication on policy issues;
 - (c) Develop draft modalities and procedures for direct communication with relevant stakeholders for consideration of the Board at a future meeting, taking into account the input received by the call and the analysis prepared by the secretariat.



6. In accordance with the above-mentioned mandate the call for inputs was launched at EB59. The call was open from 18 February 2011 to 18 March 2011, eight inputs were received. A brief summary of these inputs is presented in Appendix 1. This document represents the analysis requested in paragraph 5 (b) above. Following the Board's deliberations specific draft modalities and procedures will be drafted.

7. This document and the subsequent procedures is focused on establishing principles for direct communication and modalities for existing processes. The aim is not to recommend changes to existing processes to accommodate enhancements in communication. However as specific elements of the Board's procedural framework are revised additional provisions for direct communication may be incorporated.

II. Definition of stakeholders

8. Stakeholders according to modalities and procedures of the clean development mechanism¹ "Stakeholders" are defined to be the public, including individuals, groups or communities affected, or likely to be affected, by the proposed clean development mechanism project activity.

9. Taking into account this definition and for the needs of this document, the following stakeholders have been defined:

- (a) Designated National Authorities (DNAs);
- (b) Designated Operational Entities (DOEs);
- (c) Project participants;
- (d) Civil society.

III. General Objectives

10. The recently adopted CDM business plan provides clear objectives for the work of the Board and its support structure. Any procedures for direct communication will need to be developed in a manner that supports these objectives, in particular by supporting the transparency of CDM processes. Specifically the development of the precise procedures for direct communication should be guided by the following objectives:

- (a) Greater efficiency in the operation of the CDM: Direct communication should support the Board in taking decisions in a more efficient and effective manner, i.e. the procedure must allow for relevant information to be placed in the appropriate moment for consideration by the Board and its support structure. The principle of direct communication will also be guided by the knowledge that well informed stakeholders will be better positioned to comply with the expected quality standards, thus supporting the overall efficiency of the system;
- (b) Improved objectivity, clarity and integrity in the CDM: Direct communication should support the Board in identifying areas within the regulatory framework where revisions or additions would enhance objectivity and/or ensure environmental integrity;

IV. Proposed scope of procedures for communication

11. Communication with different stakeholders shall aim to address two main areas:

¹ FCCC/CP/2001/13/Add.2, Annex, A. 1(e); p. 8.



- (a) Policy and procedural related matters: this area covers consultations with stakeholders in situations where new rules and regulations are being prepared or existing rules and regulations (procedures, methodologies, standard) are being revised that have an important impact on the stakeholders.
 - (b) Case specific matters: this area covers situations related to case submissions (requests for registration, issuance, deviations, revision of monitoring plans, new methodologies proposals, revision of an approved methodology, and clarification on an approved methodology or an approved tool).
12. The following sections elaborate means for communication in each of these two areas.

V. Communication on policy issues

13. Currently many means of consulting and communication with stakeholders on policy issues are implemented including call for input. However there is a lack of a systematic approach to these consultations that is mainly done on the discretion of the Board and/or one of its support structures.

A. Communication initiated by the Board or its support structure

1. Objectives

14. Objectives of such type of communication is:
- (a) To seek stakeholders input regarding difficulties in the application of existing rules;
 - (b) To seek suggestions for areas requiring additional guidance within the regulatory framework with the aim of improving the objectivity and broadened applicability of rules and requirements;
 - (c) To ensure that actors within the CDM process understand the rules and regulations established by the Board.

2. Means of communication

Interaction with DNAs

15. It is proposed that interaction between the Board and the DNA forum through its co-chairs to be held twice a year during Board meetings. When need of further interaction, the Board can invite the co-chairs of the DNA forum to any of its meetings.

16. The two meetings where the DNA forum interacts with the Board should be defined at the beginning of the year.

17. The secretariat will continue to organize global and regional meetings of the DNA Forum for the purpose of facilitating communications with and between DNAs.

Interaction with AEs/DOEs

Board interaction with AEs/DOEs

18. An interaction with the DOE/AIE Coordination Forum chair on issues of interest to applicant entities (AEs)/DOEs is held at each Board meeting.

19. To make this channel of communication effective, it is proposed that the secretariat, on behalf of the Chair of the Board, communicates to the DOE/AIE Coordination Forum at least three weeks before

the Board meeting, topics for which the Board would like to have views of AEs/DOEs. AEs/DOEs should be invited to come-up with consolidated views for the consideration of the Board.

CDM-AP interaction with AEs/DOEs

20. It is proposed that interaction between the CDM Accreditation Panel (CDM-AP) and the DOE/AIE Coordination Forum through its Chair and, if the forum wishes, with a limited number of AEs/DOEs to be held twice a year during CDM-AP meetings. The scope of this interaction shall be focused on the CDM accreditation standard and the CDM accreditation procedures.

21. It is also proposed that when need for further interaction; the CDM-AP could invite the Chair of the DOE/AIE Coordination Forum to any of its meetings. The two meetings where the DOE/AIE Coordination Forum interacts with the CDM-AP should be defined at the beginning of the year.

22. In addition, if the DOE/AIE Coordination Forum feels the need for any further interaction with the CDM-AP, it is proposed that a request shall be made by the forum at least three weeks prior to the CDM-AP meeting in which the interaction is requested.

Secretariat interaction with AEs/DOEs

23. In addition to the workshops, it is proposed that the secretariat continues organizing after each Board meeting a conference call with all members of the DOE/AIE Coordination Forum that wish to participate. The aim of these calls is to discuss the outcome of the Board meeting and provide clarification to AEs/DOEs on decisions taken by the Board at the relevant meeting.

24. It is proposed that secretariat organises periodically regional calibration workshops for which AEs/DOEs are invited. The objective of these workshops is to provide clarifications and communicate the Board's interpretation and rationale behind its policy decisions. It also aims at sharing good practices among AEs/DOEs and promoting common understanding of the CDM requirements.

Interactions including other stakeholders

Executive Board interaction with stakeholders

25. At each of its meetings, the Board dedicates a time slot for interaction with admitted observers. Such interactions should be focused on policy and general issues not on case specific matters.

26. All interested parties can take part to this interaction including project participants, NGOs and civil society.

Targeted workshops and/or call for input

27. It is proposed that when developing new documents or undertaking any major revision of existing documents that have a considerable impact on the stakeholders, the Board and its support structures:

- (a) Launch a call for input to seek views of the stakeholders on the areas to be covered/revised in the document and the concerns that it should cover;
- (b) Decide whether an organization of a workshop including practitioners workshops is relevant to have views of stakeholders.

28. The Board and its support structures should determine at which stage these means of seeking views of stakeholders are more useful :

- (a) At the beginning of the preparation/revision of the document;



- (b) At a stage where a first draft is available.
- 29. The Board may wish to consider fixing the time allocated for calls for input on a case per case basis in order to ensure efficiency and expedited preparation/revision of important documents.
- 30. All inputs received shall be taken into consideration by the Board while making its decision.
- 31. It is proposed that, after Board had finalised its consideration and has taken a decision on the subject of the call for input, a summary of the inputs received including reasons for taking a decision different from proposals by stakeholders, be made available to the public.
- 32. Calls for input are directed to the public at large and all interested parties can provide their views on the subject of the call.
- 33. For workshops, due to limited capacity, selected stakeholders would be invited through recognized channels. In such workshops it is proposed that interest should be balanced ensuring however a composition that would ensure a fruitful outcome of the workshop.

System wide consultation and calibration

- 34. For sharing good practices, enhancing understanding and providing a platform for exchange of ideas and free discussion between Board members, secretariat and stakeholders on general policy issues as well as exchange on experience regarding the implementation of different rules and regulations, some means have been identified:
 - (a) CDM Roundtables;
 - (b) Joint Coordination Workshop.
- 35. It is proposed that agendas of such events should be prepared in consultation with stakeholders to ensure that issues of stakeholders' interest are discussed when appropriate.
- 36. For both events identified, all relevant stakeholders are invited taking into account representation of all interested parties, space limitation and topics included in the agenda of the events.
- 37. The number of roundtables and joint workshops should be defined at the beginning of the year based on the Board work plan and the need for consultation with stakeholders.

3. Means of response

- 38. The secretariat shall ensure that the outcomes of the above interactions are formally documented, made publicly available in an appropriate format on the UNFCCC CDM website, and brought to the attention of the Board.

B. Communication initiated by stakeholders:

1. Objectives

- 39. Objectives of such type of communication is:
 - (a) To provide stakeholders with a forum where they can communicate to the regulator their views on rules, regulations and their implementation;
 - (b) To provide stakeholders with channels for asking clarification and enhancing their understanding of CDM rules and regulations and providing feedback.

2. Means of communication

40. As a general principle and in order to ensure expeditious treatment of the queries from stakeholders, it is proposed that all correspondence should be considered by the secretariat and responded to directly wherever possible. Only issues that require attention or further guidance of the Board or its panels and working group shall be brought for their consideration. In addition to the establishment of the mechanisms below, the secretariat will maintain channels for queries of a more general nature.

Communication initiated by AEs/DOEs

41. Currently AEs/DOEs may make non-case specific submissions and requests for clarification and guidance to the Board. All submissions are responded to and the answers are made available to all AEs/DOEs. The Board agreed at its fifty-ninth meeting that DOE submissions seeking clarification on the Accreditation Standard could be directed to the CDM Accreditation Panel. In addition the secretariat maintains a number of mechanisms for received and responding to individual DOE queries.

42. It is proposed that:

- (a) Mechanisms be established to receive and log all non-case specific submissions from AEs/DOEs;
- (b) The secretariat should reply to the submission directly within 14 days if it relates to a matter that can be clarified by the secretariat or refer the matter to the CDM Accreditation Panel in the case of clarification to the Accreditation Standard or to the Board in the case of general policy matters. The clarifications provided by the CDM-AP shall be included in the CDM-AP report to the Board for its consideration;
- (c) Any responses be made available to all AEs/DOEs in a transparent manner.

Communication initiated by DNAs

43. It is proposed to put in place an interface similar to the DOE submissions interface for DNAs to submit their requests on non-case specific matters.

44. It is proposed to follow the same process and timelines than with AEs/DOEs for providing responses to DNAs submissions.

45. It is also proposed that a new functionality allowing confidential submissions from DNAs and confidential responses from the Board to be put in place.

46. It is proposed that submissions from DNAs through this interface to be done in English language.

Communication initiated by project participants and civil society

47. It is proposed as per the Board discussion at its fifty-ninth meeting, to change the name of “unsolicited submissions” to “representations”. The secretariat shall develop a specific template for such submissions to ensure they remain focused and understandable. This channel should mainly be used by project participants and civil society as the other stakeholders have dedicated communication channels.

48. This channel of communication should be focused on policy issues. Other mechanism for dealing with case specific issues will be proposed under the section related to case specific communication.

49. It is proposed that all letters received from stakeholders shall be responded to within four weeks after the Board meeting in which the letter was considered.



3. Means of response

50. The secretariat shall ensure that all such submissions are treated with priority and answered within the agreed timeframes. All responses provided shall be made available to the full stakeholder group, i.e. DOE/AIE and DNA submissions via the appropriate Extranet and other representations via the UNFCCC CDM website.

VI. Communication on case specific issues

1. Objectives

51. The objectives of such communications are:

- (a) To provide information on status of case specific submissions in order to ensure transparency of the processing;
- (b) To allow better understanding by stakeholders of issues raised in a case specific submissions;
- (c) To allow better understanding of stakeholders of the rational behind the Board's decisions on case submissions. It is however to be noted that it should not be used as a platform for contesting the Board's decisions. An appeal mechanism is being prepared for this purpose.

2. Means of communication

Disclosure of case specific submissions status

52. Many of the critics that the Board and secretariat are facing in case specific issues are related to a lack of communication on status of submissions in different processes.

53. Recognizing that for some processes where workflows and IT facilities are in place and related procedures have strict timelines such as the accreditation procedure and registration and issuance procedures, information on status of case submissions are already available. Nevertheless some other processes like status of methodologies related submissions require more transparency.

54. Therefore, and in accordance with the CMP request (decision 3/CMP.6, paragraph 17), it is proposed that status of all case specific submissions will be made available in the UNFCCC website including an indication of the next step and a tentative date of its performance in case the timelines are not specified in the procedures.

55. It is also proposed that the secretariat undertake an analysis of all existing procedures and identify steps of the processes where no clear timelines are provided and make a recommendation to the Board accordingly for the revision of the relevant procedures.

Communication with the Board and its support structures in case specific issues

56. The general principles in the establishment of these proposed modalities of communication with stakeholders on case specific issues are guided by decision 3/CMP6 paragraph 59 requesting the secretariat not to reject submissions because of minor editorial issues. It is also guided by the principle that when a decision is made that is not in favour of the request; the DOE/PP can initiate communication in order to clarify, if they wish, the issues raised.



57. The table below proposes stages of existing process, where communication can be initiated either by secretariat or by the relevant stakeholders. It defines only new means of communication that are not already part of the existing procedures. An exception to this is the accreditation process where the table only reflects the existing practices for the sake of completeness.

58. It is also proposed that issues resolved as a result of a communication initiated by secretariat and or a stakeholder on a project submission should be taken into consideration in the DOE performance monitoring.

59. To ensure the transparency of the process, it is proposed that a summary of the telephone call to be recorded as part of the project/methodology related documentation.

60. It is to be noted that only the focal point nominated through modalities of communication (MoC) by all project participants (through MoC form (F-CDM-MOC)) is allowed to initiate a communication with the secretariat on a case specific matter.

3. Means of response

61. As indicated in the table below the outcome of such communications will be documented and made available on the record of the submission. To support the overall efficiency of the system the secretariat will initiate communication prior to decision making where this is considered appropriate. The purpose of stakeholder led communication post decision making is to ensure mutual understanding of the decision, and does not provide a possibility to challenge a decision. Notwithstanding this the secretariat as an administrative authority does have a responsibility to ensure that errors made in the conduct of its duties are appropriately corrected when identified.



Process	Stage	Communication to be initiated by secretariat	Communication to be initiated by stakeholder
Registration/Issuance	Completeness-check	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ If a minor issue is raised, secretariat to send an email to the DOE copying the PP asking for the missing document and/or information▪ DOE/PP should have 36 hours to provide the missing/revised document/information/clarification▪ If nothing is received within this timeline, the submission to be kicked-out.	
	Information and reporting check	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ If a minor issue is raised, secretariat to send an email to the DOE copying the PP asking for the missing document and/or information▪ DOE/PP should have 36 hours to provide the missing document/information▪ If nothing received within this timeline, the submission to be kicked-out	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ If a request is kicked-out, the DOE/PP² may request through a dedicated email address: (xxxx@unfccc.int or xxxx@unfccc.int) a telephone call from the secretariat to ask for clarifications in case the issues raised are not sufficiently clear to them▪ DOE/PP shall provide contact detail of the person to be called with preferred time slots▪ Secretariat shall fix a call appointment within 72 hours▪ The call shall not be of more than 15 minutes▪ The call is to be focused on the issues raised and not provide DOE/PP any advice

² Only one request for a call shall be sent to the secretariat. The PP and DOE shall coordinate between themselves as only one opportunity will be provided



Process	Stage	Communication to be initiated by secretariat	Communication to be initiated by stakeholder
			<p>on how to address them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ A summary of the call shall be recorded by the secretariat in the project file.
	Request for review		<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ If a review is requested on a submission, the DOE/PP may request through a dedicated email address (xxxx@unfccc.int or xxxx@unfccc.int) a telephone call from the secretariat to ask for clarifications in case the issues raised are not sufficiently clear to them▪ DOE/PP shall provide contact detail of the person to be called with preferred time slots▪ Secretariat shall fix a call appointment within 72 hours▪ The call shall not be of more than 15 minutes▪ The call is to be focused on the issues raised and not provide DOE/PP any advice on how to address them.▪ A summary of the call shall be recorded by the secretariat in the project file.



Process	Stage	Communication to be initiated by secretariat	Communication to be initiated by stakeholder
Accreditation	All stages	The accreditation procedure already provides many opportunities to AEs/DOEs to respond to issues raised in assessment	A AE/DOE can at any stage of the process raise a complaint against the secretariat, the accreditation panel or the assessment team A DOE can at any stage during the assessment process initiate a dispute against the assessment team
			An AE/DOE can appeal to the Board against any recommendation of the CDM-AP
			A client of a DOE can raise a complaint on the DOE at any stage of the process. It is to be noted that the client of the DOE should not complain to the CDM-AP until all possibilities have been exhausted within the DOE system.
Submission and consideration of proposed new baseline and monitoring methodologies and tools	Completeness check stage	The procedure already stipulates that, secretariat, on behalf of the Meth panel may request PPs to provide any additional information or clarification at any stage of the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ PPs may request for a call from the secretariat, to ask clarification if the PNM is rejected▪ The requested call shall be accommodated within 72 hours▪ The PP may wish to, instead of a call to the secretariat send its requests for clarification via email. In such case the same deadline than for the tel. call apply.
	Assessment stage		<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ PPs may request for a call from the secretariat, to ask clarification when the



Process	Stage	Communication to be initiated by secretariat	Communication to be initiated by stakeholder
			<p>PNM is considered unqualified</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The requested call shall be accommodated within 72 hours▪ The PP may wish to, instead of a call to the secretariat send its requests for clarification via email. In such case the same deadline than for the tel. call apply.
	Preliminary recommendation stage		<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ PPs may request for a call from the secretariat when they need further explanations before submitting the requested clarifications▪ The requested call shall be accommodated within 72 hours▪ The PP may wish to, instead of a call to the secretariat send its requests for clarification via email. In such case the same deadline than for the tel. call apply.
	Draft reformatted methodology stage		<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ PPs may request for a call from the secretariat, to ask clarification when they need further clarifications before sending comments to the secretariat.▪ The requested call shall be accommodated within 72 hours <p>The PP may wish to, instead of a call to the secretariat send its requests for clarification</p>



Process	Stage	Communication to be initiated by secretariat	Communication to be initiated by stakeholder
			via email. In such case the same deadline than for the tel. call apply.
Submission and consideration of queries on approved methodologies and methodological tools	Consideration of a request for revision	Secretariat on/Meth panel shall inform the PPs of reason for rejecting a request for revision	
Requests to the Board on deviation from an approved methodology	Communication of the final decision		<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ If a request for deviation is rejected, the PP/DOE may request a call of no more than 15 min from the secretariat to further clarify the reasons for rejections.▪ The requested call shall be accommodated within 72 hours.▪ The DOE/PP may wish to, instead of a call to the secretariat send its requests for clarification via email. In such case the same deadline than for the tel. call apply.
Request for deviation prior to submitting a request for issuance			
Revision of monitoring plan			



VII. Establishment of formal communication channel with project participants

62. Some stakeholders such as DOEs and DNAs have a formal channel for communication with the Board that is the DOE/AIE coordination forum and the DNA forum respectively. These channels facilitate communication with these instances help providing the Board with views that express opinions of the majority of the DOEs/DNAs and constitute a single communication channel when some inputs are needed.

63. There is currently no such formal channel for project participants. Communications are now received from each individual project participants or some groups of project participants and expresses only views of those that have submitted them. The Board may wish to consider tow options to address this gap:

- (a) Establish a project participant forum supported directly by the secretariat;
- (b) Recognising existing organizations through means of placing conditions on their representations.

VIII. Expected outcome from the Board

64. The Board may wish to consider and provide further input and guidance on the means and modalities for enhancing communication with stakeholders that are presented in this concept note.

65. The Board may also wish to:

- (a) Agree to the objectives of this work and objectives different types of communication;
- (b) Agree to the scope of the areas of interactions;
- (c) Agree on further mechanisms for interactions with stakeholders;
- (d) Agree on a general principle that secretariat respond directly to stakeholders wherever possible. Only issues that require attention or further guidance of the Board or its panels and working group shall be brought for their consideration;
- (e) Agree on the proposed modalities and channels of communication within the registration, issuance and methodologies processes as proposed.

66. The Board may also wish to consider which areas of the stakeholders input that were not covered in this proposal to include in the draft procedures for direct communication with stakeholders.

67. The Board may wish to request the secretariat to draft a procedure for direct communication with stakeholders in line with this document and the outcome of the Board's discussions.

- - - - -

**Appendix 1: Summary of input of stakeholders**

Stakeholder	Summary of input
Eco - Ideal Consulting S/B	Proposal that direct communication shall be allowed for minor issues identified that can be resolved through a telephone call or an email exchange.
Common climate expert	This submission was mainly complaint about DOEs applying very conservative interpretations of requirements and guidelines in validation and verification and also about delay in validating and verifying project activities by DOEs especially at the technical review stage.
Project Developer Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Welcome the opportunity to give input;▪ Reminder of the CMP decision in Cancun▪ Proposal that modalities of communication should not be only on case specific issues in registration/issuance but also address the methodologies processes by inter alia:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Defining clear criteria for taking decisions on methodologies- Having clear timelines in the methodology processes and report on progress- Justification on how the workplan on top-down methodologies are defined and how the public input are taking into consideration▪ Request the Board to put in place procedures whereby the PP is automatically offered the opportunity of a telephone conversation with the secretariat in every situation where project documents are delayed or rejected. Similarly, the secretariat/RIT members shall have the opportunity to talk to DOEs/PPs during their assessments. The call can be automatically scheduled and offered to stakeholders in the existing notifications of CC/I&R rejections or Requests or Review. These communications are to be on the record.▪ Better planning of workshops including by communicating dates well in advance of the events, giving the opportunity to stakeholders to comment on the topics, providing clear description of the subject of the workshop and having clear outputs.▪ Communication with the secretariat not to be anonymous and disclosure of level of expertise of secretariat staff.▪ Putting in place a quality control system within the secretariat to ensure consistency in case handling.▪ Publishing the Board's response to unsolicited letters.▪ Providing summary of the comments received on the call for inputs along with the Board's assessment on them.▪ Better planning of calls for input not to overload stakeholders.
Beijing Wenhui Economic Consult Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Proposal that direct communication with the Board shall be project participants and groups of project participants and/or stakeholders who are involved in the issue object of the communication as the aim of the direct communication is to provide feedback directly to relevant project



	<p>participants and/or stakeholders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Proposal to establish two new forums: one for the ordinary project participants and stakeholders and the other for the specific project participants and/or specific and professional stakeholders interested by a specific issue.
DOE/AIE Coordination Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Welcome the initiative of the Board to initiate work on communication with stakeholders and state that a regular direct interaction is a key to enhance common understanding and efficiency within the CDM.▪ Suggestion of the measures below:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Provision of a dedicated email address: [project-id]-clarification@unfccc.int for urgent ad-hoc communication;- Introduction of obligatory phone calls with project participants, UNFCCC secretariat, RIT members and DOEs whenever questions on project-specific issues by reviewing teams may occur;- Establishment of a dedicated phone contact for DOEs which ensures real-time responses to inputs/calls independently which issue they refer;- Move from anonymous to a direct interaction with individuals in the secretariat.
Carbon Partners Asiatica	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Welcome the initiative of the Board as direct communication is a means of improving overall efficiency as well as transparency in the process;▪ Proposal that direct communication does not need to always be with the Board but could as effective with its support structures especially the secretariat;▪ Suggestions of the following that communication with stakeholders should be:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Compulsory prior to a request for review and prior to any recommendation in any process;- Speedy;- Be a dialogue and give the opportunity to the PP to respond at least 3 times;- All issues should be identified before the first communication and subsequent communications deals only with initial issues.
IETA	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Presentation of background of CMP decisions regarding communication with stakeholders;▪ Statement that communication can be direct and indirect and should address policy/general communication and case specific.▪ The objective for such communication is to draw attention to issues and for decision making.▪ Communication should be mandatory and discretionary.▪ Proposal that indirect communication should be done through a well organized and informative website, through clear explanation of decision-making procedures and through a clear and comprehensive



	<p>written decisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Proposal that direct communication on general policy issues and guidance should be through unsolicited communications, calls for input, direct interaction and through giving notice and comment and implementation periods.▪ Proposal that case specific communication should not add additional steps to the process and should be available at points of assessment in project cycle. It should follow the general principle that is if there is an issue to be resolved at some stage on the project or methodology assessment cycle, direct communication should be initiated within a clear time limit with limited exercise of discretion. It should also be transparent and on the record. In some cases direct communication on case specific could be initiated at the discretion of the EB or its support structures.
CDM Watch	<p>Welcome the opportunity to provide views to the Board. Submission focused on how to improve the public participation as a mean to improve direct communication with the Board. Proposal of the following actions to be taken by the Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Set-up email notification systems for registration, issuance and methodology processes as well as for all public participation procedures that depend on a certain period of time;▪ Further improve of the user-friendliness of the UNFCCC CDM website including the translation into all official UN working languages;▪ Make available essential documents of CDM projects (at least the PDD and the EIA) in the language(s) of the host country;▪ Make available hard copies of the translated PDD to affected communities;▪ Ensure that all supporting documents are uploaded prior to the start of the public commenting period ;▪ Allow submissions of comments in the language(s) of the host country;▪ Allow delayed submissions of comments if the delay is due to a reasonable justification▪ Increase the public commenting period for large projects;▪ Increase the public commenting period on new methodologies;▪ Introduce a mechanism where concerns about CDM projects can be submitted at any time.