

Nuske, Alexandra

Von: CDM Info <CDM-Info@unfccc.int>
Gesendet: Mittwoch, 6. März 2019 11:55
An: Nuske, Alexandra
Betreff: RE: Clarification about PRCs of A/R projects

Dear Alexandra,

Thank you for your query.

There is no change in the common practice. We apologize for the inconvenience in case of Kachung Project. No revised PDD is necessary for A/R PRC requests. We are consistently applying this to all other DOEs/PPs.

Thank you for highlighting the inconsistency in forms and interface. We take note of this and will address the inconsistency in the next revision of the forms.

Regards,

Your CDM Team

----- Original Message -----

From: CDM InfoSystem
Received: 2/28/2019 12:14 PM
To: CDM Info; CDM-Info
Subject: Clarification about PRCs of A/R projects

This is to inform you that user (CDM Designated Operational Entity (DOE)) (anuske@tuev-nord.de) has sent a message and requested to alert you on its arrival.

The message is addressed to: To UNFCCC Secretariat

First name: Alexandra
Last name: Nuske
City: Hannover

Country: Germany

Message body follows:

Dear UNFCCC Secretariat,

TÜV NORD would like to request clarification on the following issue:

Up until 2018 it was common practice and UNFCCC/DOEs understanding that for the submission of PRCs for A/R specific type of changes, no revised PDD is necessary to be uploaded.

The history of this was 1. Intensive discussions in 2011/2012 and workshops about how to deal with changes in A/R projects (they are forest specific as nature can change issues on the project ground anytime without PPs influence) 2. Based on the result of those discussions of A/R specific type of changes were implemented in the procedures by UNFCCC , 3. The acceptance and confirmation via e-mail (see attachment) that for A/R specific type of changes no revised PPD is required.

Since 2018 it seems that UNFCCC changed their mind and requests revised PDDs to be submitted (Ref. Kachung Project No.4653) , which means an unreasonably extra work for the PPs as those initial PDDs and A/R Methodologies had more than 100 parameters in the monitoring plan, which are now reduced to a hand full of

parameters. All this was a learning process for all involved parties that forest projects are different to other CDM projects and thus need different handling. To adopt the type of changes means nowadays to write a complete new PDD.

Further it seems this issue is still not handled consistently among DOEs/PPs, which is just not fair looking at the extra work and cost implied by such a request.

Last, we are also wondering why in the MR form the chapter for A/R specific types of changes has been deleted as well as in the uploading interface when doing RfI, but in the PRC form 2.0 it is still there. The overall picture of how A/R specific types of changes are handled is just not consistent und understandable.

We would highly appreciate if the Secretariat could once again rethink on that issue to help A/R projects will have a chance to be verified in future without facing unacceptable extra cost and extra work for DOEs and PP.

We are looking forward to your response.

With kind regards
Alexandra Nuske

--

CDM WEB ALERT