
Enhance standardisation to up-scaling the scope of the CDM

CDM reform category: 3. Up-scaling the scope of the CDM

CDM reform sub-category: a. Establish and promote standardized, multi-project baselines.
b. Establish and promote positive lists of criteria for determining the upfront eligibility and additionality of project activities.)

Examples: Water purification technology Solvatten

- Everyone wants projects from Africa and everyone says “Let’s develop standardized baselines!” as if we had not had that idea already 10 years ago (read Bosi’s and Ellis’ studies from IEA on this topic, they date from 2000). There exists a simple water purification technology that could prevent women in countries such as Kenya and Nepal from harvesting non-renewable wood, carrying the heavy burden for many kilometres, burning it on inefficient three-stone stoves and thus endangering their whole families’ respiratory health.
 - AMS-I.E. is the methodology developed upon CMP’s demand, for projects avoiding the use of non-renewable wood. However, it has been made clear by several meth panel, small-scale panel and EB members on an informal basis that the concept of non-renewability is so disputed by certain EB members (thereby setting themselves above the CMP’s will and decision) that the project participants consider it a waste of time investing in appropriate survey methods, as claimed by the methodology, to prove that the country in question has experienced a deforestation since 1989 (very difficult to prove with survey methods).
 - Further, AMS-I.E. does not contain guidance for PoAs although the CMP clearly wanted such methodologies to be applicable under PoA, also for innerpolitical reasons.
 - Further, when asked at a conference whether unmet demand can be claimed stating that every person should have the right to 15 lts of water with drinking quality per day, the EB member in question said “you are trying to claim credits for something that did not happen in the baseline i.e. these people use less drinking quality water”. Unmet demand is an UN accepted concept (see the Medium Development Goals), it is the very basis of the CDM’s second goal i.e. to support non-Annex I countries in their sustainable DEVELOPMENT. Otherwise, the EB might just as well say “please stay poor, less GHG/capita to worry about, that is really what we mean with *sustainable*”.
 - Finally, when asked to confirm the standardized baseline for cook stove efficiency as maximum 6% to ease the use of AMS-I.E. the EB member said that they did not have the capacity and mandate to do that. How come a regulatory body sitting on 27 million US\$ (see Annex 52 of the 50th EB meeting) does not have the funding to do what everyone is asking for: further the development of standardized baselines for LDCs.
-

Impact:

- It is a waste of the project developers' time if new methodologies are effectively dead -born due to politicking.

Improvement recommendation:

- Use the budget to professionalize the regulatory body i.e. 100% mandate for the whole EB to avoid conflict of interest and politicking
 - Use the budget to commission independent studies from for example the WB, WHO, OECD, IEA, TERI, universities etc. to develop standardized baselines and positive lists.
-