Institutional framework for registries

Sacramento, California, 23 September 2015
United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change (UNFCCC) secretariat and registries

- Decision
- Annual report
- Conclusions
- National registries and ITL
- CDM Registry

Conference of the Parties (COP) / Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP)

Bureau
- Permanent subsidiary bodies
- Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA)
- Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI)

Convention bodies
- The Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP)
- Adaptation Committee (AC)
- Standing Committee on Finance (SCF)
- Executive Committee of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage

Kyoto Protocol bodies
- Compliance Committee
- Executive Board of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM-EB)
- Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (JISC)
- Adaptation Fund Board (AFB)

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)
Organizational structure and key decisions

Decision 24/CP.8
- General design requirements
- DES
- Functional specifications
- RSA Forum

Decision 16/CP.10
- Common operational procedures
- Public information
- Cooperation arrangements

Decision 13/CMP.1
- Main accounting decision

Decision 14/CMP.1
- Annual accounting reporting format
Challenges (1)

- **Mission critical system**
  - Complex business rules (non-permanence...)
  - Stringent performance, availability and security requirements

- **Mitigation measures**
  - Keep it simple
  - Use (highly) skilled staff
  - Apply industry standards and best practices (ISO-27000, ISO-9000, ITIL, PM methodology, SSL, VPN, SOAP, etc.)
  - Do not venture in fancy technologies
  - Stick to the Needs-Requirements-Analysis-Design-Implementation-Testing chain
  - Zero known bugs policy, **including on results of annual security tests**
  - Ensure effective collaboration (one team) between the „business“ and „IT“
  - Validate legal understanding
Challenges (2)

- **Liability ... Mitigation ?!**
  - Transfer risk to third parties
  - Insurance

- **Staff training / retention**
  - It can take several months or even more than a year before staff becomes effective
  
  **Mitigation**
  - Establish procedures for all key processes
  - Keep all *necessary and sufficient* documentation up-to-date

- **Vendor dependence**
  - Establish procedures for all key processes
  - Document

- **Sufficient and predictable funding**
  - Establish and maintain business model
  - Distinguish direct vs indirect, divisible vs indivisible costs
  - Report transparently
  - Anticipate! Forecast 2-3 years in advance, and keep an eye on the long-term
Maintaining costs under control

- Establish and maintain „Lean“ procedures
- Balance staff vs contractors
- Investigate the possibility to make use of interns, etc.
- Understand fix vs variable cost items (service desk)
- Competitive tendering
- Consolidate activities
- Careful forecast

*ITL Budget 2008-2017*
- Methodology for the collection of fees versus budget
- What to do in case of:
  - Non-payment
  - New entrant
  - (Temporarily) Disconnected user
- Minimize administrative overhead
- Proportional
- Transparent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Scale of Fees (per cent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>2.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>0.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>2.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>16.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>15.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>0.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>0.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>0.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>9.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>14.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liechtenstein</td>
<td>0.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>0.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>0.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>3.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>0.961</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suggestions for a legal framework

- **Fix the scope** of the framework **realistically**
  - Maybe it is not possible or desirable to address all issues?
  - What is the core that is strictly needed to get started?

- **Think in terms of processes**
  - What processes are required?
  - What are the actors, what timeframes are bound to each process?

- **Think in terms of information**
  - What information is needed to sustain each process?
  - Is the information public?

- **Implement while drafting** the framework
  - Perform detailed analysis and design
  - Get feedback from the implementer(s)
  - Amend as necessary
  - Finalize when the implementation is robust
Thank you!

Questions?