

**SEVENTH PROGRESS REPORT OF THE CDM ACCREDITATION PANEL (CDM-AP)**

Seventeenth Meeting of the CDM-AP

18 – 19 June 2005

I. INTRODUCTION	2
II. ROSTER OF EXPERTS	2
III. STATUS OF APPLICATIONS	2
IV. INDICATIVE LETTERS AND RECOMMENDATION FOR ACCREDITATION	2
V. OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS	3
VI. OTHER OUTPUTS OF THE PANEL	3
VII. ISSUES UNDER CONSIDERATION	3

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. This seventh progress report covers the period from 24 April 2005 to 19 June 2005. During this period the accreditation panel held one meeting.

## II. ROSTER OF EXPERTS

2. During this period five new applications had been received (two from the Asia and Pacific Region and three from the Western Europe and Other Region). The panel had evaluated three applications as eligible and for two applications information was not found complete.

3. The panel when establishing its teams continues to take into consideration the issue of capacity building and regional balance in the assessment teams (ATs). The CDM-AP is also continuously paying attention to means to further enhance the competence of the ATs and take appropriate action as necessary. For regional distribution of team leaders and team members please refer to the table in annex 1.

## III. STATUS OF APPLICATIONS

4. Since the nineteenth meeting of the Board, **one new application** for accreditation was received, which brings the total number of applications to thirty (30). It should be noted that three of the 30 applicant entities have withdrawn their applications.

5. The **geographical distribution of the 27 applications** under consideration is as follows: Eleven are from Asia and Pacific region, 13 from Western Europe and Other region, two from Latin America and Caribbean region and one from African region. Three applicants from the Asia and Pacific region, two from Latin America and Caribbean region and one from the African region are from Non-Annex I Parties (Republic of Korea (2), Malaysia, Columbia, Brazil and South Africa). Thus a total of six applications are from Non-Annex I Parties.

6. During the period covered by this report, one applicant entity have successfully passed the **desk review and on-site assessment stage**. For this applicant entity, the panel issued the indicative letter (see section IV).

7. One AE is **addressing nonconformities** in accordance with the procedure for accreditation. For one entity the date for the on-site assessment is being agreed. One of the new entities had been requested by the panel to submit revised application documentation. For details on status of all applications please refer to the overview table in annex 2.

## IV. INDICATIVE LETTERS AND RECOMMENDATION FOR ACCREDITATION

8. The panel at its seventeenth meeting agreed to issue **indicative letter** to the following entity;

- E-0024 Columbian Institute for Technical Standards and Certification (ICONTEC).

9. Issuance of indicative letter to this entity indicates that the AE has successfully completed the desk review and on-site assessment.

10. The Board will be able to consult the reference file for this applicant entity during its next meeting.

11. The panel **considered three cases for recommendation regarding phased accreditation for validation and one case for recommendation regarding phased accreditation for verification**. The panels deliberation on this matter are presented to the Board under strict confidentiality.

## V. OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

12. The CDM Executive Board (EB), at its nineteenth meeting, requested the chair of the CDM accreditation panel (CDM-AP) to consult on the feasibility of an entity applying solely for the function of verification/certification, bearing in mind the discussion of the Board, and prepare an input for consideration at EB20. The Chair invited the panel to consider this issue and provide an input. The panel agreed to submit to the Board a recommendation for phasing of accreditation contained in annex 3 to this report.

## VI. OTHER OUTPUTS OF THE PANEL

13. There are no other outputs from the panel from the seventeenth meeting.

## VII. KEY ISSUES UNDER CONSIDERATION

14. The panel, in order to incorporate decisions and clarifications by the Board and also clarifications issued by the panel, continues to **revise the “procedures for accrediting operational entities by the Executive Board of the CDM”**. It decided to consider issuing a new version after a decision has been made regarding the recommendation on phasing of accreditation referred to above.

15. The panel, with increasing experience, is continuously working on measures to enhance the harmonization of outputs from the CDM- ATs. It will consider draft **guidelines for preliminary and final reports to guide team leaders** at its next meeting.

16. The panel agreed that it is important to start considering focus and modalities of the re-accreditation process and requested the secretariat to invite the DOE/AE coordination forum to provide, through its chair, input on this subject.

17. The panel is considering themes to be discussed at and modalities of **the next joint coordinating workshop**, such as: re-accreditation, aborting of the assessment, focused session for CDM-AT members, training requirements for new CDM-AT members, DOE/AE focused session, etc. The panel agreed to invite the DOE/AE coordination forum to provide, through its chair, input on issues for discussion as well as on identified themes.

18. To ensure systematic management of the CDM accreditation documents and records, the panel, with the assistance of the secretariat, is developing **“document control and record management procedures”**.

## Annex 1

**Table: Regional distribution of team members***(in bold character members from Non-Annex I Parties)*

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Leader</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Member</b>
0001 JQA	ASP	WEO	<b>AFR</b>
0002 JACO CDM	ASP	<b>ASP</b>	ASP
0003 DNVCert	ASP	WEO	<b>AFR</b>
0004 CHUO*	<b>ASP</b>	ASP	WEO
0005 TUV Sued	ASP	WEO	<b>ASP</b>
0006 TECO*	<b>ASP</b>	WEO	ASP
0007 JCI	ASP	ASP	<b>ASP</b>
0008 AZSA*	<b>ASP</b>	<b>LAC</b>	WEO
0009 BVQI*	<b>AFR</b>	<b>ASP</b>	WEO
0010 SGS	ASP	<b>ASP</b>	<b>LAC</b>
0011 KEMCO	WEO	<b>ASP</b>	WEO
0012 PWCC	WEO	<b>ASP</b>	WEO
0013 TUV Rhein.	WEO	WEO	<b>AFR</b>
0014 KPMG	WEO	WEO	<b>AFR</b>
0015 URS	WEO	<b>ASP</b>	WEO
0016 ERM-CVS	WEO	WEO	<b>ASP</b>
0017 Clouston Env.	WEO	<b>ASP</b>	ASP
0018 BSI UK*	<b>AFR</b>	<b>ASP</b>	<b>LAC</b>
0019 Nexant	WEO	<b>ASP</b>	<b>LAC</b>
0020 CRA	<b>AFR</b>	WEO	<b>ASP</b>
0021 AENOR	<b>AFR</b>	ASP	WEO
0022 RWTUV	<b>AFR</b>	WEO	WEO
0023 LRQA*	<b>AFR</b>	<b>ASP</b>	WEO
0024 ICONTEC	<b>AFR</b>	ASP	<b>LAC</b>
0025 KFQ	<b>AFR</b>	WEO	WEO
0026 TECPAR	<b>AFR</b>	ASP	<b>LAC</b>
0027 SQS	<b>ASP</b>	<b>ASP</b>	WEO
0028 Shin Nihon	<b>ASP</b>	<b>LAC</b>	ASP
0029 PWC, SA	<b>ASP</b>	<b>AFR</b>	<b>LAC</b>
0030 NKK QA	<b>ASP</b>	ASP	WEO

\* The team composition for these cases had changed due to appointment of one of the team leader as the member of the panel. The panel replaced the members with other members from the roster.

## Annex 2

Table: Status of application of AEs

Entity	Completeness check	Initial consideration	CD M-AT	Work plan	Desk review	Add. Docs	On-site assessment	Witnessing activities	Indicative letter	Phased Accreditation and provisional designation
E-0001 / JQA	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOP	I (1.12.03)	AC (24.03.04) AC (11.05.05)
E-0002 / JACO CDM	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOP	I (4.2.05)	AC (23.2.05)
E-0003 / DNV Cert	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (1.12.03) Ie (4.2.05)	AC (24.03.04) AC (12.06.04) AC (08.06.05)
E-0004 / CHUO	X	X	X	X	X	N	X	NP	I (23.04.05)	
E-0005 / TUEV sued	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (1.12.03) Ie (4.2.05)	AC (12.06.04) AC (23.2.05)
E-0006 / TECO	X	X	X	X	X	N	X	NP	I (1.12.03)	
E-0007 / JCI	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (26.7.04)	AC (11.05.05)
E-0008 / AZSA Sustainability Co.	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	NP	I (13.11.04)	
E-0009 / BVQI	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (15.3.04)	
E-0010 / SGS	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (25.5.04) Ie (23.4.05)	AC (12.06.04) AC (23.2.05)
E-0011 / KEMCO	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (13.11.04)	
E-0013 / TUEV Rhein	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOP	I (25.5.04)	AC (11.05.05)
E-0014 / KPMG	X	X	X	X	X	N	X	WOI	I (4.2.05)	
E-0015 / URS	Application Withdrawn									
E-0016 / ERM	X	X	X	X	D	N	Xnc	NP	N/A	
E-0017 / Clouston*	X	X	X	X	RD	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
E-0018 / BSI	X	X	X	X	X	N	X	NP	I (23.04.05)	
E-0019 / Nexant	Application Withdrawn									
E-0020 / CRA	X	X	X	X	D	PR	P	N/A	N/A	
E-0021 / AENOR	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (4.2.05)	AC (11.05.05)
E-0022 / RWTUV	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (4.2.05)	

Entity	Completeness check	Initial consideration	CD M-AT	Work plan	Desk review	Add. Docs	On-site assessment	Witnessing activities	Indicative letter	Phased Accreditation and provisional designation
E-0023 / LRQA	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	N/P	I (4.2.05)	
E-0024 / ICONTEC	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	NP	I (19.06.05)	
E-0025 / KFQ	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	NP	I (23.04.05)	
E-0026 / TECPAR	X	X	X	X	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
E-0027 / SQS	PX	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
E-0028 / Shin Nihon	X	X	X	X						
E-0029 / PWC, SA	X	X	X	X						
E-0030 / NKK QA	X	X	X	X						

*Note: E-0012 / PWC C, E-0015 URS Corporation and E-0020 Nexant withdrew their applications*

*\* The entity has not submitted adequate documentation at the desk review stage as requested by the panel.*

**Legend:**

**X**=stage completed

**PX**= partly completed

**N/A**= stage not yet reached

**PR**=provided

**NP**=not provided

**N**=not requested

**D**=Drafting

**P**=Planned

**DC**=Dates confirmed

**RD**=Requested Delay

**WOI**= Witnessing opportunities identified by AT

**WOP**=Witnessing opportunities proposed by AE

**WOIa**= WOI identified for all sectoral scope(s) applied for

**WOPa**= WOP identified for all sectoral scope(s) applied for

**I (date)** =Issuing date

**Ie (date)**=Issuing date for scope extension

**AC (date)** = Accredited and provisionally designated

**Xnc**=AE addresses non conformities

### Annex 3

#### RECOMMENDATION BY THE CDM ACCREDITATION PANEL

#### TO THE CDM EXECUTIVE BOARD:

#### PHASING OF ACCREDITATION

#### Background

1. The CDM Executive Board (EB), at its nineteenth meeting, requested the chair of the CDM accreditation panel (CDM-AP) to consult on the feasibility of an entity applying solely for the function of verification/certification, bearing in mind the discussion of the Board, and prepare an input for consideration at EB20.
2. The Chair of the CDM-AP invited the panel to discuss the issue and provide him with input. After its deliberation on the issue, the panel agreed with the Chair to forward the below recommendation to the Board. The panel concluded that the basic substantive knowledge is very similar for both functions and recommends to determine the phasing of accreditation by function as proposed below.
3. The recommendation is made with the following premises:
  - (a) The basic knowledge/skill set is essentially the same for validation and verification.
  - (b) The application by DOE, desk review and on-site assessment cover both functions
  - (c) Witnessing opportunities for witnessing groups can be presented at any time for either one of the two functions (validation or verification)

#### Recommendation

4. Once the AE is accredited for one function (e.g. verification) for sectoral scope(s) in a sectoral group<sup>1</sup> (group 1), the AE will receive accreditation in the other function (e.g. validation) for that same group (group 1) once it is accredited for other function (e.g. validation) in either the same (group 1) or another group (group 2).
5. If the accreditation for the other function (i.e. validation) referred to in para 1 above, is in another group (group 2), the AE is accredited at the same time for the function (e.g. verification) in that other group (group 2).
6. Once the AE is accredited for both functions, the AE will always be accredited for both functions in the remainder of the group(s) to be witnessed on the basis of a witnessed activity in either validation or verification.
7. All groups applied for have to be witnessed at least once in either of the two functions.
8. The approach specified in para 1 to 4 above does not apply to A/R, where both functions need to be witnessed.

./..

---

<sup>1</sup> To ease the understanding and reading, “for sectoral scope(s) within in a witnessing group” is referred to as “for a group”.

9. Graphical presentation of examples of phasing in the two cases referred to in paragraph 4 and 5:


*Case where witnessing of other function is proposed in the same group*

	1	2	3	4	5	...	A/R
<b>VER</b>	a	c	e	D	...	...	z
<b>VAL</b>	b	c	e	D	...	...	z

*Case where witnessing of other function is proposed in another group*

	1	2	3	4	5	...	A/R
<b>VER</b>	a	b	c	d	...	...	z
<b>VAL</b>	b	b	c	d	...	...	z

Legend

 indicates an accreditation based on a witnessing activity

a,b,c... indicates sequence of witnessing activities

 indicates an accreditation granted simultaneously

VER Verification

VAL Validation

-----