Annex 4
Workplans of CDM Panels

Work plan for the Methodologies Panel (Meth Panel)
(to be updated during the meetings in 2005 and 2006)

	Meth 16 **Date: 14/6/2005-18 /6/2005**	**Meth 17** **Date: 6/9/2005 - 9/9/2005**	**Meth 18** **Date: 17/10/2005 - 19/10/2005**	**Meth 19** **Date: 30/01/2006 - 03/02/2006**	**Meth 20** **Date: 27/03/2006 - 30/03/2006**	**Meth 21:** **Date: April 2006**
Total cases considered at meeting	36 cases	34 cases	# depending on below	# depending on below	# depending on below	# depending on below
New cases (max. number to be considered):	11 cases	10 cases from round 11	10 cases from round 12	10 cases from round 13	10 cases from round 14	10 cases from round 15
Preliminary cases:	6 cases	9 cases	# cases from Meth 17	# cases from Meth 18	# cases from Meth 19	# cases from Meth 20
B cases:	3 cases	EB 20 (potential 3 cases)	# cases from EB 21	# cases from EB 22	# cases from EB 23	# cases from EB 24
Other (e.g. consolidation underway):	9 cases	9 cases	# cases from Meth 17	# cases from Meth 18	# cases from Meth 19	# cases from Meth 20
Cases transferred from previous meeting:	7 cases	3 cases	# cases from Meth 17	# cases from Meth 18	# cases from Meth 19	# cases from Meth 20
Cases requiring further input before consideration:	3 cases	## cases	# cases from Meth 18	# cases from Meth 19	# cases from Meth 20	# cases from Meth 21
Cases to be consolidated:	4 consolidations (9 cases)	2 consolidations (9 cases)	Depending on submissions received	Depending on submissions received	Depending on submissions received	Depending on submissions received
Revision of AMs	3 cases	# cases as request from EB 20	# cases as request from EB 21	# cases as request from EB 22	# cases as request from EB 23	# cases as request from EB 24
Other issues to be considered:	12 issues	10 issues from Meth 16 and # as request from EB 20	# issues as request from EB 21 and Meth 17	# issues as request from EB 22 and Meth 18	# issues as request from EB 23 and Meth 19	# issues as request from EB 24 and Meth 20

Work of the CDM Methodologies Panel (Meth Panel)

Workload for first half 2005

- The average of days of work estimated per meeting period[1] is 191,5. This estimation is based on the work of the Panel from January 2005 until end of June 2005. The table below provides detailed information on the work.
- Taken into account that the Meth Panel will meet five times until April 2006, the estimation of work of the panel is approximately 957,5 days.
- As the estimation was based on 10 members that worked in the past, the number of days per meeting period is around 20 days (19,15). With a planning of around five meetings per year, this corresponds to 94 days per member per year, i.e. to will over 4 work months, not counting travel time.

	Days per case	**Cases per meeting period**	
NM	5 days	31 cases per meeting	**155** days per meeting spent on cases
AM (reformatting)	1 day	1.5 approved methodology	**1,5** days per meeting spent on
Consolidation	2 days	2 consolidations	**4** days spend per meeting
Other issues	3 days per issue	9 issues	**27** days spent on other issues per meeting
Meeting days	4 days		**4** days
Total			**191,5** days of work spent for meeting period

Estimates for mid 2005 - mid 2006 (12 months)

The workload of the Meth Panel can be estimated on two tiers. The first tier being based on the same amount of workload but with the increased panel membership (from 10 members to 15 members) and the second tier being based on the increase of the workload in proportion to the increase of the membership.

Tier 1: Same workload for the panel as a whole (less workload for individual members):

- 957,5 days of work for the Meth Panel (19 days per member per meeting period, five meetings);
- 191 days per meeting period (19 days per member per meeting period)
- 13 (12,8) days per member per meeting period (15 members).

[1] Meeting period includes also preparatory work for the meeting (e.g. consolidate inputs received, prepare draft recommendations, etc)

Tier 2: Increased workload for the panel as a whole (same workload for individual members):

- 1400 (1436,25) days of work for the Meth Panel (19 days per member per meeting period, five meetings);
- 290 (287,25) days per meeting period (19 days per member per meeting period);
- 19 days per member per meeting period (15 members).

Tentative workplan for the CDM Accreditation Panel mid 2005 to mid 2006

1. The Executive Board of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM-EB) launched the CDM accreditation process for the operational entities in August 2002. The Board established the CDM accreditation panel (CDM-AP) and invited interested entities to submit their applications for accreditation. Since then, a total of 30 applications for accreditation were received and dealt with by the CDM-AP. In accordance with the procedures, the CDM-AP had considered each new application, identified key issues to be considered by the CDM assessment team (CDM-AT) and established CDM-ATs for each application to carry out detailed assessment. The accreditation process of applicant entities requires witnessing to prove that of entities are capable of performing tasks required. Therefore, the accreditation of these entities depends upon:

   a. Availability of approved baseline and monitoring methodologies;

   b. Private sector willingness to apply available approved methodologies and to contract AEs to allow them to utilise project activities in the witnessing process.

2. The CDM-AP, in the period from mid 2004 to mid 2005, held five (5) meetings. In this period, the CDM-AP had accomplished the following tasks. The CDM-AP:

   a. Considered six (6) new applications, which were received in this period, while progressing with previously received applications;

   b. Issued indicative letters to fourteen (14) applicant entities (AEs) on their successful completion of desk review and the on-site assessment;

   c. Forwarded ten (10) recommendations for sector-specific phased accreditation for the consideration of the EB. The EB, on the basis of recommendations from the CDM-AP, accredited and provisionally designated eight (8) entities for sector-specific validation functions;

   d. Forwarded one recommendation for sector-specific phased accreditation for verification function to the EB. The EB will consider this request at its 20th meeting;

   e. Considered four (4) additional cases for phased accreditation for validation which were not forwarded to the Board on the basis of the recommendations from the CDM-ATs or deficiencies found in the assessment;

   f. Provided five progress reports on the work of the CDM-AP to the EB. These progress reports provided information on the work of the CDM-AP and also gave status of applications of AEs and DOEs;

   g. Forwarded a number of recommendations to the EB on policy and procedural issues. Most of these recommendations were adopted by the EB and were issued to provide guidance to various stakeholders;

   h. Issued a number of clarifications related to the accreditation process aimed to provide guidance and facilitate the process for the AEs and DOEs;

   i. Maintained a roster of experts to establish CDM-ATs. The roster contains over 60 experts. The CDM-ATs have been established by taking into consideration the regional balance;

j. The CDM-AP members participated in meetings, events and workshops as part of awareness raising and capacity building activities.

3. The CDM-AP considered, on average, three (3) cases related to issuance of indicative letters and three (3) cases for phased accreditation for validation in each of its meetings. As mentioned above, one case for phased accreditation for verification has been received and considered.

4. The CDM-AP had received, on average, ten new applications per year. The rate is expected to drop but few more applications over the next one year are foreseen. Taking into consideration the increase in new applications at and the number of witnessing activities required for the AEs to be accredited, as well as the need for further guidance on newly emerging issues, the work of the CDM-AP for the period mid 2005 to mid 2006 is expected to increase significantly.

5. Taking into consideration that majority of entities have already passed the stage of desk review and the on-site assessment and are now at the stage of witnessing activities to be accredited. Assuming that all these entities will manage to come forward with the required number of witnessing activities over the next one year. In this case the total number of witnessing activities required for the AEs to seek accreditation for validation functions will be approximately 90. This takes into consideration the current status of applications and the availability of approved methodologies related to sectoral scopes. Similarly, the total number of witnessing activities required for entities to seek accreditation for verification functions will be approximately 35. However, it may be noted that the number of witnessing cases for verification functions will depend on the number of CDM project activities being registered.

6. The work of the panel in the mid 2005 to mid 2006 is expected to increase as follows:

a. As mentioned, few more new applications are expected to be submitted. A couple of companies have already shown strong interests to submit their applications for accreditation. The panel will have to consider incoming new applications, identify particular issues to be considered by the CDM-AT and establish teams;

b. **Scenario 1:** The average number of cases for sector-specific phased accreditation for validation functions to be considered at each meeting is expected to increase to approximately eighteen (18).
Scenario 2: Considering the alternative scenario, i.e. only three quarters of the total required number of required witnessing activities are proposed by the AEs in this period, the average number of cases to be considered by the panel at each meeting will be approximately thirteen (13).

c. **Scenario 1:** The average number of cases for phased accreditation for verification functions to be considered at each panel meeting is expected to increase to approximately seven (7).

Scenario 2: Considering the alternative scenario, i.e. three quarters of the total number of required witnessing activities are proposed in this period, the average number of cases to be considered by the panel at each meeting will be approximately five (5).

d. Continuous consideration of progress of each application;

e. Consideration of policy and procedural issues and provision of guidance on newly emerging issues, such as re-accreditation, means to enhance the performance of DOEs, new proposed sectoral scopes etc.

f. Considering measures to enhance the performance of CDM-ATs and ensuring consistency and harmonisation in the assessment exercises;

g. Undertaking necessary revisions in the procedure and other related forms;

h. To carry out any spot-checks of the DOEs, if necessary.

7. The CDM-AP considers its resources to be augmented to undertake the expected increase in its workload. The CDM-AP had given priority to its functions to consider cases for phased accreditation and recommend to the EB so that as many as possible entities could be accredited. However, there is some pending work related to improving the quality of the work.

8. Depending on the increase in the amount of the work, the number of days of the panel meetings will have to be increased. The meeting of the CDM-AP is currently consisting of two days, which might have to be doubled.

9. The table 1 below provides a tentative workplan for the CDM-AP. It lists the expected new applications, cases for phased accreditation and policy and procedural issues, which are currently under consideration and/or expected to arise in future.

10. Second table provides an overview of costs associated with the accreditation process and fee received from the entities applying for accreditation. The major cost items, related to accreditation, are costs of the CDM-AP meetings and costs of desk review work undertaken by team leaders. Other costs related to on-site assessment, witnessing activities and spot-checks are borne by the AEs and DOEs directly based on the information provided by the secretariat.

11. The table includes the estimated costs for five meetings of the CDM-AP to be held in the period mid 2005 to mid 2006. It also includes the costs of desk reviews, which had already been completed, and also for the new AEs for which the desk reviews will be undertaken. At its current standing the accreditation process had generated revenues to sustain itself to a large extent. A small shortfall in the resources had been fulfilled from other sources.

12. The gap between the costs and revenues, in the period from mid 2005 to mid 2006, will depend upon the number of new applications. As it is difficult to estimate how many new applications will be received over this period, therefore the table does not include the amount of fees which is expected to be received from new AEs. However, keeping in view the previous trend, the certainty in the CDM due to the entry into force of Kyoto Protocol and also taking into consideration recent expressions of interests received by the secretariat, it is expected that seven new applications will be received. The total amount of fees from these new applications will not be sufficient for the accreditation process to be self-sustained. The shortfall in the resources will have to be complemented from other sources.

13. The last table shows the status of AEs and DOEs with respect to accreditation procedural stages.

Table 1
Tentative workplan for the CDM-AP
mid 2005 to mid 2006

	CDM-AP 17 Date: 18- 19 June 2005	CDM-AP 18 Date: 9 - 10 September 2005	CDM-AP 19 Date: 18 - 19 October 2005	CDM-AP 20 Date: Feb 2006	CDM-AP 21 Date: April 2006	CDM-AP 22 Date: June 2006
Applications						
New applications	2	2	2	1	1	1
Cases for issuance of indicative letters	1	2	1	2	2	2
Cases for phased accreditation - validation	3	10	20	20	20	20
Cases for phased accreditation - verification	1	2	5	7	10	10
Cases not considered at meeting	0					
Policy/procedural issues						
Revision of the procedure for accrediting operational entities by the EB						
Issues related to witnessing activities						
Measures to enhance the harmonization of outputs from the CDM-ATs						
Issues related to re-accreditation						
Issues related to sequencing of validation and verification functions						
Revision of forms, as required						
Handbook of the CDM accreditation process						
Document control and record management procedures.						

Table 2

CDM Accreditation Panel - An overview of costs and fee received

CDM-AP Meetings	Type of Work			Average costs per meeting (US$)	Fee for accreditation application
	Policy Issues	Procedural issues	New cases/ cases for accreditation		
CDM-AP 1	X	X		26,400*	
CDM-AP 2	X	X		26,400	
CDM-AP 3	X	X	X	26,400	
CDM-AP 4	X	X	X	26,400	
CDM-AP 5	X	X	X	26,400	
CDM-AP 6	X	X	X	26,400	
CDM-AP 7	X	X	X	26,400	
CDM-AP 8	X	X	X	26,400	
CDM-AP 9	X	X	X	26,400	
CDM-AP 10	X	X	X	26,400	
CDM-AP 11	X	X	X	26,400	
CDM-AP 12	X	X	X	26,400	
Subtotal				290,400	352,000
For the period mid 2004 to mid 2005					
CDM-AP 13	X	X	X	26,400	
CDM-AP 14	X	X	X	26,400	
CDM-AP 15	X	X	X	26,400	
CDM-AP 16	X	X	X	26,400	
CDM-AP 17	X	X	X	30,600	
Subtotal				136,200	82,500
Total				426,600	434,500
Expected workload and costs for the period mid 2005 to mid 2006					
CDM-AP 18	X	X	X	30,600	
CDM-AP 19	X	X	X	30,600	
CDM-AP 20	X	X	X	30,600	
CDM-AP 21	X	X	X	30,600	
CDM-AP 22	X	X	X	30,600	
Subtotal				153,000	
Total meeting costs				**579,600**	
Total costs for desk reviews				**24,000**	
Total amount of fee received					**434,500**
Total costs associated with the accreditation process				**603,600**	
Total accreditation cost vs fees received				**169,100**	

* The amount includes fee for the CDM-AP members for their participation in the panel meetings.

Annex

Status table of applicant entities and designated operational entities

Entity	Completeness check	Initial consideration	CDM-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 / DNVCert	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 CDM	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 UK Ltd.	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	CDM-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 / NKKKQA	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