

NINETH PROGRESS REPORT OF THE CDM ACCREDITATION PANEL (CDM-AP)

Nineteenth Meeting of the CDM-AP

11 – 12 November 2005

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction	3
II. Roster of Experts.....	3
III. Status of applications.....	3
IV. Indicative letters and recommendation for accreditation	3
V. Other recommendations	3
VI. Other outputs of the panel	4
VII. Key issues under consideration.....	5
 Annexes	
1. Regional distribution of team members	6
2. Status of application of AEs	7-8
3. Recommended text to be added for clarity to the provisions on “Phasing of accreditation (adopted at twenty first session of the Executive Board)”..	9

I. Introduction

1. This eighth progress report covers the period from 10 September 2005 to 11 November 2005. During this period the accreditation panel held only one meeting.

II. Roster of Experts

2. During this period three applications from experts were evaluated and included in the roster, as applicable. No cases are requiring action of the panel. In some cases, applicants have been requested to provide further information so that the assessment of their application can be completed.

3. Drawing on this roster, the panel, when establishing its teams, takes into consideration the issue of capacity building and regional balance in the assessment teams (ATs). The CDM-AP is enabling well performing team members to assume the role of team leader after successful participation in a number of CDM accreditation teams. So far three Non-Annex I and one Annex I expert benefited of this provision. For regional distribution of team leaders and team members please refer to the table in annex 1.

III. Status of applications

4. Since the twenty-first meeting of the Board, **one new application** for accreditation was received, which brings the total number of applications to thirty two (32). It should be noted that three of the 32 applicant entities have withdrawn their applications.

5. The **geographical distribution of the 29 applications** under consideration is as follows: Twelve are from Asia and Pacific region, 14 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. One AE is **addressing nonconformities** in accordance with the procedure for accreditation. The panel noted that if the AE is not addressing the non-conformities within the six month deadline provided for in the procedure for accreditation (paragraph 41.2) its application is automatically rejected. The panel informed the AE through the secretariat accordingly. For two entities the dates for the on-site assessment are agreed. For three entities the desk review work is being prepared and one entity are at the initial stage of launch of the ATs. For details on status of all applications please refer to the overview table in annex 2.

IV. Indicative letters and recommendation for accreditation

7. During this period the panel has issued to one indicative letter to “Conestoga Rovers & Associates Limited.(CRA)”.

8. The panel **considered cases for recommendations regarding phased accreditation for validation and verification** and its deliberation on this matter are presented to the Board under strict confidentiality.

V. Other recommendations

9. The panel recommends that the **provisions relating to the use of small-scale activities for the purpose of witnessing are to be included in the provisions for “Phasing of accreditation”** adopted by EB at its twenty first meeting (see Annex 1 of report of that meeting) in order to combine all relevant

information relating to the phasing for accreditation in one document. The recommended text to be added, which reflects current understanding, is contained in annex 3 of this report.

10. To **avoid potential and/or perception of DOEs providing consultancy services**, the panel noted that the Board may wish to consider the need for issuing guidance/clarification regarding the acceptable number of versions to be issued by project participants in response to issues raised by a DOE and criteria enabling a DOE to decide whether or not a PDD shall be made publicly available again. If the Board concludes that the need exists to issue such a guidance, it may wish to consider to involve the DOE/AE coordination forum in developing such guidance.

11. The Board may wish to consider to **clarify to DOEs** whether or not they have the **obligation to alert project participants at validation** (through the validation report) of aspects which may have to be changed after registration and/or after the first verification/certification, due to provisions in the approved methodology (e.g. the monitoring provisions).

12. Having been made aware both formally and informally that **promotional material(s) by some DOE/AEs contains factually wrong or misleading information**, the panel has requested **all DOE/AEs to check their promotional and information material** (including web sites and all language versions) and ensure accuracy of such material **by the twenty four meeting of the Board**. The panel recommends to the **Board to clarify** by that time whether grievances on such an issue are to be treated under the **provisions for “spotcheck”** or whether **an alternative procedure** and consequences shall be developed by the deadline above.

VI. Other outputs of the panel

13. The AP agreed that the Board may wish to consider the following as **modules of the coordination workshop** which is presently planned for February 2005:

- (a) A special module for assessment team members, incl. the meth. experts for witnessing, to exchange experiences with their assessment work and to identify options for improving
- (b) Homogeneity of the drafting of assessment results and reports to ensure that a reader understands reasons and evidence which led the drafter to a particular conclusion without copying/repeating supporting documents in detail
- (c) Non-conformities versus observations – how to develop and ensure homogeneity between teams, the panel and Board
- (d) Module involving AT members on how to conduct assessments
- (e) Brainstorming on process towards re-accreditation
- (f) Conditions under which an assessment can be aborted
- (g) Training requirements for new CDM-AT members
- (h) DOE/AE professional conduct – tools / with input from the DOE/AE CF
- (i) Presentation of the accreditation process to the whole workshop incl. Q&A
- (j) Presentation of revised accreditation related extranets of UNFCCC CDM Web site

VII. Key issues under consideration

14. The AP, in order to incorporate decisions and clarifications by the Board and also clarifications issued by the panel, requested the secretariat to prepare, for consideration at its twenty first meeting of the panel, a draft of **“Procedures for accrediting operational entities by the Executive Board of the CDM (Version 4)”** taking into account guidance and clarification provided since the adoption of Version 3 of this document including the “Phasing of accreditation”. It also requested that the set of forms for the accreditation process be revised and, if necessary, that draft versions be prepared for consideration at the same meeting. It noted with appreciation that a vacancy announcement for an additional post in support of the CDM accreditation unit of the secretariat has been issued (closing date end of November for detail please refer to the UNFCCC website). It also noted with appreciation that the hiring of additional resources in support of the CDM Executive Board are enabling the lead officer of this unit to be released of other duties.

15. Regarding preparations for the modalities of the **re- accreditation process**, the panel is expecting to prepare a first document at its second meeting in 2006 taking into consideration input received at the joint workshop.

16. Noting the resource constraints, the panel agreed to consider a draft of the **“Document control and record management procedures”**. The document will assist the panel and the CDM accreditation unit to ensure systematic management of the CDM accreditation documents and records.

Annex 1

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

Organisation	Leader	Member	Member
0001 JQA	ASP	WEO	AFR
0002 JACO CDM	ASP	ASP	ASP
0003 DNV Cert	ASP	WEO	AFR
0004 CHUO*	ASP	ASP	WEO
0005 TUV Sued	ASP	WEO	ASP
0006 TECO*	ASP	WEO	ASP
0007 JCI	ASP	ASP	ASP
0008 AZSA*	ASP	LAC	WEO
0009 BVQI*	AFR	ASP	WEO
0010 SGS	ASP	ASP	LAC
0011 KEMCO	WEO	ASP	WEO
0012 PWCC	WEO	ASP	WEO
0013 TUV Rhein.	WEO	WEO	AFR
0014 KPMG	WEO	WEO	AFR
0015 URS	WEO	ASP	WEO
0016 ERM-CVS	WEO	WEO	ASP
0017 Clouston Env.	WEO	ASP	ASP
0018 BSI UK*	AFR	ASP	LAC
0019 Nexant	WEO	ASP	LAC
0020 CRA	AFR	WEO	ASP
0021 AENOR	AFR	ASP	WEO
0022 RWTUV	AFR	WEO	WEO
0023 LRQA*	AFR	ASP	WEO
0024 ICONTEC	AFR	ASP	LAC
0025 KFQ	AFR	WEO	WEO
0026 TECPAR*	AFR	ASP	LAC
0027 SQS	ASP	ASP	WEO
0028 Shin Nihon	ASP	LAC	ASP
0029 PWC, SA	ASP	AFR	LAC
0030 NKK QA	ASP	ASP	WEO
0031 Perry Jhonsons	WEO	ASP	ASP
0032 LGAI Tech.	LAC	WEO	AFR

* The team composition for these cases has changed with regard to the previous report.

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 (23.02.05)
E-0003 / DNV Cert	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (1.12.03) Ie (04.02.05)	AC (24.03.04) AC (12.06.04) AC (08.06.05) AC (28.09.05)
E-0004 / CHUO	X	X	X	X	X	N	X	X	I (23.04.05)	
E-0005 / TUEV sued	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (01.12.03) Ie (04.02.05)	AC (12.06.04) AC (23.02.05) AC (28.09.05)
E-0006 / TECO	X	X	X	X	X	N	X	NP	I (01.12.03)	
E-0007 / JCI	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (26.07.04)	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 (15.03.04)	AC (08.07.05)
E-0010 / SGS	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (25.05.04) Ie (23.04.05)	AC (12.06.04) AC (23.02.05) AC (08.07.05) AC (28.09.05)
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 (25.05.04)	AC (11.05.05)
E-0014 / KPMG	X	X	X	X	X	N	X	WOI	I (04.02.05)	AC (08.07.05)
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	

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-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	X	NP	I (28.09.05)	
E-0021 / AENOR	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (04.02.05)	AC (11.05.05)
E-0022 / RWTUV	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (04.02.05)	AC (28.09.05)
E-0023 / LRQA	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (04.02.05)	
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	WOI	I (23.04.05)	
E-0026 / TECPAR	X	X	X	X	D	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	D	N	P			
E-0029 / PWC, SA	X	X	X	X	X	N	X			
E-0030 / NKK QA	X	X	X	X	D					
E-0031 / Perry Jhonsons	X	X	X	X						
E-0032 / LGAI Tech.	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

Recommended text to be added for clarity to the provisions on “Phasing of accreditation (adopted at twenty first session of the Executive Board)”

For sectoral scopes other than the scope 14 Afforestation and reforestation, an AE shall be witnessed on the basis of at least one large scale project activity for each function (validation, verification/certification) (hereafter referred to as criteria). As long as an AE has not fulfilled this criteria it shall receive accreditation only for the sectoral scope or function it is witnessed. With the fulfillment of the criteria, the AE is accredited for both functions for all the sectoral scopes it is accredited at this point in time. After the fulfillment of the criteria, the AE is accredited for both functions independent of whether the witnessing is based on a small-scale or large scale activity. A graphical example is provided below (“Case 3 ...”)

Case 3: Example of the application criteria regarding need for large scale activities

Group	1	2	3	4	5	6		A/R (*)
VER	S(1)	L(5)	L(5)	L(2)	L(7)	S(6)	...	Z
VAL	L(5)	S(4)	L(5)	S(3)	L(7)	S(6)	...	Z

Legend

S Witnessing of a small-scale

L Witnessing of a large scale

(1), (2) .. Indicates sequence of witnessing activities

Indicates an accreditation based on a witnessing activity indicated

Indicates an accreditation granted simultaneously with the witnessing activity indicated

VER Verification

VAL Validation

(*) A/R is treated separately and requires large scale witnessing

- - - - -