

REPORT OF THE CDM ACCREDITATION PANEL (CDM-AP)

Fifty-fourth meeting of the CDM-AP

3 - 6 May 2011

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
I. INTRODUCTION	2
II. STATUS OF APPLICATIONS	2
III. CASE SPECIFIC ISSUES	2
IV. UPDATE ON WORK OF THE CDM-AP	2
V. EXPERT RESOURCES	3
VI. FURTHER SCHEDULE OF THE CDM-AP	3
ANNEX 1 - RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION	
ANNEX 2 - DOE ANNUAL ACTIVITY REPORT FORM (F-CDM-AAR)	

I. Introduction

1. This report of the CDM Accreditation Panel (CDM-AP) covers the period from 18 March 2011 to 6 May 2011, including its fifty-fourth meeting (3-6 May 2011).

II. Status of applications

2. The total number of entities currently under consideration by the CDM-AP is forty four (44), including thirty nine (39) designated operational entities (DOEs)¹ and five (5) applicant entities (AEs). So far, a total of ten (10) entities have withdrawn their applications, accreditation of one (1) entity has expired and three (3) applications have been rejected by the Executive Board of the Clean Development Mechanism (Board).

3. In terms of geographical distribution, out of the forty four (44) entities currently under consideration, the highest number of entities, twenty six (26), are from the Asia and Pacific region, followed by fifteen (15) from the Western Europe and Other regions. One (1) entity is from Africa and two (2) from the Latin America and Caribbean region.

4. A total of eighteen (18) entities are from non-Annex I Parties, including fifteen (15) entities from the Asia and Pacific region, one (1) from Africa and two (2) from the Latin America and Caribbean region. With respect to individual countries, five (5) are from the Republic of Korea, five (5) entities are from China, three (3) from India, one (1) from Thailand, one (1) from Brazil, one (1) from Colombia, one (1) from Malaysia and one (1) from South Africa.

III. Case specific issues

5. The CDM-AP considered the final report on one (1) initial accreditation assessment and on one (1) application for extension of accreditation scope. One (1) recommendation will be submitted for consideration by the Board under confidentiality.

6. The CDM-AP also considered the final reports on thirteen (13) regular on-site surveillances of central offices and non-central sites. Notifications on six (6) cases will be submitted for consideration by the Board under confidentiality. In seven (7) cases the entity was requested to implement further corrective actions.

7. The CDM-AP further considered the final reports on ten (10) performance assessments. Notifications on eight (8) cases will be submitted for consideration by the Board under confidentiality. In two (2) cases the entities were requested to implement further corrective actions.

8. Finally, the CDM-AP considered two (2) notifications on changes.

IV. Update on work of the CDM-AP

9. The CDM-AP, at its previous meeting, invited the DOE/AIE Coordination Forum for a direct interaction to discuss the claimed scarcity of qualified personnel in complex technical areas. Following the invitation, the chair of the DOE/AIE Coordination Forum, Mr. Betzenbichler, made a presentation to the CDM-AP on the scarcity of DOE resources and on other issues raised by DOEs. The CDM-AP took note of the report and thanked Mr. Betzenbichler for a useful input into its further discussions.

¹ Includes entities accredited and provisionally designated by the Board.

10. The CDM-AP discussed possible options to address the concern raised by the DOE/AIE Coordination Forum on the scarcity of personnel available to DOEs to work on projects in complex technical areas. The CDM-AP discussed means of addressing this problem in the short-term, including an option of a "grandfathering" scheme of qualification. In parallel, the CDM-AP requested the secretariat to conduct a deeper review of the problem through an analysis of the requests for clarifications, non-conformities raised in the assessments and other information related to sufficiency of resources in complex technical areas.

11. The CDM-AP also considered a number of requests for clarifications submitted by DOEs and other stakeholders on the accreditation standard. The responses to the individual requests are contained in annex 1 to this report, in accordance with the decision of the Board at its fifty-ninth meeting.

12. The CDM-AP considered a request of the Board to elaborate the process of handling notifications of change, inter alia the cases of transfer of the central office of a DOE to another legal entity. The CDM-AP agreed to address the issue at the next revision of the CDM accreditation procedure and submit it for consideration by the Board at its future meeting.

13. The CDM-AP agreed to recommend to the Board to introduce an independent technical review by the secretariat of the reports prepared by the CDM assessment teams. The technical review should be conducted prior to consideration of the reports by the CDM-AP.

14. The CDM-AP agreed on a draft form for Annual activity reports to be submitted by DOEs to the Board. The form elaborates the requirements for the annual reports, contained in annex C of the CDM accreditation procedure, and ensures consistent reporting of the data by DOEs. The form is contained in annex 2 to this report for consideration by the Board.

15. The CDM-AP also considered the purpose, modalities and number of performance assessments to be undertaken for each DOE. The CDM-AP agreed to continue its work on this issue at its next meeting.

16. The CDM-AP considered a regular report by the secretariat on the implementation of the version 2.0 of the "CDM accreditation standard for operational entities" (accreditation standard), which became effective on 17 March 2011.

V. Expert Resources

17. The CDM-AP considered a regular report by the secretariat on the status and performance of internal and external assessment resources.

18. The CDM-AP approved revised terms of reference of CDM assessment teams, including qualification criteria for team members. The document will be used to qualify new applicants and existing experts on the accreditation roster of experts.

19. The CDM-AP discussed outcomes of the interaction session with the assessment team leaders and preparations for the next training session for the assessment team members, planned for 10-11 May 2011.

VI. Further schedule of the CDM-AP

20. The Board may wish to note that the fifty-fifth meeting of the CDM-AP is scheduled for 20 - 23 June 2011.

ANNEX 1

Responses to requests for clarification



Response form for requests for clarification on accreditation-related documents

F-CDM-Acc_CLA number:

F-CDM-Acc_CLA_006_v2

Document and version against which clarification is sought:

CDM Accreditation Standard v2.0

Text of the query:

The [author of the query] would kindly like to ask for clarification of the paragraph 166 f) of the Accreditation Standard:

“The DOE shall not use personnel who have been involved in, or have had relationships with the CDM PPs of, a CDM project activity under validation and/or verification/certification in any way within the last two years, to take part in validation and/or verification/certification work for the CDM project activity. If the person in question was involved in the development of a CDM project activity under validation and/or verification/certification, then the DOE shall not use such person at all;”

In particular [the DOE] is seeking clarification of the following terms/sections:

- Which position does the term “personnel” include? DOE personnel such as admin staff, auditors, experts, reviewer, approver, external experts, etc.?
- What is the exact meaning of the section “...involved in, or have had relationships with the CDM PPs of, a CDM project activity under validation and/or verification/certification in any way within the last two years...”?
- Does the wording “involved in” include tasks conducted within a DOE (e.g. preparation of proposals, assessments, etc.)?
- Does the term “relationships with a CDM PP” include DOE’s contract for a validation/verification with a PP and past engagement of auditors with that PP? As a consequence this would mean that the DOE personnel is limited to conduct only one validation or verification for the same client or involved PP within two years. And can subsequent verifications or SSC validations and the following verification(s) be conducted by the same auditor?
- Does the term “CDM PP” refer to and is accordance to the definition of the PDD guidance, i.e. this section of the Accreditation Standard is only applicable to parties named in Annex 1 of a PDD and paragraph 82 b of the Standard?

Answer from CDM-AP to authors of request for clarification:

- *Which position does the term “personnel” include?*

>> Personnel: persons working for or on behalf of the DOE.

DOE personnel such as admin staff, auditors, experts, reviewer, approver, external experts, etc.?

>> Any personnel who are proposed to take part in validation or verification/certification activities for the CDM project activity have to be included in the conflict of interest analysis.

- *What is the exact meaning of the section “...involved in, or have had relationships with the CDM PPs of, a CDM project activity under validation and/or verification/certification in any way within the last two years...”?*

>> It is understood that not all relationships present a risk to the DOE. Any relationship has to be seen in the context of conflict of interest and if the relationship poses a threat to impartiality. Relationship may be referred to as any situation that may present the personnel and/or the DOE with a conflict of interest. Footnote 8, related to paragraph 149, gives examples of relationship that may threaten the DOE’s impartiality. Furthermore, paragraph 160 lists the types of risks to conflict of

interest that have to be considered, minimally, in the conflict of interest analysis.

• Does the wording “involved in” include tasks conducted within a DOE (e.g. preparation of proposals, assessments, etc.)?

>>No.

• Does the term “relationships with a CDM PP” include DOE’s contract for a validation/verification with a PP and past engagement of auditors with that PP?

>>No.

As a consequence this would mean that the DOE personnel is limited to conduct only one validation or verification for the same client or involved PP within two years. And can subsequent verifications or SSC validations and the following verification(s) be conducted by the same auditor?

>>Yes.

• Does the term “CDM PP” refer to and is accordance to the definition of the PDD guidance, i.e. this section of the Accreditation Standard is only applicable to parties named in Annex 1 of a PDD and paragraph 82 b of the Standard?

>>The definition of “CDM project participant” is given in the “Glossary of CDM terms” (ver. 05).

Recommendation by the CDM-AP to the Board:

N/A

Name of the authors of the query:	(a DOE)
Date when the request for clarification was received at UNFCCC secretariat:	6 January 2011
Date and meeting number of consideration by the CDM-AP:	CDM-AP 53, 14-17 March 2011 CDM-AP 54, 3-6 May 2011

 Response form for requests for clarification on accreditation-related documents	
F-CDM-Acc_CLA number:	F-CDM-Acc_CLA_012
<i>Document and version against which clarification is sought:</i>	CDM Accreditation Standard v2.0
Text of the query:	
<p>In reference to 'CDM Accreditation Standard for Operational Entities' (Version 02), Para 166 (a) and Para 166 (f) and F-CDM-Acc_CLA_006, further clarification is requested on the following points;</p> <p>Para 166 (a) – The DOE shall not have any direct relationship with its client other than validation and/or verification/certification work and third party conformity assessment</p> <p>Query #1 If an expert is employed by a CDM Project Participant (PP 1), and PP1 is the DOE's client on a specific project "A"; can the DOE utilize the services of this expert on validation or verification for project B (for which PP1 is not involved as Project Participant).</p> <p>Para 166 (f) - "The DOE shall not use personnel who have been involved in, or have had relationships with the CDM PPs of, a CDM project activity under validation and/or verification/certification in any way within the last two years, to take part in validation and/or verification/certification work for the CDM project activity. If the person in question was involved in the development of a CDM project activity under validation and/or verification/certification, then the DOE shall not use such person at all;"</p> <p>Query # 2: Is this restriction of involvement of personnel (for both the cases) limited to only specific project case(s) and CDM PPs where the personnel either "have had relationships with the CDM PPs of, a CDM project activity under validation and/or verification/certification in any way within the last two years" or "involved in the development of a CDM project activity under validation and/or verification/certification"?</p> <p>Query # 3 Please clarify whether this restriction also applies to external experts (an external expert who is not employed permanently by the DOE).</p>	

Answer from CDM-AP to authors of request for clarification:	
<p>Query #1 Paragraph 166(a) is not relevant to respond this query and address this issue, as the requirement in this paragraph applies to the DOE (and its client), not to the personnel. The issue raised has to be considered with the broad picture of all impartiality requirements. Although there might not be a systematic prohibition for the issue raised, the situation should be considered in the conflict of interest analysis carried out by the DOE and for the mitigation actions to put in place.</p> <p>Query # 2: Yes, the prohibition specified in paragraph 166(f) is applicable to the personnel on a project basis.</p> <p>Query # 3 Yes, the prohibition specified in paragraph 166(f) is applicable to external experts, as these are included in the DOE's personnel.</p>	
Recommendation by the CDM-AP to the Board:	
N/A.	
Name of the authors of the query:	(a DOE)
Date when the request for clarification was received at UNFCCC secretariat:	20/04/2011
Date and meeting number of consideration by the CDM-AP:	CDM-AP 54, 3-6 May 2011

 Response form for requests for clarification on accreditation-related documents	
F-CDM-Acc_CLA number:	F-CDM-Acc_CLA_013
<i>Document and version against which clarification is sought:</i>	CDM Accreditation Standard v2.0
Text of the query:	
<p><i>Paragraph 85. An AE/DOE shall have a documented procedure for entering into a contractual agreement with the project participant (PP) for the provision of validation and/or verification/certification functions.</i></p> <p>(A DOE) would like to clarify with the CDM AP that the requirement to have a contractual agreement between the DOE and the PP is applicable to both validation and verification services.</p>	
Answer from CDM-AP to authors of request for clarification:	
Yes, the requirement in paragraph 85 is applicable to both validation and verification services.	
Recommendation by the CDM-AP to the Board:	
N/A	
Name of the authors of the query:	(a DOE)
Date when the request for clarification was received at UNFCCC secretariat:	20/04/2011
Date and meeting number of consideration by the CDM-AP:	CDM-AP 54, 3-6 May 2011

 Response form for requests for clarification on accreditation-related documents	
F-CDM-Acc_CLA number:	F-CDM-Acc_CLA_014
<i>Document and version against which clarification is sought:</i>	CDM Accreditation Standard v2.0
Text of the query:	
<p><i>Para 82 (a) – Essential information that should be included in the application documentation which would enable the DOE to establish the above are:</i></p> <p><i>(a) The project design document (PDD) that defines project boundaries and sites included in assessment, the nature of the data needed for validation/verification and the methodology used;</i></p> <p>It is (DOE)' understanding that although the word "should" is used, despite its definition in the glossary section, the requirement is to obtain in all cases at enquiry stage a PDD and there are no acceptable alternative to this.</p>	
Answer from CDM-AP to authors of request for clarification:	
<p>As contained in paragraph 3, the term "should" is used for indicating a typical means for meeting a requirement, and if the AE/DOE uses alternative means, it shall provide a suitable and adequate justification for the alternative means.</p> <p>Therefore, the possibility to use an alternative means for what it mentioned in paragraph 82 (a), and provide suitable and adequate justification, is left to the AE/DOE.</p>	
Recommendation by the CDM-AP to the Board:	
N/A	
Name of the authors of the query:	(a DOE)
Date when the request for clarification was received at UNFCCC secretariat:	20/11/2011
Date and meeting number of consideration by the CDM-AP:	CDM-AP 54, 3-6 May 2011



Response form for requests for clarification on accreditation-related documents

F-CDM-Acc_CLA number:

F-CDM-Acc_CLA_015

Document and version against which clarification is sought:

CDM Accreditation Standard v2.0

Text of the query:

The draft revised accreditation standard contained in the report of AP 50 defines in Annex D the following two technical areas within sectoral scope 1:

TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation from fossil fuels and biomass including thermal electricity from solar (complex)

TA 1.2: Energy generation from renewable energy sources

TA 1.1 mentions thermal energy generation from biomass and as such we are planning to place biomass power plants into this TA. However, we are wondering if some biomass power plants could also be placed in TA 1.2.

We have several biomass power plants under validation or verification which are biomass power plants where all steam produced from a biomass boiler is diverted to a steam turbine to generate electricity. There is no other use of steam and the biomass power plant is not connected to any other processes.

According to the terms and definitions in the draft revised accreditation standard, a complex technical area is a "A sub-sector of a CDM sectoral scope where: (a) operations with diverse components and/or processes that are independent and interrelated with others; (b) operations may be conducted in different configurations and the inter linkages between these components are diverse."

However, in the case of simple biomass power plants (without any cogeneration), there is no interrelation with other processes and there are no operations in different configurations. Hence, the definition of a complex technical area would indicate that simple biomass power plants can be placed in TA 1.2.

The final version of the revised accreditation standard, which we understand has been adopted by the EB this week, may clarify this issue. If not, we are seeking your clarification on the above issue.

Answer from CDM-AP to authors of request for clarification:

Electricity generation from biomass is a form of thermal energy generation from biomass and, therefore, shall be included in TA 1.1.

Recommendation by the CDM-AP to the Board:

N/A

Name of the authors of the query:

(a DOE)

Date when the request for clarification was received at UNFCCC secretariat:

Date and meeting number of consideration by the CDM-AP:

CDM-AP 54, 6 May 2011



Response form for requests for clarification on accreditation-related documents

F-CDM-Acc_CLA number:	F-CDM-Acc_CLA_016
<i>Document and version against which clarification is sought:</i>	CDM Accreditation Standard v2.0
Text of the query:	
All the projects that involved use of biomass for energy production have to be included in TA 1.1, or just the projects that foreseen the thermal energy generation from biomass have to be inserted inside TA 1.1? Can the electricity production from biomass be included in TA 1.2?	
Answer from CDM-AP to authors of request for clarification:	
Electricity generation from biomass involves generation of energy in thermal/heat form and its conversion to mechanical/shaft power to ultimately generate electric power. Therefore, all biomass based projects shall be covered under TA 1.1.	
Recommendation by the CDM-AP to the Board:	
N/A	
Name of the authors of the query:	(a DOE)
Date when the request for clarification was received at UNFCCC secretariat:	
Date and meeting number of consideration by the CDM-AP:	CDM-AP 54, 6 May 2011



Response form for requests for clarification on accreditation-related documents

F-CDM-Acc_CLA number:

F-CDM-Acc_CLA_017

Document and version against which clarification is sought:

CDM Accreditation Standard v2.0

Text of the query:

In particular [the DOE] is seeking clarification/guidance about the categorisation whether ‘biogas/landfill gas to energy’-projects belong to a complex or simple technical area.

The definition of complex technical area in the revision is: “A sub-sector of a CDM sectoral scope where: (a) operations with diverse components and/or processes that are independent and interrelated with others; (b) operations may be conducted in different configurations and the inter linkages between these components are diverse.” In the light of the technical note (AP49), page 5: “TA 1.1: Thermal energy and thermal electricity generation from fossil and biomass fuels has diverse interrelated and interdependent components such as boilers, turbines, heat exchangers with different configurations making this a complex technical area. [...]”, [The DOE] concludes the following:

Biogas/landfill gas projects could include diverse interrelated and interdependent components such as gas generation and collection systems, gas cleaning, engine, generator, heat exchangers, flares, etc. which could have different configurations.

Biogas/landfill gas projects which include biogas utilization, e.g. electricity generation technology belong to sectoral scope 1 and 13. Moreover, it is also possible to generate heat and electricity with a combined heat and power (CHP) unit. Again these projects have diverse interrelated and interdependent components and processes.

This leads to the conclusion that ‘biogas/landfill gas to energy’-projects belong to two technical areas:

a) a simple technical area from sectoral scope 13 and b) a complex technical area, in this case “TA 1.1: Thermal energy and thermal electricity generation from fossil and biomass fuels including thermal electricity from solar.”

[The DOE] seeks guidance/clarification to ensure a correct interpretation and inquire if in the view of the Accreditation Panel room is left open to differentiate these projects depending on the installed component type between simple and complex technical areas, i.e. projects with only electricity generation are simple and projects with CHP units are per se complex.

Answer from CDM-AP to authors of request for clarification:

From the CDM Glossary of Terms: "Biomass means non-fossilized and biodegradable organic material originating from plants, animals and micro-organisms. This shall also include products, by-products, residues and waste from agriculture, forestry and related industries as well as the non-fossilized and biodegradable organic fractions of industrial and municipal wastes. Biomass also includes gases and liquids recovered from the decomposition of non-fossilized and biodegradable organic material." Therefore LFG and biogas from waste projects belong to S.S. 13, T.A. 13.1 and, if LFG or biogas from waste is used as source of energy, it shall also be included in S.S. 1, TA 1.1.

Recommendation by the CDM-AP to the Board:

N/A

Name of the authors of the query:	(a DOE)
Date when the request for clarification was received at UNFCCC secretariat:	
Date and meeting number of consideration by the CDM-AP:	CDM-AP 54, 6 May, 2011



Response form for requests for clarification on accreditation-related documents

F-CDM-Acc_CLA number:

F-CDM-Acc_CLA_017

Document and version against which clarification is sought:

CDM Accreditation Standard v2.0

Text of the query:

Query 1

TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation from fossil fuels and biomass including thermal electricity from solar (COMPLEX)

Query No. 1: For the above technical area (TA 1.1), are the thermal energy generation from fossil fuels, thermal energy generation from biomass and thermal electricity generation from solar three different activities (technical areas) and should be considered separately or the above technical area (TA 1.1) is a combination of thermal energy generation from fossil fuel and biomass including thermal electricity from solar? There are number industries/ plants where thermal energy is generated from fossil fuels and biomass and are combined with the solar thermal electricity generation, so, is TA 1.1 for this type of facility?

Query 2

TA 1.2: Energy generation from renewable energy sources

Query No. 2: Are the thermal energy and electrical energy generation from the biomass are considered different from the energy generation from renewable energy sources (although biomass is renewable energy source)?

Being a stakeholder, my understanding for the above technical areas are (i) TA 1.1 is for the project activities which are producing thermal energy from fossil fuels and/or biomass along with the thermal electricity from solar energy and hence should not be a case of further bifurcation because the thermal and electrical energy generation by biomass will be counted/ considered under TA 1.2 (Energy generation from renewable energy sources).

Although, this is my understanding, I request you to further guide and clarify.

Answer from CDM-AP to authors of request for clarification:

Answer 1

TA 1.1 includes all activities related to thermal energy generation from fossil fuels, thermal energy generation from biomass and thermal electricity generation from solar.

Answer 2

In the classification of TAs, the only renewable energy projects under TA 1.1 are biomass and thermal electricity from solar. All other renewable energy technologies are classified under TA 1.2.

Recommendation by the CDM-AP to the Board:

N/A

Name of the authors of the query:	(a stakeholder)
Date when the request for clarification was received at UNFCCC secretariat:	
Date and meeting number of consideration by the CDM-AP:	CDM-AP 54, 6 May 2011

ANNEX 2

DOE Annual Activity Report Form (F-CDM-AAR)



**DOE annual activity report to the Board form (F-CDM-AAR)
Version 01**

1. Introduction

A. Period covered by the report:

>> *DD/MM/YYYY to DD/MM/YYYY*

B. Purpose of the report:

>> *Please complete the following sentence, substituting the sections in Italics appropriately:*

Name of the DOE, CDM accreditation entity number (e.g. CDM-E- 00XX) located in (country, city) submits this annual activity report to the CDM-EB in accordance with paragraph 27 (g) of the CDM M&P and the requirements for the preparation of the annual activity report by a DOE to the Board as set out in Annex C of the CDM accreditation standard.

2. Accreditation Status

A. Scope(s) accredited for and date of accreditation:

>> *Please provide the following information:*

The sectoral scopes for which the DOE is accredited (individually stating each scope in the following format - 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 etc), whether the most recent accreditation was an initial or re-accreditation, the date of (re-) accreditation (DD/MM/YYYY), any extensions of scope and suspensions (period, scopes and reason) that took place during the reporting period.

B. Sectoral scope(s) applied for and status of application:

>> *Please provide the following information:*

The sectoral scopes that the DOE is presently applying for, if there is an open accreditation application during the reporting period, (individually stating each scope in the following format - 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 etc) and the date of application.

3. Organization¹

A. Major changes in organizational structure and personnel:

>> *Please complete the table:*

List the major changes that took place within the DOE during the reporting period. Type shall be classified as a, b, c, d or e as in accordance with the paragraph 148 of the "Procedure for accrediting operational entities by the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism (version 10.1)" (hereinafter referred to as CDM accreditation procedure.

No.	Type	Summary of change	Date of Change	Notification to CDM-AP	Date of notification
<i>1</i>			<i>DD/MM/YYYY</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>	<i>DD/MM/YYYY</i>
<i>...</i>					

B. List of sites, other than the DOE's central office, having carried out validation and/or verification/certification work:

>> *Please complete the table:*

No.	Location	Legal entity at the location	Relationship with the central office	Status - declared non-central site as of final day of the reporting period

¹ *This report does not substitute the procedure for notifications of changes or the as a declaration of non-central sites. The DOE shall continue to inform the CDM-AP separately of changes in accordance with paragraph 148 of the CDM accreditation procedure.*



1.	(city & country)		(e.g. subsidiary company, group company, branch, etc)	Yes/No
...				

Note: The entity is reminded to refer to paragraphs 28 to 30 of the CDM accreditation standard.

C. Use of external personnel

>> Please provide the following information:

How many external individuals are contracted and which activities are carried out by them.

Note: The entity is reminded to refer to paragraphs 65 to 67 of the CDM accreditation standard.

D. Use of subcontractors

>> Please complete the table:

List the legal entities subcontracted by the entity, their location and the activities performed.

No.	Location	Legal entity at the location	Activities performed
1.	(city & country)		
...			

Note: The entity is reminded to refer to paragraphs 70 to 73 of the CDM accreditation standard.

E. Management systems;

E(i) Internal audit(s) carried out:

>> Please complete the table:

No.	Date	Location	Focus
1.	DD/MM/YYYY	(country)	
...			

E(ii) Management review(s) carried out:

>> Please complete the table:

No.	Date	Location	Focus
1.	DD/MM/YYYY	(country)	
...			

E(iii) Complaints, disputes and appeals on CDM-related activities:

>> Please complete the table:

List any complaints, disputes and appeals regarding the entity's function as a DOE as formally received during the reporting period. The type of the complaint, dispute or appeal shall be classified according to the following:

Type of complaint, dispute or appeal:

(a)(i) Complaint type 1 - Delays

(a)(ii) Complaint type 2 - Communication issues

(a)(iii) Complaint type 3 - Termination of contract

(a)(iv) Complaint type 4 - Other (please specify)

(b) Dispute

(c) Appeal

No.	Date	Type	Outcome	Complainant
1.	DD/MM/YYYY			(project participant or stakeholder)
...				

F. CDM-related training undertaken:

>> Please complete the table:

List the main CDM-related trainings undertaken during the reporting period.

No.	Date	Title	Period	No.	Internal /	Location	Provider
-----	------	-------	--------	-----	------------	----------	----------



			(hours)	of participants	External		
I.	MM/YYYY						
...							

4. Activities relating to the consideration of project activities:

A. List of project activities:

>> Please provide the following information:

List all CDM project activities the DOE worked on (validation or verification/certification) during the reporting period. This list shall be provided as an excel file annexed to the report including the following information - UN project number, title, host country and status as of the final day of the reporting period. The excel sheet shall be clearly referenced in this section.

Note: For the purpose of this report, a verification project activity is considered to be the verification of an individual monitoring report. This definition is valid for all other relevant sections within this report.

B. Status of project activities:

>> Please complete the table:

Include all CDM project activities the DOE worked on during the reporting period.

Validation Status	No. of Validation Activities	No. of Verification Activities
Initiated during this reporting period*		
Contract terminated during this reporting period		
Withdrawn during this reporting period		
Registered (validation) / CER's issued (verification) during this reporting period		
Rejected during this reporting period		
Validation/verification on going as of final date of the reporting period (not yet submitted for registration/request for issuance)		
Validation/verification on going as of final date of the reporting period (already submitted for registration/request for issuance)		

*For the purpose of this report, "Initiated during this reporting period" is considered to be validation or verification/certification work that began during this period.

C. Regional distribution of project activities:

>> Please complete the table:

Include all CDM project activities the DOE worked on during the reporting period per region.

Region ²	No. of validation activities	No. of verification activities
Africa		
Asia and Pacific		
Latin America and Caribbean		
Eastern Europe		

D. Sectoral scopes distribution of project activities:

>> Please complete the table:

Include all CDM project activities the DOE worked on during the reporting period per sectoral scope.

²A list of the countries per UN region can be located at:

http://www.un.int/wcm/webdav/site/gmun/shared/documents/GA_regionalgrps_Web.pdf



Scope	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
No. of validation activities															
No. of verification activities															

E. List of project activities declined, if any, including the reasons for doing so:

>> Please complete the table:

Include all CDM project activities for which the DOE declined to perform validation or verification/certification in the reporting period.

No.	Location	Reason for declining
1	(country)	
...		

F. List of the project activities under validation or verification/certification in countries having less than 10 registered projects activities:

>> Please complete the table:

Include all CDM project activities the DOE worked on during the reporting period in countries having less than 10 registered CDM project activities

Country	No. of validation activities	No. of verification activities

G. Number of projects activities under validation or verification/certification per qualified auditor:

>> Please complete the table:

Include information regarding the workload as per qualified auditor as of the final day of the reporting.

No. of validation or verification activities	Validators	Verifiers	Lead Auditor	Technical Expert	Technical Reviewer
0					
1-10					
11-20					
21-30					
30+					

H. Average timeframes for validation and verification/certification of project activities divided by region:

>> Please complete the table:

Include information regarding the average timeframes for validations and verifications/certifications during the reporting period per region.

Region	Average timeframe* (days)		Shortest timeframe (days)		Longest timeframe (days)	
	Validation	Verification	Validation	Verification	Validation	Verification
Africa						
Asia and Pacific						
Latin America and Caribbean						
Eastern Europe						

*For the purpose of this report the average time is defined as the period from the signing of contract to the submission of the request of registration or issuance to the Board.

I. Average fees for the validation and verification/certification of CDM project activities divided by region:



>> Please complete the table:

Include information regarding information regarding the average fees in USD for validations and verifications/certifications during the reporting period per region.

Region	Average fee (USD)		Lowest fee (USD)		Highest fee (USD)	
	Validation	Verification	Validation	Verification	Validation	Verification
Africa						
Asia and Pacific						
Latin America and Caribbean						
Eastern Europe						

5. Impartiality:

A. Report of the Impartiality Committee:

>> Please provide the following information:

The annual synthesis report of the activities of the impartiality committee as per paragraph 155 (f) of the CDM accreditation standard shall be provide jointly with this report. The aforementioned report shall be referenced in this section along with the number of meetings that took place in the reporting period.

B. Other impartiality issues:

>> Please provide the following information:

Add any further relevant comments with regards to impartiality issues experienced during the reporting period.

6. Interactions with interested parties:

>> Please provide the following information:

Describe in the three sections below significant interactions that your entity has had with interested parties during the reporting period.

A. Interactions with the Board:

B. Interactions with other designated operational and/or applicant entities:

C. Interactions with other interested parties:

7. Financial statement:

A. Annual income and expenditure relating to CDM related activities:

>> Please complete the table:

Include the annual income and expenditure of the entity regarding its validation and verification/certification activities in USD for the reporting period.

	Value (USD)
Annual Income	
Annual Expenditure	

8. Challenges and lessons learnt:

Please provide the following information:

Add any further relevant comments with regards to challenges and lessons learnt during the reporting period.

Date:	Name and signature of CEO:
-------	----------------------------

History of the document

Version	Date	Nature of revision
01	XX XXXX 2011	Initial document


