

REPORT OF THE CDM ACCREDITATION PANEL (CDM-AP)

Fifty-ninth meeting of the CDM-AP

26–29 March 2012

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

I. Introduction

1. This report of the CDM Accreditation Panel (CDM-AP) covers the period from 3 February 2012 to 29 March 2012, including its fifty-ninth meeting (26–29 March 2012).

II. Status of applications

2. The total number of entities currently under consideration by the CDM-AP is 47, including 41 designated operational entities (DOEs)¹ and six applicant entities (AEs). To date, a total of 11 entities have withdrawn their applications or accreditation, the accreditation of one entity has expired and three applications have been rejected by the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism (hereinafter referred to as the Board).

3. In terms of geographical distribution, out of the 47 entities currently under consideration, the highest number of entities, 29, is from the Asia and Pacific region, followed by 15 from the Western Europe and Other regions. One entity is from Africa and two are from the Latin America and Caribbean region.

4. A total of 23 entities are from non-Annex I Parties, including 20 entities from the Asia and Pacific region, one from Africa and two from the Latin America and Caribbean region. With respect to individual countries, six entities are from the Republic of Korea, eight are from China, four from India, one from Thailand, one from Brazil, one from Colombia, one from Malaysia and one from South Africa.

III. Case-specific issues

5. The CDM-AP considered two initial accreditation assessment cases. A recommendation on one case will be submitted to the Board under confidentiality.

6. The CDM-AP considered nine on-going re-accreditation assessment cases. Recommendations on four cases will be submitted to the Board under confidentiality.

7. The CDM-AP considered an extension of accreditation scope case. A recommendation will be submitted to the Board under confidentiality.

8. The CDM-AP considered nine regular on-site surveillances of central offices and non-central sites. Notifications on five cases will be submitted to the Board under confidentiality.

9. The CDM-AP considered 11 performance assessments. Notifications on eight cases will be submitted to the Board under confidentiality.

10. The CDM-AP considered two additional focused desk review assessments. A notification on one case will be submitted to the Board under confidentiality.

11. The CDM-AP considered five notifications on changes. No recommendation will be submitted to the Board at this time.

IV. Update on work of the CDM-AP

12. The CDM-AP considered the DOE performance monitoring reports for the period from 1 January to 30 June 2011. In accordance with the “Procedure on performance monitoring of designated operational entities”, the CDM-AP reviewed the number and nature of performance assessments, the number of non-central sites to be assessed and the areas to be assessed during regular on-site surveillance assessments of the central offices and non-central sites.

¹ Includes entities accredited and provisionally designated by the Board.

13. The CDM-AP reviewed the draft revised CDM accreditation standard and provided further feedback to the secretariat on the revision. The CDM-AP agreed to request the Board to consider whether carbon capture and storage should be included as a sectoral scope in this revision and to consider providing a grace period for the implementation of this revised standard.

14. The CDM-AP issued further guidance to the CDM assessment teams (CDM-ATs):

- (a) The conclusions of the performance assessment reports should focus on whether or not the validation or verification activity was conducted competently by an AE/DOE and not on the ability of the AE/DOE to address the identified non-conformities;
- (b) The CDM-ATs should not accept proposed corrective actions, if the summary of the root-cause analysis provided by the AE/DOE only contains re-phrased non-conformities or self-defensive justification. A misreading, misinterpreting or misunderstanding of CDM requirements may be accepted as an appropriate root cause, if the AE/DOE demonstrates that root-cause analysis was carried out appropriately and this was indeed the cause encountered.

V. Expert resources

15. The CDM-AP considered a regular report on the performance of the CDM-AT leaders and members. The CDM-AP agreed on a number of changes to the status of members on the accreditation roster of experts (AROE):

- (a) Five trainee lead assessors became lead assessors;
- (b) One trainee assessor became an assessor;
- (c) Eight new members were added to the roster as technical experts.

16. The CDM-AP reviewed and further strengthened mitigation measures to safeguard impartiality of the experts on the AROE.

17. The CDM-AP considered a status update and provided feedback to the secretariat on the development of an online training for the members of the AROE.

18. The CDM-AP requested the secretariat to organize two training workshops for the members of the AROE in 2012, including an interaction session between the lead assessors and the CDM-AP.

VI. Further schedule of the CDM-AP

19. The Board may wish to note that the sixtieth meeting of the CDM-AP is currently scheduled for 18–21 June 2012.

- - - - -