

THIRD PROGRESS REPORT OF THE CDM ACCREDITATION PANEL

Twelfth Meeting of the accreditation panel

22 – 23 May 2004

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 third progress report covers the period 8 March 2004 to 22 May 2004. During this period the accreditation panel held one meeting.

II. ROSTER OF EXPERTS

2. The panel noted that a considerable experience has been gained by the team leaders and the team members with their involvement in various assessments. The panel invited the team members to update their profiles through the new electronic application system. The panel, through the established system of evaluating team members' performance, continues to enhance the establishment of teams.

3. The panel when establishing its teams, continues to take into consideration the issue of capacity building and regional balance in the assessment teams. For all 24 applications, the panel included in each team at least one member from Parties not included in Annex I (see annex 1). In seven teams, 2 of the three members are from Non Annex I Parties. Ten teams involve at least one non Annex I expert from the African, in 20 teams from the Asia and Pacific and 3 teams from the Latin America and Caribbean Region. However, it is important to note that some experts are involved in several teams. Eight teams are lead by team leaders from Non-Annex I.

4. Although no new applications were received from experts, efforts with regard to issues relating to capacity building and enhancing the number of applications to the CDM-AT roster will continue.

III. STATUS OF APPLICATIONS

5. Since the thirteenth meeting of the Board, two new applications for accreditation were received, which brings the total number of application to twenty four (24). It should be noted that one applicant entity subsequently withdrew its application.

6. The geographical distribution of the applications is as follows: Eight are from Asia and Pacific region, 14 from Western Europe and Other region and one from Latin America and Caribbean region. Two applicants from the Asia and Pacific region and one from Latin America and Caribbean region are from Non Annex I Parties (Republic of Korea, Malaysia and Columbia).

7. The panel considered one new application and, based on a draft work plan prepared by an AP member serving as the case leader (the leader is determined on a rotational basis), agreed on particular issues to be covered by the assessment team (AT). The second application was received too late to be considered prior to the establishment of this report.

8. During the period covered by this report, two applicant entities have successfully passed the desk review and on-site assessment stage. For these two applicant entities, the panel issued the indicative letters (see section IV). For three applicant entities the panel has made recommendations regarding phased accreditation for validation (see section IV). Four companies are identifying or addressing corrective actions in accordance with the procedure for accreditation. For three applicants dates for on-site assessment have been agreed. For details on status of all applications please refer to the overview table in annex 2.

IV. INDICATIVE LETTERS AND RECOMMENDATION FOR ACCREDITATION

9. The panel at its twelfth meeting agreed to issue indicative letters to "E-0010 Société Générale de Surveillance UK Ltd. (SGS UK Ltd)" and "E-0013 TUV Anlagentechnik GmbH (TUV Rheinland)" indicating that these AEs successfully completed desk review and on-site assessment. The chair of the panel will sign these letters on 25 May 2004.

10. The preliminary report for these cases will be made available to the Board which in accordance with the procedure for accreditation shall remain confidential. The Board will be able to consult two reference files for these applicant entities during its next meeting.

11. The panel has agreed to make recommendations for phased accreditation in specified sectoral scope(s) for validation for three applicant entities. In accordance with the accreditation procedure, the recommendations and the supporting documentation remain confidential as well as the deliberations of the Executive Board. In accordance with the accreditation procedure, only the decision by the Executive Board will be made public. Therefore the documentation related to these three recommendations is forwarded to the Executive Board separately.

V. OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

12. The panel revised sections 1(e), 2(a), 2(a)(i), and 2(a)(ii) of desk and on-site review report (F-CDM-DOR) form. The revised form is forwarded to the Executive Board separately for consideration of these sections at its fourteenth meeting.

VI. OTHER OUTPUTS OF THE PANEL

13. The panel took note of the issue of qualification of validation report by the AEs. A validation report has been submitted with a disclaimer that “the validation is based on the information made available to us and the engagement conditions detailed in this report. The AE cannot guarantee the accuracy or correctness of this information. Hence the applicant entity cannot be held liable by any party for decisions made or not made based on the validation opinion”. The panel agreed that this type of disclaimer in validation reports is unacceptable and decided to bring this matter to the attention of the Executive Board for appropriate action. The AP is of the view that applicant entities/designated operational entities shall take full responsibility for the quality of their work.

VII. ISSUES UNDER CONSIDERATION

14. This section provides an overview of some key issues under consideration by the panel.

15. Taking note of weaknesses of applicant entities in identification of competency criteria, the panel is working on guidelines for competency criteria for applicant entities and designated operational entities.

16. With increasing experience, the panel is continuously working on measures on how to further enhance the harmonization of output from CDM assessment teams. It is working presently on writing guidelines for preliminary and final reports to guide team leaders.

17. The panel, in order to improve consistency in the consideration of applications, is working on a checklist for preliminary consideration of the applications by the panel. The list will contain key questions to be checked and evaluated before the application will to be accepted for accreditation.

18. The panel, in consideration to two new sectoral scopes, is reconsidering the grouping of sectoral scopes for witnessing and competency requirements.

19. The panel is also undertaking a review of forms used in the accreditation process to revise them as necessary.

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	ASP	ASP	ASP
0003 DNVCert	WEO	ASP	AFR
0004 CHUO	ASP	ASP	WEO
0005 TUV Sued	ASP	WEO	ASP
0006 TECO	ASP	WEO	ASP
0007 JCI	WEO	ASP	ASP
0008 Asahi	ASP	LAC	WEO
0009 BVQI	WEO	WEO	ASP
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	ASP	WEO	AFR
0019 Nexant	WEO	ASP	LAC
0020 CRA	WEO	WEO	AFR
0021 AENOR	AFR	ASP	WEO
0022 RWTUV	AFR	WEO	WEO
0023 LRQA	ASP	WEO	AFR
0024 ICONTEC	AFR	ASP	ASP

Annex 2

Table: Status of application of AEs

Entity	Completeness check	Initial consideration	CDM -AT	Work plan	Desk review	Add. Docs	On-site assessment	Witnessing activities	Indicative letter	Accreditation and provisional designation	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 AC (date) = Accredited and provisionally designated
E-0001 / JQA	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (1.12.2003)	AC (24.03.04)	
E-0002 / JACO	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOP	N/A		
E-0003 / DNV Cert	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (1.12.2003)	AC (24.03.04)	
E-0004 / CHUO	X	X	X	X	X	N	P	N/A	N/A		
E-0005 / TUEV sued	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (1.12.2003)		
E-0006 / TECO	X	X	X	X	X	N	X	NP	I (1.12.2003)		
E-0007 / JCI	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	N/A	N/A		
E-0008 / Asahi	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	N/A	N/A		
E-0009 / BVQI	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	NP	I (15.3.2004)		
E-0010 / SGS	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (25.5.04)		
E-0011 / KEMCO	X	X	X	X	X	PR	P	N/A	N/A		
E-0012 / PWC C	Withdrew Application										
E-0013 / TUEV Rhein	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOP	I (25.5.04)		
E-0014 / KPMG	X	X	X	X	X	N	X	N/A	N/A		
E-0015 / URS	X	X	X	X	X	N	RD	N/A	N/A		
E-0016 / ERM	X	X	X	X	D	N	P	N/A	N/A		
E-0017 / Clouston	X	X	X	X	D	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
E-0018 / BSI	X	X	X	X	D	N	RD	N/A	N/A		
E-0019 / Nexant	X	X	X	X	D	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
E-0020 / CRA	X	X	X	X	D	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

Entity	Completeness check	Initial consideration	CDM -AT	Work plan	Desk review	Add. Docs	On-site assessment	Witnessing activities	Indicative letter	Accreditation and provisional designation
E-0021 / AENOR	X	X	X	X	D	N/P	N/A	N/A	N/A	
E-0022 / RWTUV	X	X	X	X	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
E-0023 / LRQA	X	X	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
E-0024 / ICONTEC	X	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	