

**SEVENTEENTH PROGRESS REPORT
OF THE
CDM ACCREDITATION PANEL (CDM-AP)**

**Twenty-Seventh Meeting of the CDM-AP
01 -03 March 2007**

CONTENTS

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction.....	1	2
II. Expert resources.....	2-3	2
III. Status of applications	4-9	2
IV. Indicative letters and recommendation for accreditation	10-11	2
V. Other recommendations	12-16	3
VI. Key Issues Under Consideration.....	17	4

Annexes

I. Table: Regional Distribution Of Team Members	5
II. Status Of Application Of Aes	6

I. Introduction

1. This seventeenth progress report covers the period from 24 January 2007 to 03 March 2007. During this period the accreditation panel (CDM-AP) held one meeting.

II. Expert Resources

2. The CDM-AP, with regard to the establishment of a pool of experts, identified experts from the current roster of experts to be included in the contracted pool of experts. The CDM-AP also identified methodological experts to be included in the contracted pool of experts. The CDM-AP agreed that additional experts should be contacted from the regions not currently represented in the pool to be included in the pool.

3. The CDM-AP also took note of the progress made by the panel member assigned to provide options to develop training modules for assessment team members. The CDM-AP considered the detailed profiles of competency requirements for the auditors and provided feedback on the requirements for specific CDM related competency requirements desired for each role within the assessment team. The CDM-AP agreed to further consider it at its next meeting and will submit to the Board for its consideration at its next meeting.

III. Status of applications

4. The total number of active applications currently under consideration by the CDM-AP is 37. It may be noted that three applications are withdrawn.

5. The **geographical distribution of the 37 applications** under consideration is as follows: 17 are from Asia and Pacific region, 17 from Western Europe and Other region, two from Latin America and Caribbean region and one from the African region. Eight 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 (4), Malaysia (2), China (2), Columbia, Brazil and South Africa). Thus a total of eleven applications are from Non-Annex I Parties and one from economies in transition country.

6. With regard to other entities, five CDM-ATs are at the initial stage of preparing desktop reviews, one entity has been requested to submit additional documents and one is addressing nonconformities in accordance with the procedure for accreditation. Five entities are undertaking witnessing activities for validation and verification functions and remaining entities are at different stages of the accreditation procedure.

7. The Board may wish to note that a total of seventeen entities are accredited for validation functions and six for verification functions, covering a wide range of sectoral scopes. It may be noted that at least one DOE exists for each sectoral scope.

8. The Board may also wish to note that 24 entities have been issued indicative letters by the CDM-AP so far, which indicates that these entities have successfully passed the stage of desk review and on-site assessment. Seven AEs out of these 24 are still waiting for the witnessing activities to accomplish their accreditation. For details on status of all applications please refer to the overview table in annex 2.

9. The CDM-AP also considered documentation received for one DOE for its re-accreditation. The CDM-AP undertook the preliminary consideration of the application and agreed to proceed in accordance with the procedure. The CDM-AP established the new CDM-AT to proceed with the detailed assessment work and also determined the additional documents required by the DOE to submit.

IV. Indicative letters and recommendation for accreditation

10. The CDM-AP considered one case for recommendation regarding phased accreditation for validation and three cases for verification functions. Two witnessing cases for verification functions and one witnessing case for validation function were not accepted by the CDM-AP on the basis of substantive aspects, in particular taking into consideration that some methodological aspects were not addressed by

these AEs during the witnessing assessment. During this period the CDM-AP did not issue indicative letter to any entity.

11. The CDM-AP considered the reports of the follow-up visit of the CDM-AT for verification of implementation of corrective actions relating to the spot-check of a DOE raised by the Board at its twenty-seventh meeting. The deliberations of the CDM-AP on this matter are presented to the Board under strict confidentiality.

V. Other recommendations

12. The CDM-AP considered the request from the Board to re-visit the accreditation procedures, in particular the procedures for “unscheduled surveillance”. The CDM-AP had an initial consideration of the accreditation procedure and recognized that:

- (a) The accreditation procedure addresses the essential elements to implement the accreditation process;
- (b) Other supporting documents used in the accreditation process for its implementation such as, assessment forms and list of sectoral scopes and its annex containing competency aspects for DOEs elaborates the necessary operational assessment requirements;
- (c) There is a need to improve communication and dissemination of these operational assessment requirements to the AEs and DOEs; and
- (d) There is a need to have further clarity and improvement of assessment requirements in these documents.

13. The CDM-AP also decided to put the accreditation procedure under review to specifically consider unscheduled surveillance to address issues relating to verification of the implementation of the quality management system and use of technical resources from non-accredited premises of the DOEs. In this regard, the CDM-AP considered various options including the possibility for multi-site accreditation system for DOEs, as practiced in other accreditation schemes.

14. The CDM-AP considered the input to the Board from the DOE/AE coordination forum relating to the possibility for DOEs or other units of the DOE or its parent companies to provide services, such as calibration and/or laboratory services as required by some approved baseline and monitoring methodologies. The CDM-AP discussed the issue by examining how such matters are handled and practiced by other accreditation systems and how the independence and impartiality of services is ensured. The CDM-AP also considered the proposal by the forum and discussed the potential risks it may pose to the DOEs in performing their verification functions in an independent and impartial manner.

15. The CDM-AP recognized that the accreditation of other units of the DOE or its parent company under other accreditation systems may ensure their competencies for providing services such as carrying out tests and/or calibration services, but impartiality of its operations and how potential conflict of interest situations are avoided still shall have to be assessed. The CDM-AP considered different possible scenarios of different institutional structures and agreed that independence and maintenance of impartiality depends upon the specific organizational and institutional structure. The CDM-AP recognized the need for guidance for DOEs on this issue. The CDM-AP, therefore, recommends to the Board to allow the CDM-AP to look further deeply into this matter and prepare a guidance note for the consideration of the Board.

16. The CDM-AP considered proposals to utilize information by the registration and issuance team appraisal to improve its decision-making. The panel agreed to further define the requirements and agreed to consider this at its next meeting.

VI. Key Issues under consideration

17. The CDM-AP recognized the importance of the uniformity and harmonization in the assessment process and, in particular, in the assessment reporting. The CDM-AP noted differences in the

understanding of key concepts relating to the accreditation and assessment process amongst the team leaders and team members and agreed that further guidance is needed. The CDM-AP considered a guidance document elaborating the key concepts of the accreditation process and agreed to issue it to the CDM-AT members and leaders.

Annex I

Table: Regional distribution of team members

(in bold character members from Non-Annex I Parties)

Organisation	Leader	Member	Member
0001 JQA (Re-accreditation)	WEO	ASP	ASP
0002 JACO CDM	ASP	ASP	ASP
*0003 DNV Certification AS (Re-accreditation)	-	-	-
0004 MISUZU Sustainability Certification	ASP	ASP	WEO
0005 TÜV Sued (Re-accreditation)	-	-	-
0006 TECO	ASP	WEO	ASP
0007 JCI	-	ASP	ASP
0008 AZSA	ASP	LAC	WEO
0009 BVC Holding S.A	-	ASP	WEO
*0010 SGS (Re-accreditation)	-	-	-
0011 KEMCO	WEO	ASP	LAC
0012 PWCC	Application Withdrawn		
*0013 TÜV Rhein.	WEO	LAC	-
0014 KPMG	WEO	WEO	AFR
0015 URS	Application Withdrawn		
0016 ERM-CVS	WEO?Juhani	WEO	ASP
*0017 Clouston Env.	-	ASP	ASP
*0018 BSI UK	-	ASP	WEO
0019 Nexant	Application Withdrawn		
0020 CRA	WEO	WEO	ASP
0021 AENOR	ASP	ASP	WEO
*0022 TÜV NORD CERT	ASP	WEO	-
0023 LRQA	WEO	ASP	WEO
0024 ICONTEC	WEO	ASP	LAC
0025 KFQ	WEO	WEO	ASP
0026 TECPAR	ASP	ASP	LAC
0027 SQS	WEO	ASP	WEO
0028 Shin Nihon	ASP	WEO	ASP
0029 PWC, SA	ASP	AFR	WEO
0030 NKKKQA	ASP	ASP	WEO
0031 Perry Johnson	WEO	ASP	LAC
0032 LGAI Tech.	WEO	WEO	AFR
0033 ECA Cert.	ASP	AFR	ASP
0034 CEC	WEO	ASP	ASP
0035 Tsinghua	WEO	ASP	LAC
0036 AWMS	WEO	WEO	AFR
0037 RINA S.p.A	WEO	LAC	ASP
0038 SIRIM QAS Int.	ASP	WEO	AFR
0039 KSA	ASP	AFR	ASP
0040 EMC	ASP	WEO	LAC

* Replacement of Team Members being confirmed

Annex II

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	Phased Accreditation and provisional designation
E-0001 / JQA	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (1.12.03) I (5.10.06)	AC (24.03.04) AC (11.05.05)
E-0001 / JQA (Re-accreditation)	X	X	X	X	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
E-0002 / JACO CDM	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (4.2.05)	AC (23.2.05)
E-0003 / DNV Certification AS	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (1.12.03) Ie (5.2.05)	AC (24.03.04) AC (12.06.04) AC (08.06.05) ACv (29.8.05) AC (20.7.06) ACv (20.7.06)
E-0003 / DNV Certification AS (Re-accreditation)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
E-0004 / MISUZU Sustainability Certification	X	X	X	X	X	N	X	X	I (23.04.05)	
E-0005 / TÜV-SÜD	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOPa	I (1.12.03) Ie (5.2.05)	AC (12.06.04) AC (23.2.05) ACv (28.9.05) AC (24.11.05) ACv (22.02.06) ACv (20.7.06) AC (1.11.06) ACv (1.11.06)
E-0006 / TECO	X	X	X	X	X	N	X	WOI	I (1.12.03)	AC (11.05.06)
E-0007 / JCI	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (26.7.04)	AC (11.05.05) AC (24.11.05)

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-0008 / AZSA Sustainability Co.	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	NP	I(13.11.04)	
E-0009 / BVC Holding S.A.	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOP	I (15.3.04)	AC (08.07.05) ACv (11.05.06)
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) AC (08.07.05) AC (28.9.05) ACv (24.11.05)
E-0010 / SGS UK Ltd (Re-accreditation)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
E-0011 / KEMCO Additional Sectoral Scopes	X X	X X	X X	X X	X D	PR	X	WOI WOP	I (13.11.04)	AC (25.11.05)
E-0012 /PWCC	Application Withdrawn									
E-0013 / TÜV Rheinland	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOP	I (25.5.04)	AC (13.05.05) AC (22.02.06)
E-0014 / KPMG	X	X	X	X	X	N	X	XNC	I (4.2.05)	AC (08.07.05) AC (1.11.06)
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	WOI	I (23.04.05)	AC (11.05.06)
E-0019 / Nexant	Application Withdrawn									
E-0020 / CRA	X	X	X	X	D	PR	X	N/A	I (25.11.05)	
E-0021 / AENOR	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (5.2.05)	AC (13.05.05) ACv (11.05.06)
E-0022 / TÜV NORD	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (4.2.05) I (5.10.06)	AC (28.9.05) AC (20.7.06) ACv (20.7.06)
E-0023 / LRQA	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (4.2.05)	AC (1.11.06) AC (16.2.07)
E-0024 / ICONTEC	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOI	I (19.06.05)	

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-0025 / KFQ	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	WOP	I (23.04.05)	AC (25.02.06)
*E-0026 / TECPAR	X	X	X	X	D	NP	N/A	N/A	N/A	
E-0027 / SQS	X	X	X	X	D	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
E-0028 / Shin Nihon	X	X	X	X	X	N	X	N/A	I (06.09.06)	
E-0029 / PWC, SA	X	X	X	X	X	N	X	N/A		AC (11.05.06)
E-0030 / NKKKQA	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	N/A	I (06.09.06)	
E-0031 / Perry Johnson	X	X	X	X	X	PR	X	N/A	I (06.09.06)	
E-0032 / LGAI Tech.	X	X	X	X	X	PR	XNC			
E-0033 / ECA Cert.	X	X	X	X	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
*E-0034 / CEC China	X	X	X	X	PX	NP	N/A	N/A	N/A	
E-0035 / Tsinghua	X	X	X	X	D	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
E-0036 / AWMS	X	X	X	X	D	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
E-0037 / RINA	X	X	X	X	D	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
E-0038 / Sirim Qas Int	X	X	X	X	D	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
E-0039 / KSA	X	X	X	X	D	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
E-0040 / EMC	X	X	X	X	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

Note: E-0012 / PWC C, E-0015 URS Corporation and E-0019 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 (validation)

ACv (date) = Accredited and provisionally designated (verification)

XNC = AE addresses non-conformities
