

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

**Thirty-Second Meeting of the CDM-AP
07 - 09 November 2007**

CONTENTS

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. INTRODUCTION	1	2
II. EXPERT RESOURCES.....	2–3	2
III. STATUS OF APPLICATIONS	4–12	2
IV. INDICATIVE LETTERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACCREDITATION.....	13–16	3
V. OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS.....	17	3
VI. KEY ISSUES UNDER CONSIDERATION.....	18	4

I. Introduction

1. This twenty-second progress report covers the period from 24 August 2007 to 09 November 2007. During this period the accreditation panel (CDM-AP) held one meeting.

II. Expert Resources

2. The CDM-AP considered recent additions to the roster of experts and taking into consideration the evaluation of the applicants agreed to roster them accordingly. The CDM-AP also took note that number of experts in the roster are gradually increasing. The CDM-AP also held discussion on the need and ways to develop training opportunities for accreditation and methodological experts in the roster. The CDM-AP agreed to further discuss the matter at the next meeting and submit a proposal for the consideration of the Board.

3. The CDM-AP, following the decision of the Board at its thirtieth meeting, relating to strengthening the role of the secretariat in the assessment process, established two assessment teams (CDM-ATs) with the secretariat staff as team members. The CDM-AP requested the secretariat to undertake the assessment work on two new applications in an expeditious manner so that delays for the entities could be avoided.

III. Status of applications

4. The total number of active applications currently under consideration by the CDM-AP is 41. It may be noted that three applications are withdrawn.

5. In terms of geographical distribution of the 41 applications under consideration, highest number of applications are from Asia and Pacific region (20) followed by Western Europe and Other region (18). Two applications are from Latin America and Caribbean region and one from the African region. Nine 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 (4), Colombia, Brazil and South Africa). Thus a total of twelve applications are from Non-Annex I Parties and one from an Annex I Party with an economy in transition (Romania).

6. The Board may wish to note that the CDM-AP have already issued indicative letters to 25 entities. It indicates that these entities have successfully passed through the stage of desk review and on-site assessment and require witnessing activities to complete their accreditation. With regard to the status of work of entities, three entities have recently undergone the on-site assessment and are implementing corrective actions. Remaining entities are at different stages of the accreditation procedure.

7. With regard to witnessing activities, three entities are undertaking witnessing activities for validation functions and one for verification functions.

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

9. The CDM-AP also considered the progress of the assessment work for five DOEs that applied for re-accreditation. Out of these five entities, for two entities on-site assessments have already been undertaken and corrective actions by these entities are being implemented. The CDM-AP also noted that three more entities have applied for re-accreditation, thus a total of eight applications are under consideration for re-accreditation.

10. The CDM-AP, for five cases of re-accreditation, determined the number of witnessing activities required for re-accreditation of the operational entity. In determining the required number of witnessing

activities, the CDM-AP took into consideration their previous accreditation status as well as their performance in their previous accredited period. The approach and criteria applied by the CDM-AP is based on the premise that DOEs performing well in the sectoral scopes for which they are accredited should gain benefits by performing less number of witnessing activities. Whereas, it also provides an opportunity and incentives to the DOEs to demonstrate their competencies and application of their quality management systems in areas where improvements are required. In this regard, the CDM-AP, making use of the data and information from Board's requests for reviews particularly selected witnessing activities in those sectoral scopes where DOEs are facing difficulties. This approach is expected to provide an opportunity to the DOEs to re-evaluate application of their knowledge and competencies and provide an opportunity to the CDM-AP to assess their competencies and operations of their management systems.

11. The CDM-AP also considered three new applications received from the entities. The CDM-AP in accordance with the procedure, undertook a review of these applications and highlighted particular issues for the attention of the CDM-AT. The CDM-AP established CDM-ATs for these new applications and requested to secretariat to accomplish the assessment of these cases in an expeditious manner.

12. In undertaking the review of other entities under the accreditation process, the CDM-AP considered the requests from two entities for changes in their names. The CDM-AP after careful analysis of the information submitted for these requests recognized that in one case the request is merely a change in the name of the entity, and agreed to allow this change. Considering the other case the CDM-AP recognized that the name change pertains to changes in the organisational and institutional structure, as well as in ownership of the entity. The CDM-AP taking into consideration the nature of these changes and its implications on the entity in terms of independence and impartiality of its operations, agreed that a limited assessment of its institutional structure shall be carried out. The CDM-AP requested the secretariat to undertake this assessment and the case shall be considered at the next meeting of the CDM-AP.

IV. Indicative letters and recommendations for accreditation

13. The CDM-AP, in this meeting, considered two cases for issuance of indicative letters and agreed not to issue indicative letters to these entities due to need for for some additional information.

14. The CDM-AP considered review of three project activities submitted by a DOE under spot-check, following the decision of the Board at its thirty-second. The CDM-AP concluded its overall evaluation of the performance of the DOE by reviewing the work of the DOE on project activities. The evaluation of the CDM-AP shall be presented to the Board under confidentiality.

15. The CDM-AP considered the reports of the spot-check, agreed by the Board at its thirty-fourth meeting. The recommendation of the CDM-AP on this case shall be presented to the Board under confidentiality.

16. The CDM-AP also considered two cases for phased accreditation for two entities. The CDM-AP agreed to hold back the decision due to a pending institutional issue for an entity. The recommendation of the CDM-AP for the second case shall be presented to the Board under confidentiality.

V. Other recommendations

17. The CDM AP at its thirty-second meeting, having considered the request for the acceptance of a phased verification approach by the DOE/AE Forum, agreed that the requested phased verification approach is not in compliance with the requirements of the CDM Modalities and procedures (paragraph 62 of CDM M&P) and the decision of the Board taken at its twenty-fifth meeting related to the conduct of verification activities during the first, and subsequent monitoring periods. The CDM-AP, therefore,

recommends that the request of the AE/DOE Coordination Forum for acceptance of phased verification approach should not be accepted.

VI. Key issues under consideration

18. Following key issues are under the consideration of the CDM-AP:
- (a) The secretariat, following the decision of the Board to undertake an elaboration of accreditation standards, facilitated an interaction of the consultant, hired to develop the guidance document, with the CDM-AP. The consultant presented an overview of development of the document and sought views of the CDM-AP members. The CDM-AP provided the guidance on a number of issues to the consultant. The CDM-AP, taking into consideration the importance of this guidance document for the AEs and DOEs, requested the secretariat to finalize this work in an expeditious manner.
 - (b) The CDM-AP, in its thirty-first meeting assigned a CDM-AP member to develop a policy framework for assessing non-compliance by a DOE on the basis of the risk it may pose to the system as well as assurance of its capability to perform CDM validation and verification functions. Due to resignation of that member, the CDM-AP assigned another member for the task and requested to prepare the document. The CDM-AP also requested the secretariat to provide assistance in preparation of the draft policy framework. The CDM-AP agreed to consider the document at its next meeting.
 - (c) The CDM-AP considered the information submitted by the secretariat on the submission of annual activity reports by the DOEs. The CDM-AP took note that six DOEs submitted their annual activity reports after the deadline. The CDM-AP requested the secretariat to seek explanations from the DOEs for delays in submitting their annual activity reports. The CDM-AP further requested the secretariat to prepare a synthesis report for the consideration of the CDM-AP. The synthesis report shall be submitted to the Board at its next meeting.
 - (d) The CDM-AP considered the assessment form for re-accreditation of operational entities and agreed to approve the form. The CDM-AP requested the secretariat to issue the form to the CDM-ATs.
 - (e) The CDM-AP took note on the progress of the work on preparation of guidance for designated operational entities on verification and validation in order to promote quality and consistency in verification and validation, provided by the secretariat. The CDM-AP noted the difficulties in completion of this work and requested the secretariat to pursue the matter expeditiously.

VII. Further schedule of the CDM-AP

19. The Board may wish to note that thirty-third meeting of the CDM-AP is schedule on 21 - 23 January 2008.

- - - - -