

# **REPORT OF THE CDM ACCREDITATION PANEL (CDM-AP)**

## **Fifty-first Meeting of the CDM-AP**

**20 – 22 October 2010**

### CONTENTS

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. INTRODUCTION	1	2
II. STATUS OF APPLICATIONS	2-4	2
III. UPDATE ON WORK OF THE CDM-AP	5-9	2
IV. CASE SPECIFIC ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACCREDITATION OF ENTITIES	10-13	3
V. EXPERT RESOURCES	14-15	3
VI. KEY ISSUES UNDER CONSIDERATION	16	3
VII. FURTHER SCHEDULE OF THE CDM-AP	17-18	3

## **I. Introduction**

1. This report of the CDM Accreditation Panel (CDM-AP) covers the period from 21 August 2010 to 22 October 2010, including its fifty-first meeting (20–22 October 2010).

## **II. Status of applications**

2. The total number of entities currently under consideration by the CDM-AP is forty three (43), including thirty-four (34) designated operational entities (DOEs)<sup>1</sup> and nine (9) applicant entities (AEs). A total of nine (9) entities have withdrawn their applications, accreditation of one (1) entity has expired and three (3) applications have been rejected by the Executive Board of the Clean Development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 three (43) 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 one (1) from the Latin America and Caribbean region.

4. A total of seventeen (17) entities are from non-Annex I Parties, including fifteen (15) entities from the Asia and Pacific region, one (1) from Africa and one (1) from the Latin America and Caribbean region. With respect to individual countries, six (6) from the Republic of Korea, five (5) entities are from China, three (3) from India, one (1) from Colombia, one (1) from Malaysia and one (1) from South Africa.

## **III. Update on work of the CDM-AP**

5. The CDM-AP discussed the details of implementation of the revised CDM accreditation procedure, adopted by the Board at its last meeting. The CDM-AP revised application form (F-CDM-A) and the work plan form (F-CDM-W), aligning them with the revisions of the procedure. The CDM-AP also prepared the complaints and disputes form (F-CDM-CD), as provided for by the revised procedure. The new and revised forms will be published on the UNFCCC CDM web site.

6. The CDM-AP discussed the details of implementation of the revised CDM accreditation standard, adopted by the Board at its last meeting. The CDM-AP agreed that to ensure compliance of all entities with the revised standard, additional desk review assessments may be conducted.

7. The CDM-AP took note of the recent developments by the secretariat in the implementation of the framework to address non-compliance and monitor performance of DOEs, including development of the forms to be used to report the information on performance of DOEs to themselves and to the CDM-AP. The CDM-AP agreed to provide further comments on the forms for the secretariat to take into account in preparing the first report due to be published for cases finalized as at 31 December 2010.

8. The CDM-AP took note of the initial analysis by the secretariat of the annual reports submitted by DOEs for the period from 1 July 2009 to 30 June 2010. The individual reports of the DOEs and the synthesis report prepared by the secretariat will be submitted to the Board under confidentiality.

9. Finally, the CDM-AP reviewed the assessment activities undertaken in 2010, including initial accreditation, re-accreditation, extension of scopes, regular surveillances and performance assessments. The CDM-AP requested the secretariat to prepare for its consideration at its next meeting an assessment plan for each entity for 2011.

---

<sup>1</sup> Includes entities accredited and provisionally designated by the Board.

#### **IV. Case specific issues and recommendations for accreditation of entities**

10. The CDM-AP considered four (4) applications for initial accreditation and one (1) application for re-accreditation. A recommendation on one (1) case will be submitted for consideration by the Board under confidentiality.

11. The CDM-AP also considered twelve (12) performance assessments. Notifications on five (5) cases will be submitted for consideration by the Board under confidentiality.

12. The CDM-AP further considered a report on a spot-check assessment. A recommendation on the spot-check assessment will be submitted for consideration by the Board under confidentiality.

13. Finally, the CDM-AP considered six (6) notifications on changes from AEs/DOEs and four (4) other requests from AEs/DOEs.

#### **V. Expert Resources**

14. The CDM-AP considered a regular report on the status of internal and external assessment resources including the results of the qualification and performance monitoring of assessment team members. The CDM-AP requested the secretariat to continue providing such information at each meeting of the CDM-AP.

15. The CDM-AP considered a report on the outcome of the second training workshop for assessment team members, held on 22–24 September 2010. The CDM-AP agreed on two training workshops to be organized in the first half of 2011.

#### **VI. Key issues under consideration**

16. The following key issues are under consideration by the CDM-AP:

- (a) The development of an “ABC Guidance” document to enhance consistency of decision making of the CDM-AP on accreditation assessment cases;
- (b) The development and application of a system for continuous monitoring of the performance of DOEs, including its use within the accreditation process;
- (c) Training of the assessment resources.

#### **VII. Further schedule of the CDM-AP**

17. The Board may wish to note that the fifty-second meeting of the CDM-AP is scheduled for 18–20 January 2011, in Bonn, Germany, in accordance with the tentative calendar of meetings in 2011, agreed by the Board at its last meeting.

18. The CDM-AP would like to request the Board to increase the duration of regular CDM-AP meetings in 2011 to four (4) days, in view of increased number of new entities, as well as significant increase in the number of performance assessments and other types of assessments.

-----