

REPORT OF THE CDM ACCREDITATION PANEL (CDM-AP)

Fifty-third meeting of the CDM-AP

14 - 17 March 2011

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
I. INTRODUCTION	2
II. STATUS OF APPLICATIONS	2
III. CASE SPECIFIC ISSUES	3
IV. UPDATE ON WORK OF THE CDM-AP	2
V. EXPERT RESOURCES	3
VI. FURTHER SCHEDULE OF THE CDM-AP	4
ANNEX - RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION	5

I. Introduction

1. This report of the CDM Accreditation Panel (CDM-AP) covers the period from 21 January 2011 to 17 March 2011, including its fifty-third meeting (14-17 March 2011).

II. Status of applications

2. The total number of entities currently under consideration by the CDM-AP is forty four (44), including thirty seven (37) designated operational entities (DOEs)¹ and seven (7) applicant entities (AEs). So far, a total of ten (10) entities have withdrawn their applications, accreditation of one (1) entity has expired and three (3) applications have been rejected by the Executive Board of the Clean Development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 four (44) 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 two (2) from the Latin America and Caribbean region.

4. A total of eighteen (18) entities are from non-Annex I Parties, including fifteen (15) entities from the Asia and Pacific region, one (1) from Africa and two (2) from the Latin America and Caribbean region. With respect to individual countries, five (5) are from the Republic of Korea, five (5) entities are from China, three (3) from India, one (1) from Thailand, one (1) from Brazil, one (1) from Colombia, one (1) from Malaysia and one (1) from South Africa.

III. Case specific issues

5. The CDM-AP considered the final reports on two (2) initial accreditation assessments and one (1) letter of voluntary withdrawal of application for accreditation. Two (2) recommendations and one (1) notification will be submitted for consideration by the Board under confidentiality.

6. The CDM-AP also considered the final reports on four (4) regular on-site surveillances of central offices and non-central sites. Notifications on three (3) cases will be submitted for consideration by the Board under confidentiality. In one (1) case the entity was requested to implement further corrective actions;

7. The CDM-AP further considered the final reports on ten (10) performance assessments. Notifications on eight (8) cases will be submitted for consideration by the Board under confidentiality. In two (2) cases the entities were requested to implement further corrective actions.

8. Finally, the CDM-AP considered eight (8) notifications on changes. A recommendation on one (1) request will be submitted for consideration by the Board under confidentiality.

IV. Update on work of the CDM-AP

9. The CDM-AP considered the results of the DOE performance monitoring, for the monitoring period from 1 January 2010 to 30 June 2010, based on the data finalized on 31 December 2010. The CDM-AP agreed to further discuss the use of the results of the DOE performance monitoring in the accreditation process.

¹ Includes entities accredited and provisionally designated by the Board.

10. The CDM-AP also considered a report by the secretariat on the implementation of the version 2.0 of the “CDM accreditation standard for operational entities” (accreditation standard), which became effective on 17 March 2011.

11. The CDM-AP further considered a number of requests for clarifications submitted by DOEs and other stakeholders on the accreditation standard. The responses to the individual requests are annexed to this report, in accordance with the decision of the Board at its fifty-ninth meeting.

12. The CDM-AP agreed to recommend the Board to adopt the following clarifications on the accreditation standard:

- (a) On paragraph 166 (a): The requirement of this provision is applicable to the DOE's other sites as described in paragraph 28 (b) of the accreditation standard;
- (b) On paragraph 166 (f): “Personnel” means any personnel who are used in validation or verification/certification activities. Involvement or relationship with the CDM PP means any relationship other than the ones as part of a past or current DOE and third party conformity assessment.

13. The CDM-AP agreed to recommend the Board to establish the following modalities of its direct interaction with the DOE/AIE Coordination Forum:

- (a) Regular interactions shall take place twice a year - at the annual CDM joint workshop and during a CDM-AP meeting, approximately 6 months after the workshop;
- (b) The DOE/AIE Coordination Forum may request additional interactions at any time;
- (c) The CDM-AP may invite the DOE/AIE Coordination Forum to any of its meetings, depending on the issues being discussed;
- (d) The interactions should usually take up to two hours;
- (e) The interactions should be limited to policy issues and not on specific accreditation cases;
- (f) The interactions to be attended by the chair of the DOE/AIE Coordination Forum, who may be accompanied by a limited number of other AE/DOE representatives.

14. If the Board accepts the proposed modalities of interaction, the CDM-AP intends to invite the DOE/AIE Coordination Forum for a direct interaction at its next meeting to discuss the claimed scarcity of qualified personnel in complex technical areas.

V. Expert Resources

15. The CDM-AP considered a regular report on the status and performance of internal and external assessment resources.

16. The CDM-AP continued its discussion on a revision for the terms of reference of CDM assessment teams, including qualification criteria for team members.

17. The CDM-AP discussed preparations for the interaction session with the assessment team leaders, scheduled immediately after the CDM-AP meeting. The session was to align the assessment practices and understanding of the requirements of the accreditation standard.

VI. Further schedule of the CDM-AP

18. The Board may wish to note that the fifty-fourth meeting of the CDM-AP is scheduled for 3 - 6 May 2011.

19. The CDM-AP requested the secretariat to explore the possibility to organize an annual retreat for CDM-AP members and the secretariat to review and discuss the direction on the work of the CDM-AP.

- - - -

ANNEX -
Responses to requests for clarification



Response form for requests for clarification on accreditation-related documents

F-CDM-Acc_CLA number:

F-CDM-Acc_CLA_001

Document and version against which clarification is sought:

CDM accreditation standard v2.0

Text of the query:

To make sure [the author of the query] interprets the accreditation standard version 2.0, annex D, section A (2), paragraph 6 in the correct way we would like to ask for clarification. Please find below the respective paragraph as well as [our] interpretation below:

6. The fulfilment of requirements for work experience relates to initial qualification of the AE/DOE personnel. The AE/DOE is responsible for establishing a system for continual monitoring the knowledge of its personnel qualified to the technical areas within sectoral scopes.

[our] interpretation:

[We have]conducted a very thorough review of this section the exact meaning of the first sentence of this paragraph is unclear as it seems to be contradictory to matrix in annex 1 of the accreditation standard version 2.0. This section does not specify whether general work experience (not related to a technical area within the respective scope, however supplemented by training and trainee + witness audits) is needed or if the qualification for a scope requires work experience in at least one related technical area. In addition, it needs to be clarified whether this applies for all simple technical areas within sectoral scopes. E.g. if an auditor is qualified for SS 1, TA 1.2, would the qualification for SS 13, TA 13.1 require also one year of related work experience or would it be possible to gain this qualification solely based on trainings and audits (trainee + witness audits)?

Answer from CDM-AP to authors of request for clarification:

Initial qualification, as it appears in paragraph 6 and the matrix in annex D to the “CDM accreditation standard for operational entities” (ver. 2.0) (Standard), does not refer to the qualification in the first technical area (TA) as compared to qualification in additional TAs in the same sectoral scope (SS). It refers to initial qualification in a given TA as compared to the confirmation of competence for this same TA (see paragraph 53 of the Standard).

Qualification for additional TAs within the same SS is independent/separate from the qualification to the first TA. All qualification and competence requirements have to be met for each individual TAs, except for TAs with the same nomenclature (see paragraph 13 of annex D).

Requirements relating to work experience are contained in paragraphs 4(a), 4(b), 4(c) as well as 5–7 of annex D. For complex TAs, the requirement is fulfilled through direct work experience. For non-complex TAs, the requirements related to work experience may be fulfilled by one of the following:

- Direct work experience; or
- Related work experience; or
- Assessment under observation.

For options of related work experience and assessment under observation, the work experience shall be complemented with training (paragraph 8 of annex D) appropriate to the related TA/sectoral scope.

For all initial qualification to any TA in sectoral scopes (paragraph 2 of annex D), relevant educational background is mandatory.

Initial qualification to any non-complex TA may be achieved by means of assessment under

observation, complemented with training appropriate to the related TA/sectoral scope and relevant educational background.

Recommendation by the CDM-AP to the Board:

N/A

Name of the authors of the query:

(a DOE)

Date when the request for clarification was received at UNFCCC secretariat:

28 October 2010

Date and meeting number of consideration by the CDM-AP:

CDM-AP 53, 14-17 March 2011



Response form for requests for clarification on accreditation-related documents

F-CDM-Acc_CLA number:

F-CDM-Acc_CLA_002

Document and version against which clarification is sought:

CDM Accreditation Standard v2.0

Text of the query:

Paragraph 166(a) of the CDM Accreditation Standard (version 02.0) states that “The DOE shall not have any direct relationship with its client other than validation and/or verification/certification work and third party conformity assessment”.

A clarification is sought on the definition of DOE in the context of paragraph 166(a). We understand that the DOE is the legal entity holding the CDM accreditation. A confirmation is sought that paragraph 166(a) does not apply to [the DOE’s] non central offices to which [the DOE] has allocated functions in accordance with paragraph 28 of the CDM Accreditation Standard and which belong to other legal entities belonging to [the mother company of the DOE] to which [the DOE] belongs.

Answer from CDM-AP to authors of request for clarification:

The restrictions imposed to a DOE in paragraph 166 (a) of the “CDM accreditation standard for operational entities” (ver. 2.0) (Standard) (i.e. not to have any direct relationship with a client other than validation and/or verification/certification and third party conformity assessment) shall also apply to the DOE's other sites as described in paragraph 28 (b) of the Standard.

Recommendation by the CDM-AP to the Board:

Issue a clarification on paragraph 166 (a) of the “CDM accreditation standard for operational entities” (ver. 2.0) (Standard) as follows:

The requirement of paragraph 166 (a) of the Standard is applicable to the DOE's other sites as described in paragraph 28 (b).

Name of the authors of the query:

(a DOE)

Date when the request for clarification was received at UNFCCC secretariat:

17 September 2010

Date and meeting number of consideration by the CDM-AP:

CDM-AP 53, 14-17 March 2011



Response form for requests for clarification on accreditation-related documents

F-CDM-Acc_CLA number:

F-CDM-Acc_CLA_003

Document and version against which clarification is sought:

CDM Accreditation Standard v2.0

Text of the query:

Can you give us clarification regards the requirements that we have to be applied for the extension of the qualification to other TAs of the same SS. This clarification is requested because on the accreditation standard (both in the text and in annex D) is mentioned just the requirements for the initial qualification, but what about the extensions? Have we to use the same requirements applied for the initial qualification also for the extension of qualification to other TAs of the same SS? I.E. for example if a person is qualified in TA 13.1 - waste handling and disposal according to the requirements of annex D of the accreditation standard, how can he/she extend his/her qualification to the TA 13.2-Animal waste management ? Have we to follow the same requirements described in annex D also for the qualification in the other TA 13.2 even if is an extension?

Answer from CDM-AP to authors of request for clarification:

Initial qualification does not refer to the first TA compared to additional TAs in the same SS. It refers to initial qualification in a given TA as compared to the confirmation of competence in this same TA (see paragraph 53 of the "CDM accreditation standard for operational entities" (ver. 2.0) (Standard)).

Qualification for additional technical areas (TAs) within the same sectoral scope (SS) is independent/separate from the qualification to the first TA. All qualification and competence requirements have to be met for each individual TAs, except for TAs with the same nomenclature (see paragraph 13 of annex D to the Standard).

Using the example in the request for clarification, a qualification in TA 13.2 would mean an automatic qualification to TA 15.2 for the qualified assessor/technical expert. However, for TA 13.1 the assessor/technical expert will require to be qualified separately as per the associated competence criteria established for this TA.

Recommendation by the CDM-AP to the Board:

N/A

Name of the authors of the query:

(a DOE)

Date when the request for clarification was received at UNFCCC secretariat:

1 December 2010

Date and meeting number of consideration by the CDM-AP:

CDM-AP 53, 14-17 March 2011



Response form for requests for clarification on accreditation-related documents

F-CDM-Acc_CLA number:	F-CDM-Acc_CLA_004
<i>Document and version against which clarification is sought:</i>	CDM Accreditation Standard v2.0
Text of the query:	
ANNEX D, point 5: is the term engagement intended like employment?	
Answer from CDM-AP to authors of request for clarification:	
No; the term "engagement" is defined in footnote 12 (related to paragraph 5) of annex D to the "CDM accreditation standard for operational entities" (ver. 2.0).	
Recommendation by the CDM-AP to the Board:	
N/A	
Name of the authors of the query:	(a DOE)
Date when the request for clarification was received at UNFCCC secretariat:	1 December 2010
Date and meeting number of consideration by the CDM-AP:	CDM-AP 53, 14-17 March 2011



Response form for requests for clarification on accreditation-related documents

F-CDM-Acc_CLA number:	F-CDM-Acc_CLA_005
<i>Document and version against which clarification is sought:</i>	CDM Accreditation Standard v2.0
Text of the query:	
Necessity of the presence of a qualified technical expert in an on-site visit. <i>(text is a summary of all queries received with regard to this issue)</i>	
Answer from CDM-AP to authors of request for clarification:	
<p>The CDM AP noted that version 1.1 of the “CDM accreditation standard for operational entities” (Standard) did not clearly stipulate the requirement on participation of the personnel having expertise in the relevant technical area in the on-site inspection. However, version 2.0 of the Standard has integrated a clarification on the issue and clearly requires (paragraph 60) that on-site visits carried out shall be attended by qualified technical experts.</p> <p>Therefore, the on-site visits carried out before 17 March 2011, in compliance with all applicable requirements, including the DOEs’ systems, do not have to be re-conducted because qualified technical experts did not attend the original on-site visits, even if a request for registration or issuance is submitted on or after 17 March 2011. However in such cases, the DOEs shall have suitable justification for how on-site visits were conducted effectively and how competence requirements met in the validation or verification.</p>	
Recommendation by the CDM-AP to the Board:	
N/A	
Name of the authors of the query:	(DOEs and other stakeholders)
Date when the request for clarification was received at UNFCCC secretariat:	Various dates
Date and meeting number of consideration by the CDM-AP:	CDM-AP 53, 14-17 March 2011



Response form for requests for clarification on accreditation-related documents

F-CDM-Acc_CLA number:

F-CDM-Acc_CLA_006

Document and version against which clarification is sought:

CDM Accreditation Standard v2.0

Text of the query:

The [author of the query] would kindly like to ask for clarification of the paragraph 166 f) of the Accreditation Standard:

“The DOE shall not use personnel who have been involved in, or have had relationships with the CDM PPs of, a CDM project activity under validation and/or verification/certification in any way within the last two years, to take part in validation and/or verification/certification work for the CDM project activity. If the person in question was involved in the development of a CDM project activity under validation and/or verification/certification, then the DOE shall not use such person at all;”

In particular [the DOE] is seeking clarification of the following terms/sections:

- Which position does the term “personnel” include? DOE personnel such as admin staff, auditors, experts, reviewer, approver, external experts, etc.?
- What is the exact meaning of the section “...involved in, or have had relationships with the CDM PPs of, a CDM project activity under validation and/or verification/certification in any way within the last two years...”?
- Does the wording “involved in” include tasks conducted within a DOE (e.g. preparation of proposals, assessments, etc.)?
- Does the term “relationships with a CDM PP” include DOE’s contract for a validation/verification with a PP and past engagement of auditors with that PP? As a consequence this would mean that the DOE personnel is limited to conduct only one validation or verification for the same client or involved PP within two years. And can subsequent verifications or SSC validations and the following verification(s) be conducted by the same auditor?
- Does the term “CDM PP” refer to and is accordance to the definition of the PDD guidance, i.e. this section of the Accreditation Standard is only applicable to parties named in Annex 1 of a PDD and paragraph 82 b of the Standard?

Answer from CDM-AP to authors of request for clarification:

• Which position does the term “personnel” include? DOE personnel such as admin staff, auditors, experts, reviewer, approver, external experts, etc.?

>> Any personnel who are used in validation or verification/certification activities.

• What is the exact meaning of the section “...involved in, or have had relationships with the CDM PPs of, a CDM project activity under validation and/or verification/certification in any way within the last two years...”?

>>Involvement or relationship with a CDM PP means any relationship other than the ones as part of a past or current DOE and third party conformity assessment.

• Does the wording “involved in” include tasks conducted within a DOE (e.g. preparation of proposals, assessments, etc.)?

>>No.

• Does the term “relationships with a CDM PP” include DOE’s contract for a validation/verification

with a PP and past engagement of auditors with that PP?

>>No.

As a consequence this would mean that the DOE personnel is limited to conduct only one validation or verification for the same client or involved PP within two years. And can subsequent verifications or SSC validations and the following verification(s) be conducted by the same auditor?

>>Yes.

• Does the term “CDM PP” refer to and is accordance to the definition of the PDD guidance, i.e. this section of the Accreditation Standard is only applicable to parties named in Annex 1 of a PDD and paragraph 82 b of the Standard?

>>The definition of “CDM project participant” is given in the “Glossary of CDM terms” (ver. 05).

Recommendation by the CDM-AP to the Board:

Issue a clarification on paragraph 166 (f) of the “CDM accreditation standard for operational entities” (ver. 2.0) as follows:

“Personnel” means any personnel who are used in validation or verification/certification activities.

Involvement or relationship with a CDM PP means any relationship other than the ones as part of a past or current DOE and third party conformity assessment.

Name of the authors of the query:

(a DOE)

Date when the request for clarification was received at UNFCCC secretariat:

6 January 2011

Date and meeting number of consideration by the CDM-AP:

CDM-AP 53, 14-17 March 2011



Response form for requests for clarification on accreditation-related documents

F-CDM-Acc_CLA number:

F-CDM-Acc_CLA_007

Document and version against which clarification is sought:

CDM Accreditation Standard v2.0

Text of the query:

PHD studies and direct work experience:

The accreditation standard version 2, EB 56, Annex 1, page 49, para 4 (a) states “direct work experience in the field (with a minimum of one year in a technical area and 3 years in a complex area) for technical areas within the sectoral scopes”. It is currently unclear whether PHD studies (5 years) which include direct research experience with involvement in the processes of specific facilities may be classified can be used to meet the criteria “direct work experience”. We ask that clarification be issued as to whether this direct research experience can be used to meet the criteria.

Answer from CDM-AP to authors of request for clarification:

PhD studies cannot be automatically considered as a direct working experience. Direct research experience leading to gain specific knowledge in the technical area within the CDM sectoral scope is comparable to direct work experience in the field/industry leading to gain of specific knowledge in processes and its suitability to meet competence requirements.

Recommendation by the CDM-AP to the Board:

N/A

Name of the authors of the query:

(a DOE)

Date when the request for clarification was received at UNFCCC secretariat:

12 January 2011

Date and meeting number of consideration by the CDM-AP:

CDM-AP 53, 14-17 March 2011



Response form for requests for clarification on accreditation-related documents

F-CDM-Acc_CLA number:

F-CDM-Acc_CLA_008

Document and version against which clarification is sought:

CDM Accreditation Standard v2.0

Text of the query:

The accreditation standard version 2 EB 56 Annex 1, page 49, Para 8 states “successful completion of a technical course and/or training programme appropriate to a technical area/sectoral scope”. The criteria “attendance to a technical training course” does not provide sufficient information into what constitutes a technical training course. We seek clarification into: a) How long does the course need to be to meet this criteria? b) Can an individual’s educational studies (Masters or higher) where a course/module is participated to (for a period of 6 months or more) in the technical area in question be used to meet this criteria.

Conclusion / Proposal (if any): Clarification from the EB would be appreciated. Justification: Please see above.

I would like to get clarification on para 8 of EB 56 annex 1 in page 49 stating, "Successful completion of a technical course and/or training programme appropriate to a technical area/sectoral scope". Does training programme mean attending workshop/seminar (with or without examination component) related to technical area/sectoral scope?

Answer from CDM-AP to authors of request for clarification:

The duration and type of training should be determined by the DOE in terms of knowledge that will be gained to meet the requirements. What is appropriate is left to the professional judgement of the DOE in the implementation of its own system with respect to competence of its personnel qualification.

Recommendation by the CDM-AP to the Board:

N/A

Name of the authors of the query:

(a DOE and a stakeholder)

Date when the request for clarification was received at UNFCCC secretariat:

12 January 2011
24 January 2011

Date and meeting number of consideration by the CDM-AP:

CDM-AP 53, 14-17 March 2011



Response form for requests for clarification on accreditation-related documents

F-CDM-Acc_CLA number:

F-CDM-Acc_CLA_009

Document and version against which clarification is sought:

CDM Accreditation Standard v2.0

Text of the query:

Title: Difficulty to qualify for complex technical areas

Details:

Annex D of the CDM Accreditation Standard (Version 2) aims to define simple, fair and measurable criteria when evaluating the competence and capabilities of the engaged personnel of individual DOEs and AEs. We would like to draw the panel's attention to the fact that the requirements make it more difficult for staff to qualify in complex technical areas, creating a burden for the CDM as a whole, since DOEs may not be able to guarantee sufficient qualified resources to meet the demand for verification and validation services for all types of activities.

CDM Accreditation Standard (Version 2) requires that at least one team member qualifies for the technical area. This requirement is considered to be reasonable and necessary for ensuring a full understanding of technical aspects of project activities, and is therefore not questioned by this request for clarification. However, the standard also prescribes that for complex technical areas, in-depth knowledge can only be confirmed, if an individual has at least three years of direct work experience in the industry. Thus, it excludes many other experts (e.g. those who have gathered experiences in consultancy work or project management in the same technical area – so-called related work experience) and consequently risks creating a very narrow group of experts in some niche sectors. We wish to note that not many experts, who have been engaged years in specific sectors, are willing to change their positions (metier) in those specific sectors and join a DOE given the unsecure future/outlook of post-2012 carbon markets. DOEs have already experienced the fact that some existing staff are no longer qualified for specific technical areas, and have found difficulties in identifying suitable experts for complex technical areas. Hence the DOE forum would like to make the Panel aware of this issue at an early stage.

Given the far reaching market implications for the CDM overall and given that fact that several DOEs have identified this requirement as an extremely limiting factor for complex technical areas we would like to seek clarification, whether AP considers this topic as closed or still open for further discussion, hopefully enabling options for additional demonstration of the coverage of expertise in complex technical areas in a possible revision of the standard?

Proposal incl. justification (if any):

We are convinced that there are other possibilities, which ensure that individual experts/auditors have the required expertise in such complex technical areas, like e.g.

- an examination and personal certification for complex technical areas by an independent assessment panel (e.g. engaged by the secretariat)
- attendance of training courses (with or without examination) offered or arranged or accepted by the UN or recognized authorities for persons with related work experiences
- other options to be elaborated..

Widening the group of available human resources is a crucial must for mastering the upcoming demand from project under development, especially when considering the challenges of the reported increase in verifications in 2012. The given proposal does not necessarily create a risk of reducing quality but rather gives options to engage people that demonstrate their capabilities by other means.

Answer from CDM-AP to authors of request for clarification:

The CDM-AP will invite the DOE/AIE coordination forum to interact with the CDM-AP at its next meeting and request the Forum beforehand to submit to the CDM-AP specific details of the issues concerned in relation to the paucity of qualified personnel in complex technical areas.

Recommendation by the CDM-AP to the Board:

N/A

Name of the authors of the query:	DOE/AIE coordination forum
Date when the request for clarification was received at UNFCCC secretariat:	26 January 2011 1 March 2011
Date and meeting number of consideration by the CDM-AP:	CDM-AP 53, 14-17 March 2011



Response form for requests for clarification on accreditation-related documents

F-CDM-Acc_CLA number:

F-CDM-Acc_CLA_010

Document and version against which clarification is sought:

CDM Accreditation Standard v2.0

Text of the query:

The revised “CDM Accreditation Standard for Operational Entities” (Version 02, Annex 1 to the EB 56 Report, hereinafter “the Standard”), which will be in effect from March 17, 2011, requires, depending on the complexity of the technical area, working experience, which shall be demonstrated through one or a combination of the three requirements. Para. 4.c states “Qualification through validation/verification activities by means of under-training and successful under-observation assessments in a technical area within a sectoral scope” Note 11 states “For initial qualification based on the number of validation and verification experience the following is required: (a) Two numbers of validation/verification activities as Assessor Under-Training, accompanying a validator/verifier already qualified for the technical area within the sectoral scope in question; (b) Followed by a successful performance of two numbers of validation/verification activities under observation of a qualified validator/verifier/technical expert in the technical area within the sectoral scope in question.”

Conclusion / Proposal (if any): We would kindly suggest, that paragraph a) of Note 11 could be amended including the possibility of a technical expert as a proper tutor of qualification through validation/verification activities, as its judgement about performance and knowledge of candidates to be qualified can be considered. Thus, paragraph a) of Note 11 shall be as (a) Two numbers of validation/verification activities as Assessor Under-Training, accompanying a validator/verifier/technical expert already qualified for the technical area within the sectoral scope in question.

Justification: We believe that this modification ensures the credibility, strength and consistency of the system as ensuring compliance, inter alia, paragraph 44 of the CDM Accreditation Standard for Operational Entities. Moreover, this scenario does not alter the Qualification process because the applicant to be qualified will cover the whole process under the supervision and training of at least one member of validation or verification team qualified in the technical area, as specific knowledge and proper judgement about under-training technician performance is provided by a validator / verifier or a technical expert

Answer from CDM-AP to authors of request for clarification:

The CDM-AP agreed to keep this suggestion for further consideration in case a revision of the “CDM accreditation standard for operational entities” (ver. 2.0) is undertaken.

Recommendation by the CDM-AP to the Board:

N/A

Name of the authors of the query:	(a DOE)
Date when the request for clarification was received at UNFCCC secretariat:	28 January 2011
Date and meeting number of consideration by the CDM-AP:	CDM-AP 53, 14-17 March 2011



Response form for requests for clarification on accreditation-related documents

F-CDM-Acc_CLA number:

F-CDM-Acc_CLA_011

Document and version against which clarification is sought:

CDM Accreditation Standard v2.0

Text of the query:

I would like to know are there more specific definitions about the directed & related work experience stated in the EB56 Report Annex1, Annex D A(2)4(a).

Answer from CDM-AP to authors of request for clarification:

Definitions of direct work experience and related work experience are given in paragraphs 4(a) and (b) and 5, including footnote 12, in annex D to the "CDM accreditation standard for operational entities" (ver. 2.0) (Standard).

Recommendation by the CDM-AP to the Board:

N/A

Name of the authors of the query:

(a stakeholder)

Date when the request for clarification was received at UNFCCC secretariat:

29 January 2011

Date and meeting number of consideration by the CDM-AP:

CDM-AP 53, 14-17 March 2011