

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

## **Sixty-first meeting of the CDM-AP**

**14–17 August 2012**

### CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
I. INTRODUCTION	2
II. STATUS OF APPLICATIONS	2
III. CASE-SPECIFIC ISSUES	2
IV. UPDATE ON WORK OF THE CDM-AP	2
V. EXPERT RESOURCES	3
VI. FURTHER SCHEDULE OF THE CDM-AP	3
ANNEX 1 - GUIDELINES FOR THE CDM-AP DECISION-MAKING (VERSION 02.0)	

## **I. Introduction**

1. This report of the CDM Accreditation Panel (CDM-AP) covers the period from 22 June 2012 to 17 August 2012, including its sixty-first meeting (14–17 August 2012).

## **II. Status of applications**

2. The total number of entities currently under consideration by the CDM-AP is 46, including 41 designated operational entities (DOEs)<sup>1</sup> and five applicant entities (AEs).

3. In terms of geographical distribution, out of the 46 entities currently under consideration, the highest number of entities, 28, is from the Asia and Pacific region, followed by 15 from the Western Europe and Other regions. One entity is from Africa and two are from the Latin America and Caribbean region.

4. A total of 23 entities are based in non-Annex I Parties, including 20 entities from the Asia and Pacific region, one from Africa and two from the Latin America and Caribbean region. With respect to individual countries, six entities are from the Republic of Korea, eight are from China, four from India, one from Thailand, one from Brazil, one from Colombia, one from Malaysia and one from South Africa.

## **III. Case-specific issues**

5. The CDM-AP considered a spot-check assessment case and agreed on its scope. No recommendation will be submitted to the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism (hereinafter referred to as the Board) at this time.

6. The CDM-AP considered an initial accreditation assessment case. No recommendation will be submitted to the Board at this time.

7. The CDM-AP considered six on-going re-accreditation assessment cases. Recommendations on two cases will be submitted to the Board under confidentiality.

8. The CDM-AP considered three regular on-site surveillances of central offices and non-central sites. A notification on one case will be submitted to the Board under confidentiality.

9. The CDM-AP considered 14 performance assessments. Notifications on 11 cases will be submitted to the Board under confidentiality.

10. The CDM-AP considered an additional focused desk review assessment. A notification will be submitted to the Board under confidentiality.

11. The CDM-AP considered six notifications on changes. A recommendation on one case will be submitted to the Board under confidentiality.

12. The CDM-AP considered three complaints against DOEs. No recommendation will be submitted to the Board at this time.

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

13. In accordance with the “Modalities and procedures for direct communication with stakeholders”, the CDM-AP interacted with the DOE/AIE Coordination Forum representative. The subject of this interaction was limited to policy issues, particularly on the CDM accreditation standard and the CDM accreditation procedure and did not include case-specific issues.

14. The CDM-AP took note of the inputs reported by the Chair of the DOE/AIE Coordination Forum, Mr. Werner Betzenbichler, who elaborated the input provided by entities on the following:

---

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

- (a) Revision of CDM accreditation procedure, including request for sharing analysis for further strengthening the accreditation system with the DOE/AIE Coordination Forum;
- (b) Revision of CDM accreditation standard – Phase II, including proposal to add a comparative analysis between CDM and other standards and to offer further options regarding competence requirements;
- (c) Revision of DOE performance monitoring procedure including provision for calculation of indicator and a request to inform DOEs as early as possible;
- (d) Request to integrate the DOE/AIE Coordination Forum in the development of various regulatory documents;
- (e) Request to make available to DOEs the respective accreditation assessment plans.

15. The CDM-AP thanked the DOE/AIE Coordination Forum for its input and encouraged the forum to continue to raise similar issues in the future.

16. In line with the CDM-AP workplan for 2012, the CDM-AP held its second direct interaction with the joint implementation accreditation panel (JI-AP). During the joint session the panels considered an update by the secretariat on the recent developments in the CDM and JI processes, including a briefing on implementation of a project to improve CDM accreditation system. In this context, the panels provided input on the alignment and on possible integration of the CDM and JI accreditation processes. The panels also provided input on the proposed modalities of the accreditation panels work and on the common SDM accreditation roster of experts.

17. The CDM-AP considered three requests for clarifications submitted by DOEs on the CDM accreditation standard, and provided feedback to the secretariat on the draft responses.

18. The CDM-AP considered the latest versions of the DOE performance monitoring reports for the periods from 1 January to 30 June 2011 and from 1 July to 31 December 2011. In accordance with the “Procedure on performance monitoring of designated operational entities”, the CDM-AP reviewed the number and nature of performance assessments, the number of non-central sites to be assessed and the areas to be assessed during regular on-site surveillance assessments of the central offices and non-central sites.

19. The CDM-AP revised the Guidelines for the CDM-AP decision-making, as contained in Annex 1 to this report, and finalized its work on the first version of the Compendium of the CDM-AP decision-making practices, submitted to Board under confidentiality. These documents are submitted to the Board for its consideration.

## **V. Expert resources**

20. The CDM-AP considered a regular report on the qualifications and performance of the CDM-AT leaders and members. The CDM-AP agreed on a number of changes to the status of members on the accreditation roster of experts (AROE).

21. The CDM-AP considered a status update and provided feedback to the secretariat on the development of an online training for the members of the AROE.

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

22. The Board may wish to note that the sixty-second meeting of the CDM-AP is scheduled for 15 – 18 October 2012.

23. The CDM-AP would like to request the Board to extend duration of its sixty-second meeting from four to five days, to be allocated for policy discussion related to practices of the CDM-AP decision-making, its operations and the code of conduct.

-----

# **GUIDELINES FOR CDM ACCREDITATION PANEL DECISION-MAKING**

**(Version 02.0)**

## **I. Introduction**

1. In accordance with the Procedure for accrediting operational entities by the Executive Board of the Clean Development Mechanism (version 10.1)<sup>1</sup> (CDM accreditation procedure), the CDM accreditation panel (CDM-AP) “serves as the technical panel of the Board<sup>2</sup> in accordance with its terms of reference<sup>3</sup> and makes recommendations to the Board on effective implementation of the accreditation process.”
2. In accordance with the CDM accreditation procedure, when considering accreditation assessment cases the CDM-AP submits recommendations and notifications to the Board as well as other decisions in undertaking other activities as required by the CDM accreditation procedure, as outlined in paragraphs 20, 21, 36, 37, 57, 58, 86, 87, 91, 113, 114, 132 and others of that procedure.
3. In this document, the actions mentioned in paragraph 2 above are referred to as CDM-AP decisions.
4. Following a request from the Board<sup>4</sup> for the development and maintenance of a guidance document to support the consistency of the CDM-AP decision-making process, the CDM-AP has agreed to:
  - (a) Establish a compendium of CDM-AP decision-making practices (compendium),<sup>5</sup>
  - (b) Implement enhanced information-recording practices.
5. With the actions outlined in paragraph 4 above, the CDM-AP aims to ensure consistency, fairness, transparency and efficiency in its decision-making process.
6. It is acknowledged that each accreditation assessment case is to be handled on its own merit taking into account the specificity of the case. Thus, these guidelines do not contain mandatory requirements for the CDM-AP, nor do they introduce any new accreditation requirements beyond those contained in the CDM accreditation standard for operational entities<sup>6</sup> (version 04) (CDM accreditation standard), or procedural steps beyond those contained in the CDM accreditation procedure.

## **II. Modalities of CDM-AP consideration of accreditation assessment cases and recording of decisions**

7. At each meeting, when considering an accreditation assessment case, the CDM-AP should take into account the following:
  - (a) The assessment reports produced by the assessment team (CDM-AT), comments and documents provided by the applicant entity (AE) or the designated operational entity (DOE), as required by the CDM accreditation procedure;
  - (b) The compendium;

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Procedures/accr\\_proc01.pdf](http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Procedures/accr_proc01.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> Executive Board of the Clean Development Mechanism (Board)

<sup>3</sup> Terms of reference of the support structure of the CDM Executive Board (version 01), [http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Procedures/panels\\_proc02.pdf](http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Procedures/panels_proc02.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> Workplans of the CDM-AP, 2011 and 2012

<sup>5</sup> The compendium is currently under drafting by the CDM-AP, and will be made available to the Board once finalized by the CDM-AP.

<sup>6</sup> [http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Standards/accr\\_stan01.pdf](http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Standards/accr_stan01.pdf)

- (c) Previous CDM-AP decisions taken in past similar cases, as contained in the records referred to in paragraph 8 below;
- (d) Other information relevant to the case, such as the result of the DOE performance monitoring pursuant to the “Procedure on performance monitoring of designated operational entities”.

8. CDM-AP decisions should be recorded in writing, including the reasoning behind them. The record should include sufficient information to enable the CDM-AP to consider its decisions taken in past cases, as outlined in paragraph 7(c) above, and to enable the regular review of records, as outlined in paragraph 9 below.

### III. Maintenance of the compendium

9. The CDM-AP, with the support of the secretariat, should review the records of CDM-AP decisions on a six-monthly basis, with a view to updating the decision-making practices contained in the compendium.

10. The compendium is to be treated as confidential, and is to be made available to the Board after each revision.

11. Consolidated practices contained in the compendium should be incorporated into the CDM accreditation procedure at its next revision, as appropriate.

- - - - -

#### History of the document

Version	Date	Nature of revision(s)
02.0	27 August 2012	Revisions include: Paragraph 2 was revised to clarify the references to the CDM accreditation procedure. Paragraph 10 was changed; the compendium is to be kept confidential.
01.0	EB 66 02 March 2012	Initial publication.
<b>Decision Class:</b> Operational <b>Document Type:</b> Guideline <b>Business Function:</b> Governance, Accreditation		