

**CDM-AP64-A01**

## Information note

---

# DOE/AIE coordination forum presentation

Version 01.1

DOE/AE Forum | *Werner Betzenbichler* | *April 2013*

AP-64

Interaction with DOE Forum

## Topics

- Revisions
  - to the accreditation standard
  - and accreditation procedure
- Overlapping issues

## **General Comments on the Revision of Accreditation Docs**

- A lot of work has been put into this
- Contains many good solutions
- Should toughen the accreditation system up to be applied for long time in CDM (even after completion of Marrakech Accords Review)...
- ...but also in other schemes (JI, NMM, FVA, NAMA etc.)
- This is the priority compared to meeting any deadlines

## AS – Competence Requirements

- Priorities have changed:
  - During the last years it was important **that** additional experts can qualify as verifier/validators
  - Now it is consider important **how** experts can qualify as verifier/validators
- Proposed approach is considered as a more or less radical change compared to the recent one

## AS – Competence Requirements (2)

- Aspects that need further consideration:
  - “grandfathering for recent staff” – e.g. by keeping qualification criteria for staff that has been appointed under version 4
  - Focus on skills to plan and perform validation and verification activities instead of “wasted knowledge” for formal completion of on-site teams
  - Risks of negative impacts on transaction costs (extension of teams, availability of resources)
  - Coverage of competences at time of accreditation

## **AS – Competence Requirements (3)**

- **Some recommendations:**
  - Ensure that by the transition no DOE will lose a technical scope (negative signal to the market)
  - Ensure common understanding of AP, DOEs and assessment teams on the “interpretation” of competence requirements
  - Develop (jointly) guidelines and best practice examples that enable an appropriate and harmonized implementation

## AS – Further Aspects

- Outsourcing to non-group companies can be taken out
- Contractual requirements to reflect business reality  
(international contracts are frequently burdened by bureaucracy)
- Overcome inappropriate regulations of M & P (e.g. §98 publication of a procedure to allocate responsibility)
- “professional relationship” to a client should not include auditing when assessing CoI

## AP – Performance Assessment

- Workshop showed preference for “hybrid option”
  - Predefined amount of assessments with scope depending on actual performance and volume of activities
  - No link to scopes of accreditation
  - Consider randomly selected activities (including PoA, re-validations, activity changes)
- One assessment report and assessment to be performed in an pre-defined time frame

## **AP – Performance Assessment (2)**

- Define procedure for “non-operating” entities, e.g. a witnessed activity at restart of operations
- Avoid “double-punishment” by spot-checks and additional performance assessments
- Consider linking/combination of regular surveillance and performance assessment activities

## **AP – Under observation/ suspension/ withdrawal**

- Restrictions are too tough
- Restriction of “under observation” might even disable the observation
- “under observation” may have implications to risk-based approach
- Stoppage of validation and verification work is at risk of DOE under suspension but can not be checked and should not be prohibited

## **AP – Further aspects**

- Missing definitions and regulations (e.g. critical systematic persistent, scope of spot checks, lifting of status)
- Independence of the independent review process
- Approach of request to review of a final assessment report is very much welcomed

## Overlapping issues

- Still some leeway for subjective decisions/recommendations by AT members
- CoI when recommending re-visits
- Request for creating a fee structure that is independent of travel costs

**Take the time that is needed for revising these documents**

**Thank you for your attention!**

Werner Betzenbichler  
Chair of the DOE/AIE Forum

[Werner.Betzenbichler@bece-experts.com](mailto:Werner.Betzenbichler@bece-experts.com)

- - - - -

### Document information

---

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
01.1	30 April 2013	Editorial changes
01.0	30 April 2013	CDM-AP 64, Annex 1 Initial publication

---

Decision Class: Operational  
Document Type: Information note  
Business Function: Accreditation  
Keywords: DOE forum, communications

---