

Seventh CDM Roundtable

Break-out Session IIB: Accreditation standard and Procedure Wrap-up

Bonn, Germany, 20 April 2013



Wrap-up – Procedure

1. Modalities to determine the number of performance assessments

- Option 1 has the benefit of being predictable
- Recommend an hybrid option taking into account:
 - Mandatory basis of PAs
 - Volume of work
 - Outcomes of the Performance Monitoring
 - (not the number of accredited sectoral scopes)
- Implement some enabling or capacity-building measures (outside the Procedure)

2. General principles for decision-making on NCs

- Agree on the general approach, but clarify some terms:
 - Critical NC
 - Recurring NC (time, entity/group companies, requirements)
- A failure to follow any provision of the Procedure should not always lead to an “under-observation” measure



Wrap-up – Procedure

3. Conditions of, and assessment process to lift, “under-observation” and suspension
 - Conditions for “under-observation” and “suspension” are too strong – especially ‘under observation’ – impact perceived to be very harsh
 - Other incentives should be used for “under-observation”, e.g. the public notification could be sufficient
 - Consider impact on PPs and projects – i.e. allow submissions reg/issuance by DOEs under observation (but observe those submissions)
 - Preventing DOEs continuing to work on assessments when under suspension is not reasonable
 - Clarify whether an on-site assessment should always be conducted to lift and “under-observation”
 - Define/adjust the process for lifting an “under-observation” as a result of not following a provision of the Procedure



Consider *positive* measures to incentivise good performance

4. Complaint and independent review processes

- Independent review of CDM-AP recommendations (Appendix 4):
 - Ensure the independency of the panel and experts selected
 - The independent panel should recommend whether the recommendation of the AP should be upheld (rather than the EB), and the final EB decision should follow the assumption that the independent panel's recommendation is upheld

- Fine with the two other processes: Complaint against a DOE (Appendix 5) and Request of independent review of final assessment report [NCs] [conclusions] [recommendations] (Appendix 6)

5. Other issues submitted by DIA

- Ensure rotation of CDM-ATs for different assessments of a same DOE (to avoid familiarity, COI)
- Review the structure of fees – suggested standard fixed cost for Pas, and pay directly to the UNFCCC rather than individuals
- Ensure calibration of CDM-ATs

1. Competence requirements

- There is not enough time to really internalize the proposed approach, and no need to rush to adopt a new Standard. More time is needed to improve the proposal and make it deliver what is expected
- The sectoral technical knowledge may be too prescriptive, or not all the prescribed knowledge in a given SS should be required
- The reclassification of methodologies with new SSs is seen as requiring much more expertise than the current Standard
- There should not be two systems/approaches for competence qualification system running in parallel
- Grandfathering of already qualified personnel should be applied
- The necessity of having all SS expertise for on-site visits should be reviewed

1. Competence requirements (cont.)

- The proposal in paragraph 56(a) for demonstrating competence should be reviewed
- The approach in 56(b) is ok, but more practical guidelines should be provided

2. Use of external resources

- Outsourcing to non-group companies (for technical expertise) could be removed as this may be fulfilled by using external individuals