

Ninth CDM Roundtable

CDM accreditation standard, v5

Bonn, Germany, 23 August 2013



Index

- Background
 - Timelines
 - Purpose of the revision
 - Main open issues in the EB 73 draft
- Work in progress for EB 75
- Impacts
- Next steps



Background - Timeline

- **Concept note:** CDM-AP 62 (Oct 2012), CDM-AP 63 (Feb 2013), EB 72 (Feb 2013)
- **Zero draft:** 7th CDM roundtable (Apr 2013), CDM-AP 64 (Apr 2013)
- **First draft:** EB 73 (May 2013)
- **Second draft:** CDM-AP 65, JI-AP 29, RT9
- Upcoming EB 75 (Sept 2013): **expected adoption.**



Background - Purpose

Objectives of the revision:

1. Contribute to **strengthening DOEs' competence and performance**;
2. **Streamline the requirements** in the Standard in order to have cost-effective, objective, clear and highly effective requirements;
3. **Strengthen and make the standard more comparable** with other accreditation schemes.



Main open issues in the EB 73 draft... and what was done

- **List of sectoral scopes:** number too high
→ number reduced from 31 to 18.
- **Tagging of methodologies:** requiring too much expertise
→ tagging was revised and meths are now tagged to less scopes.
- **Sector technical knowledge:** too prescriptive
→ was revised and divided into general/specific knowledge.
- **Team present on-site:** too demanding
→ addressed with the revised tagging of meths.
- **Demonstration of competence:** to be elaborated
→ proposed to be elaborated in consultation with DOEs before the entry into force of the new standard.
- **Transitional provisions:** to be further elaborated
→ elaborated; dependent on list of SS/tagging. Entry into force TBD.



Work in progress, for EB 75

Few open questions on:

- List of SS and tagging
- Demonstration of competence
- Outsourcing
- Transitional provisions

Objectives of this consultation:

- Obtain **input and feedback** on the 4 areas and on other issues, if required.



Next steps

- New draft by 16 September
- Expected adoption at EB 75 (30/09 - 04/10)



Impacts

- For AE/DOEs:
Clearer and streamlined requirements, reducing cost of acquiring/maintaining accreditation and increasing the level of compliance with requirements.
- For the Board, CDM-AP and the secretariat:
Enhanced effectiveness and efficiency of the accreditation process.
- For the CDM:
Enhanced DOEs' competence and performance.



1. List of SS and meth tagging

- Background:
 - Existing SS list: 16 SS. First draft: 31. Second draft: 18.
 - Meth tagging: change in of 40 (20%) of meths.
 - Advantages: (less overlaps between SS → more accurate meth tagging) → more accurate required sector technical knowledge → increased competence.
 - Disadvantages: changes in v/v teams; IT systems
- Pending questions:
 - a. **What are the positive and negative impacts of changing the list of SS and the methodologies tagging?**
 - b. **Is the change of SS/tagging worthwhile?**



1. List of SS and meth tagging – CDM-AP input

- The CDM-AP suggested to reconsider the need to change definition of the sectoral scopes, as it may impose significant costs on the DOEs.
- The CDM-AP also suggested confirm the costs and benefits of this proposal with the DOEs.



2. Demonstration of competence

- Background:
 - Change from prescriptive requirements to competence requirements.
 - Need for tools that ensure a consistent implementation across DOEs and a consistent and fair assessment by CDM assessment teams.
 - Methods (para 96) (chicken & egg)
 - Additional guidance: reference values, others (consistency)
- Pending questions:
 - a. Para 96: Does the proposal address the chicken&egg concern?***
 - b. Cover note: Are there other principles for the demonstration of competence that could already be taken into account?***



2. Demonstration of competence – CDM-AP input

- The CDM-AP endorsed the current proposal in paragraph 96(a), whilst suggesting that the "equivalent evaluation" be further clarified.
- The CDM-AP also suggested to review the use of open qualifiers, such as "not limited to" in paragraph 96(b).
- The CDM-AP also called for an expedited development of the guidance to demonstrate and assess competence, with possible use of interviews, case-studies, mock up activities and examinations



3. Outsourcing

- Background:
 - EB 73 request: Outsourcing for all functions that may be outsourced should be allowed to any other legal entities.
 - Paragraph 65: Outsourcing provisions merge & mix the previous “non central sites” and “subcontracting” provisions.
 - Paragraph 23: functions of management vs outsourcing provisions
- Pending questions:
 - a. Para 65: Should it be allowed for DOEs to outsource the demonstration and evaluation of competence?***
 - b. Para 23: How could the functions of management be defined, particularly in the context of outsourcing?***



3. Outsourcing – CDM-AP input

- The CDM-AP recommended not to outsource management functions.
- The CDM-AP also agreed that demonstration and evaluation of competence of personnel should be considered as management function and should not be outsourced (delete 65(a)).
- Some CDM-AP members expressed concerns with the outsourcing to any legal entity (as opposed to outsourcing to group companies), while others considered it to be beneficial to the system.
- In the case outsourcing is allowed to any legal entity, the CDM-AP recommended that the Standard not allow technical review to be outsourced (delete 65(f)).
- It was also suggested to delete paragraphs 66 and 68, as they are redundant and should be covered by paragraph 64.



4. Transitional provisions

- Background:
 - Several options presented in section 15, for the transition of:
 - Personnel
 - Accreditation status
 - List of SS/tagging
 - Accreditation assessments
 - Paragraph 5: Entry into force TBD.
- Pending questions:
 - a. Section 15 : Within the several options in the text, what is the preferred approach?***
 - b. Para 5: What is the preferred entry into force date?***



4. Transitional provisions – CDM-AP input

- The CDM-AP recommended that the mandatory compliance date of version 5 be placed nine to eighteen months after the document's adoption by the Board.
- The CDM-AP recommended that all entities be assessed for compliance by the mandatory compliance date. The CDM-AP also provided suggestions on the options under transitional provisions.



5. Others: overall text, sector technical knowledge

- Any other feedback?



5. Others: overall text, sector technical knowledge – CDM-AP input

- The CDM-AP recommended to remove paragraph 109 and, in paragraph 166, request the appeals procedure to be made publicly available.



Thank you



Summary of guiding questions

1. List of sectoral scopes & tagging of methodologies (*appendix 1*)
 - a. What are the positive and negative impacts of changing the list of SS and the methodologies tagging?
 - b. Is the change of SS/tagging worthwhile?

2. Demonstration of competence
 - a. *Para 96*: Does the proposal address the chicken & egg concern?
 - b. *Cover note*: Are there other principles for the demonstration of competence that could already be taken into account?



Summary of guiding questions

3. Outsourcing

- a. *Para 65*: Should it be allowed for DOEs to outsource the demonstration and evaluation of competence?
- b. *Para 23*: How could the functions of management be defined, particularly in the context of outsourcing?

4. Transitional provisions

- a. *Section 15* : Within the several options in the text, what is the preferred approach?
- b. *Para 5*: What is the preferred entry into force date?

5. Others: overall text, sector technical knowledge

- a. Any other feedback?
-

