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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 DOE's 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?