

CDM-AP65

Meeting report

CDM Accreditation Panel sixty-fifth meeting

Version 01.1

Date of meeting: 19 to 22 August 2013

Place of meeting: Bonn, Germany



United Nations
Framework Convention on
Climate Change

TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page
AGENDA ITEM 1. AGENDA AND MEETING ORGANIZATION	3
Agenda item 1.1. Opening.....	3
Agenda item 1.2. Adoption of the agenda.....	3
AGENDA ITEM 2. GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT MATTERS	3
Agenda item 2.1. Membership issues	3
Agenda item 2.2. Planning issues.....	3
Agenda item 2.3. Performance management	4
Agenda item 2.4. Matters related to the Panel.....	4
AGENDA ITEM 3. RULINGS (CASE-SPECIFIC).....	4
AGENDA ITEM 4. REGULATORY MATTERS	5
Agenda item 4.1. Standards/tools	5
Agenda item 4.2. Procedures.....	5
AGENDA ITEM 5. OTHER MATTERS	6
AGENDA ITEM 6. CONCLUSION OF THE MEETING	6

Agenda item 1. Agenda and meeting organization

Agenda item 1.1. Opening

1. Ms. Natalie Kushko, Chair of the Clean Development Mechanism Accreditation Panel (hereinafter referred to as the CDM-AP), opened the meeting.
2. The table below represents the attendance of members at the meeting.

Table 1. Attendance

Chair and Vice-Chair	Members
Ms. Natalie Kushko (Chair)	Mr. Anil Jauhri
Mr. Hussein Badarin (Vice-Chair)	Mr. Michael Rumberg
	Mr. Abderrahmane Naas
	Ms. Ann Marie Bowles
	Mr. Adelino R J Esparta

3. The CDM-AP noted that Mr. Thomas Facklam was unable to attend the meeting. Mr. Facklam provided proper justification for his absence.
4. On behalf of the CDM-AP, the Chair expressed deep appreciation to the outgoing members Mr. Hernán Carlino, Mr. Vinay M. Deodhar, Mr. Stanford Mwakasonda, Mr. Takashi Otsubo and Ms. Marine Shvangiradze, and welcomed new members as well as the rest of the members of CDM-AP.

Agenda item 1.2. Adoption of the agenda

5. The CDM-AP adopted the agenda of the 65th meeting.

Agenda item 2. Governance and management matters

Agenda item 2.1. Membership issues

6. The CDM-AP considered information provided by members with respect to any potential conflict of interest.
7. The CDM-AP considered a presentation by the secretariat on the modalities of operations of the support structure of the CDM Executive Board (the Board), including the CDM-AP.

Agenda item 2.2. Planning issues

8. The CDM-AP considered an update on the progress of implementation of its 2013 workplan and the remaining activities for the second half of the year.

Agenda item 2.3. Performance management

9. The CDM-AP took note of a report on the designated operational entity (DOE) performance monitoring data: version 3.0 for period 5 (1 January 2012 to 30 June 2012) and version 1.0 for period 6 (1 July 2012 to 31 December 2013).
10. The CDM-AP took note of a report on the implementation of DOE assessment plans.
11. The CDM-AP took note of a report on visits deviating from the default duration of four person-days.
12. The CDM-AP took note of a report on delays of more than seven days that took place in on-going assessments.
13. The CDM-AP took note of a report on performance of the CDM assessment team leaders and members and agreed on the qualification and use of individual experts.

Agenda item 2.4. Matters related to the Panel

14. In the context of the joint meeting with the Joint Implementation Accreditation Panel (JI-AP), the CDM-AP took note of a presentation by the CDM-AP Chair on the outcomes of the 73rd and 74th meetings of the Board.
15. In the context of the joint meeting with the JI-AP, the CDM-AP took note of a presentation by the JI-AP Chair on the recent developments in the JI accreditation process.
16. In the context of the joint meeting with the JI-AP, the CDM-AP took note of a presentation by the secretariat on the recent CDM round table.
17. The CDM-AP took note of a report from the secretariat on electronic decisions conducted since the last CDM-AP meeting.

Agenda item 3. Rulings (case-specific)

18. The CDM-AP considered three spot checks. Recommendations on two cases will be submitted to the Board under confidentiality.
19. The CDM-AP considered three initial accreditation cases. Recommendations on two cases will be submitted to the Board under confidentiality.
20. The CDM-AP considered nine reaccreditation cases. Recommendations on three cases will be submitted to the Board under confidentiality.
21. The CDM-AP considered five regular surveillance assessments of central offices and non-central sites. Notifications on three cases will be submitted to the Board under confidentiality.
22. The CDM-AP considered 28 performance assessments. Notifications on 25 cases will be submitted to the Board under confidentiality.
23. The CDM-AP considered 20 notifications of change. A notification on one case will be submitted to the Board under confidentiality.

24. The CDM-AP considered two letters on other issues. No recommendation will be submitted to the Board at this time.

Agenda item 4. Regulatory matters

Agenda item 4.1. Standards/tools

25. This agenda item was considered in conjunction with the JI-AP. The CDM-AP considered a draft revised CDM accreditation standard prepared by the secretariat and provided the following inputs:
- (a) On the definition of sectoral scopes: The CDM-AP suggested reconsidering the need to change the definition of the sectoral scopes, as it may impose significant costs on the DOEs. The CDM-AP also suggested confirming the costs and benefits of this proposal with the DOEs;
 - (b) On the demonstration of competence: 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 reviewing the use of open qualifiers, such as "not limited to" in paragraph 96(b). The CDM-AP also called for the expedited development of the guidance to demonstrate and assess competence, with the possible use of interviews, case studies, mock-up activities and examinations;
 - (c) On outsourcing: The CDM-AP recommended that management functions not be outsourced. The CDM-AP also agreed that the demonstration and evaluation of competence of personnel should be considered a management function and should not be outsourced (i.e. paragraph 65(a) should be deleted). Some CDM-AP members expressed concerns with outsourcing to any legal entity (as opposed to outsourcing to group companies), while others considered it to be beneficial to the system. In the event that outsourcing to any legal entity is permitted, the CDM-AP recommended that the accreditation standard not allow technical reviews to be outsourced (i.e. paragraph 65(f) should be deleted). It was also suggested that paragraphs 66 and 68 be deleted, as they are redundant and should be covered by paragraph 64;
 - (d) On transitional provisions: The CDM-AP recommended that the mandatory compliance date of version 5 be placed nine to 18 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;
 - (e) On other matters: The CDM-AP recommended that paragraph 109 be removed, and, with respect to paragraph 166, requested that the appeals procedure be made publicly available.

Agenda item 4.2. Procedures

26. The CDM-AP took note of a presentation by the secretariat on the revised accreditation procedure adopted by the Board at its last meeting (EB 74) and provided input on the transitional measures currently being prepared by the secretariat.

27. The CDM-AP took note of a presentation by the secretariat on the revised procedure to monitor the performance of DOEs, adopted by the Board at its previous meeting.

Agenda item 5. Other matters

28. The CDM-AP, in accordance with its workplan for 2013, conducted a joint session with the JI-AP. The accreditation panels took note of presentations on on-going developments in the CDM and JI accreditation processes, and provided input to the secretariat on the revision of regulatory documents, including a concept note on options for the strategic direction of the JI accreditation system, the draft revised CDM accreditation standard, the revised CDM accreditation procedure and the revised CDM procedure to monitor the performance of DOEs.
29. The CDM-AP requested the secretariat to explore the option of scheduling the next CDM-AP meeting from 8 to 11 October 2013.

Agenda item 6. Conclusion of the meeting

30. The CDM-AP approved the internal and external reports of its 65th meeting.
31. The CDM-AP Chair closed the meeting and thanked all panel members and the secretariat for their dedication and excellent work.

- - - - -

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
01.1	29 August 2013	Editorial and format changes.
01.1	23 August 2013	CDM-AP 65 meeting report.

Decision Class: Operational
Document Type: Meeting report
Business Function: Governance
Keywords: AP, reporting procedures
