

CDM-AP 72

Meeting report

CDM Accreditation Panel seventy-second meeting

Version 01.0

Date of meeting: 2–4 June 2015

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	3
Agenda item 2.4.	Matters related to the Panel.....	4
AGENDA ITEM 3.	RULINGS (CASE-SPECIFIC MATTERS).....	4
AGENDA ITEM 4.	REGULATORY MATTERS	4
Agenda item 4.1.	Standards.....	4
Agenda item 4.2.	Procedures.....	5
AGENDA ITEM 5.	OTHER MATTERS	6
AGENDA ITEM 6.	CONCLUSION OF THE MEETING	7

Agenda item 1. Agenda and meeting organization

Agenda item 1.1. Opening

1. Mr. Martin Enderlin, Chair of the Clean Development Mechanism Accreditation Panel (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
Mr. Martin Enderlin (Chair)	Mr. Adelino Ricardo Esparta
Mr. Arthur Rolle (Vice-Chair)	Mr. Anil Jauhri
	Ms. Ann Marie Bowles
	Ms. Veronica Garcia Malo (International Accreditation Forum advisor)

3. The CDM-AP noted that Mr. Abderrahmane Naas was unable to attend the meeting. Mr. Naas provided proper justification for his absence.

Agenda item 1.2. Adoption of the agenda

4. The CDM-AP adopted the agenda of the 72nd meeting as presented.

Agenda item 2. Governance and management matters

Agenda item 2.1. Membership issues

5. The CDM-AP considered information provided by members with respect to any potential conflict of interest.

Agenda item 2.2. Planning issues

6. The CDM-AP took note of new mandates received from the eighty-third and eighty-fourth meetings of the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism (CDM) (hereinafter referred to as the Board).

Agenda item 2.3. Performance management

7. The CDM-AP took note of a report on the implementation of the 2015 assessment plans and information on visits deviating from the default duration of four person-days. The CDM-AP noted that the launching of performance assessments is lagging behind schedule due to the limited number of validation and verification submissions.
8. The CDM-AP took note of a report on delays of more than seven days that took place in ongoing assessments and that the number of delays by designated operational entities (DOEs) is at a low, acceptable level.

9. The CDM-AP took note of a report on DOE performance monitoring for period 11, version 2 (1 May 2014 to 31 August 2014), in accordance with the "Procedure: Performance monitoring of DOEs".
10. The CDM-AP noted that there was no report on the performance of the CDM assessment teams (CDM-ATs) to consider.

Agenda item 2.4. Matters related to the Panel

11. The CDM-AP took note of a presentation by the Vice-Chair of the CDM-AP on the outcomes of the Board's eighty-third meeting and eighty-fourth meeting.
12. The CDM-AP took note of a presentation by the secretariat on the actions undertaken in response to the previous requests of the CDM-AP.
13. The CDM-AP took note that no actions were taken via electronic means since the previous CDM-AP meeting.

Agenda item 3. Rulings (case-specific matters)

14. The CDM-AP considered one regular surveillance case. The CDM-AP notification on this case will be submitted to the Board in confidence.
15. The CDM-AP considered one performance assessment case. The CDM-AP notification on this case will be submitted to the Board in confidence.
16. The CDM-AP considered nine notifications of change.
17. The CDM-AP took note of two notifications of partial voluntary withdrawal of accreditation.

Agenda item 4. Regulatory matters

Agenda item 4.1. Standards

18. The CDM-AP considered the request by the Board (CDM-EB83 report, para. 36) for the CDM-AP and the secretariat to prepare a joint concept note on the revision of the CDM accreditation standard (version 06.0).
19. The CDM-AP took note of a presentation on the draft joint concept note and supported the proposal to approve an exception to the application of paragraph 104 (a) of the CDM accreditation standard (version 06.0) under the following circumstance: in situations where a validator/verifier is qualified by on-site observation of a validation/verification of a project activity or programme of activities (PoA), it would not be necessary to observe the validator/verifier during their first on-site validation/verification, as required by paragraph 104 (a).
20. The CDM-AP further agreed that such an exception should be provided by a clarification rather than a change to the accreditation standard.
21. The CDM-AP and the secretariat elaborated these recommendations in the joint concept note to be submitted to the Board for consideration at its eighty-fifth meeting.

Agenda item 4.2. Procedures

22. The CDM-AP considered the request by the Board (CDM-EB 83 report, para. 54) for the CDM-AP and the secretariat to prepare a joint concept note on the revision of the CDM accreditation procedure (version 11.0).
23. The CDM-AP took note of a presentation by the secretariat on the draft joint concept note and provided the following inputs on the various proposals:
 - (a) Regarding the composition of CDM-ATs for on-site visits to DOE offices during the regular surveillance assessment (see CDM-AP 71 report, para. 24) the CDM-AP agreed:
 - (i) To maintain the recommendation from its 71st meeting (CDM-AP 71 report, para. 24);
 - (ii) That additional flexibility should be provided regarding other aspects of the CDM-AT composition and assessment modalities including the size of the team, number of days an assessment should last, not to prescribe the central office site visit, and to conduct assessments partially using electronic means, such as with some CDM-AT members participating via video conferencing;
 - (b) Regarding options available to the CDM-AP when making recommendations to the Board (CDM-AP 71 report, para. 27(b)), the CDM-AP agreed:
 - (i) To maintain the recommendation from its 71st meeting (CDM-AP 71 report, para. 27(b));
 - (ii) That any new provision should not be applied retroactively and should be less wide-ranging than the previous provision: “[to] undertake any other appropriate action based on the reports [of the CDM-AT]”;
 - (c) Regarding consideration of options available to the CDM-AP to conclude a performance assessment (CDM-AP 71 report, para. 29(d)) the CDM-AP agreed:
 - (i) To give CDM-AT members the explicit mandate to rule performance assessments as satisfactory or non-satisfactory. This has the added benefit of clearly alerting the CDM-AP to any issues that would need to be escalated for recommendation to the Board;
 - (d) Regarding consideration of a minimum number of performance assessments per accreditation cycle (CDM-AP 71 report, para. 30 (a)), the CDM-AP agreed:
 - (i) Not to pursue this issue in the context of the joint concept note;
 - (e) Regarding enhanced access to information on DOE activity (CDM-AP 71 report, para. 30 (b)), the CDM-AP agreed:
 - (i) With the proposal to introduce an online tool publishing DOE activity with regard to submissions;
 - (f) Regarding general provisions for non-compliance by DOEs with specified deadlines (EB 83 report, para. 54), the CDM-AP agreed:

- (i) With the proposal to allow greater flexibility to place entities under observation where there has been an egregious failure to meet a deadline in a regulation or Board decision;
 - (ii) With the proposal to allow greater flexibility to place entities under observation where there has been an egregious failure to meet a deadline in a transitional document, such as transitional provisions for implementation of the revised accreditation standard;
 - (g) Regarding the consideration of previous Board decisions (EB 77 report, para. 69; EB 80 report, para. 44; EB 81 report para. 15(a); and EB 81 report, para. 26(d)), the CDM-AP agreed that they be included in the joint concept note for amendment of the procedure.
24. The CDM-AP and the secretariat elaborated these recommendations in the joint concept note to be submitted to the Board for consideration at its eighty-fifth meeting.
25. The CDM-AP considered a presentation by the secretariat on a concept note reviewing the approach on performance monitoring of DOEs, as mandated by the Board at its seventy-ninth meeting. The CDM-AP provided the secretariat with the following comments on the concept note:
- (a) Under the current market conditions it is appropriate to save resources by scaling back the publication of version 1 and version 3 of the DOE performance monitoring reports;
 - (b) It is appropriate to merge the DOE performance monitoring reports aimed at the CDM-AP and Board;
 - (c) Given the low level of submissions and the long lead times the outcomes of performance monitoring may not be relevant; therefore using a new approach to DOE performance monitoring should be considered. The CDM-AP noted that given the low number of submissions it is difficult to draw broad conclusions on DOE performance.
26. The CDM-AP considered a presentation by the secretariat of a concept note on the fee structure for accreditation assessments, as mandated by the Board at its eighty-first meeting. The CDM-AP provided the following inputs:
- (a) Comments to the secretariat on the concept note: Out of the options presented, maintaining the status quo represents the most feasible option, considering that there is room to reduce costs within the existing framework;
 - (b) Recommendation to the Board: If the Board accepts the recommendation to maintain the status quo, options to reduce the costs should be further explored.

Agenda item 5. Other matters

27. The CDM-AP considered the request by the Board at its eighty-third meeting (EB 83 report, para. 17) to explore potential areas of interest between the work of the Board and the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) with a view to providing a recommendation to the Board at a later meeting.

28. In considering notifications of change, the CDM-AP provided the following recommendation to the secretariat. Where a DOE has added an office location or a new outsourced entity, request the DOE to provide documented evidence of the new address, compliance with the CDM accreditation standard (at the new location/outsourced entity) and that the conflict of interested analysis has been updated accordingly.

Agenda item 6. Conclusion of the meeting

29. The CDM-AP approved the internal and external reports of its 72nd meeting.
30. 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>
01.0	10 June 2015	CDM-AP 72 meeting report. Initial publication
Decision Class: Operational Document Type: Meeting report Business Function: Governance Keywords: AP, reporting procedure		