

## **CDM-AP74**

# Meeting report

---

## CDM Accreditation Panel seventy-fourth meeting

Version 01.0

Date of meeting: 16 to 18 February 2016

Place of meeting: Bonn, Germany



**United Nations**  
Framework Convention on  
Climate Change

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>		<b>Page</b>
<b>AGENDA ITEM 1.</b>	<b>AGENDA AND MEETING ORGANIZATION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
Agenda item 1.1.	Opening .....	3
Agenda item 1.2.	Adoption of the agenda .....	3
<b>AGENDA ITEM 2.</b>	<b>GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT MATTERS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
Agenda item 2.1.	Membership issues .....	3
Agenda item 2.2.	Planning issues .....	4
Agenda item 2.3.	Performance management .....	4
Agenda item 2.4.	Matters related to the Panel .....	4
<b>AGENDA ITEM 3.</b>	<b>RULINGS (CASE-SPECIFIC MATTERS) .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>AGENDA ITEM 4.</b>	<b>OTHER MATTERS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>AGENDA ITEM 5.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION OF THE MEETING .....</b>	<b>7</b>

## **Agenda item 1. Agenda and meeting organization**

### **Agenda item 1.1. Opening**

1. Mr. Martin Enderlin, 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**

<b>Chair and Vice Chair</b>	<b>Members</b>
Mr. Martin Enderlin (Chair)	Mr. Adelino Ricardo Esparta
Mr. Arthur Rolle (Vice-Chair)	Ms. Ann Marie Howard
	Mr. Anil Jauhri
	Ms. Veronica Garcia de Solórzano
	Mr. Sven Kolmetz

### **Agenda item 1.2. Adoption of the agenda**

3. The Chair proposed seven items to be added to the agenda:
  - (a) An update on what the Paris Agreement means for the work of the CDM-AP;
  - (b) A discussion on designated operational entities (DOEs) performing both validation and verification for the same project activities;
  - (c) Potential areas of interest between the work of the Board and the International Organization for Standardization (ISO);
  - (d) A cut-off date for the inclusion of cases in meeting documents before the CDM-AP meetings;
  - (e) PS v8.0 and paragraph 78 stakeholder global consultation;
  - (f) The finalization, distribution and formatting of meeting documents;
  - (g) Input to the secretariat on the process of conducting hearings.
4. The agenda of the seventy-fourth meeting was adopted including the additional agenda items.

## **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 an update on the status of implementation of the mandates from the Board in 2015 and an overview of mandates to be contained in the draft CDM-AP workplan for 2016. With regard to the work in collecting experience from the implementation of the CDM accreditation standard (version 6),<sup>1</sup> the CDM-AP agreed to request that Clean Development Mechanism Assessment Teams (CDM-ATs) should provide feedback on the implementation of the CDM accreditation standard in order to identify improvements for the document in the future.
7. The CDM-AP recommended that the Board invite CDM-AP members to participate in the DOE teleconferences on a voluntary basis and hold annual meetings for the DOEs and the secretariat and schedule it on a back-to-back basis with a CDM-AP meeting in order to allow members of the CDM-AP to participate in these interactions.

## **Agenda item 2.3. Performance management**

8. The CDM-AP took note of a (1) report on the implementation of the 2015 assessment plan; and (2) the assessment plan for 2016.
9. The CDM-AP took note of a report on delays of more than seven days in ongoing assessments.
10. The CDM-AP considered the performance monitoring reports of the CDM-AT experts and made recommendations regarding the maintenance or withdrawal of experts on the CDM Accreditation Roster of Experts.
11. The CDM-AP considered the annual conflict of interest analysis prepared in accordance with paragraphs 15 and 16 of the Procedure for selection and performance evaluation of experts on the CDM Accreditation Roster of Experts,<sup>2</sup> and recommended modifications of mitigation actions to the secretariat.

## **Agenda item 2.4. Matters related to the Panel**

12. The CDM-AP took note of a presentation by the Chair of the CDM-AP on the outcomes of the eighty-seventh meeting of the Board and the eleventh session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol in Paris.
13. 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.
14. The CDM-AP recalled that one decision (reference number 1/2016) was taken via electronic means since the previous CDM-AP meeting.
15. The CDM-AP considered a report on the schedule of CDM-AP meetings for 2016.

---

<sup>1</sup> CDM-EB46-A02-STAN.

<sup>2</sup> CDM-EB79-A02-PROC.

### **Agenda item 3. Rulings (case-specific matters)**

16. The CDM-AP considered 17 regular surveillance cases. The CDM-AP recommendation on these cases will be submitted to the Board in confidence.
17. The CDM-AP considered six performance assessments. The CDM-AP recommendation on these cases will be submitted to the Board in confidence.
18. The CDM-AP considered eight notifications of change.
19. The CDM-AP took note of five notifications of voluntary withdrawal of accreditation (partial and full).

### **Agenda item 4. Other matters**

20. The CDM-AP considered possible changes to the calendar of meetings. The Chair and Vice-Chair indicated preferred dates for CDM-AP 75 of 28–30 June 2016 and CDM-AP 76 for the last week of September/first week of October 2016. The CDM-AP agreed to reserve three days for the scheduling of video conferences, if needed: 20 April 2016, 17 August 2016 and 14 December 2016, respectively, at 16:00 Central European Time (CET).
21. The CDM-AP held an initial discussion on what the Paris Agreement means for the work of the CDM-AP. The CDM-AP was not in a position to forward a recommendation to the Board at this time. Given the importance and time-sensitivity of the matter, the CDM-AP agreed to continue working on this item at a future meeting.
22. The CDM-AP held a discussion about a cut-off date and agreed on one week before the meeting for inclusion of cases in meeting documents, as well as for the finalization, distribution and formatting of meeting documents.
23. Based on the request from the Board at its eighty-sixth meeting (EB 86 meeting report, para. 10(h)) and following up on the request by the CDM-AP at its seventy-third meeting (CDM-AP 73 meeting report, para. 26), the CDM-AP considered additional information provided by the secretariat regarding the proposal to allow a DOE to perform both validation and verification for the same project activity of all scales (large and small scale) and for the same PoA, as part of the simplification and streamlining of the CDM. The CDM-AP and the secretariat agreed to recommend that the Board change the rule to allow a DOE to perform both validation and verification for the same project activity of all scales and for the same PoA through a joint recommendation from the CDM-AP and the secretariat to the Board.
24. The CDM-AP discussed potential areas of interest between the work of the Board and the ISO as presented to the Board at its eighty-seventh meeting (EB 87 meeting report, para. 18):
  - (a) The CDM-AP worked on Option 1 (see EB 87 meeting report, para. 18) in combination with paragraph 28(d) of the CDM-AP 73 meeting report, on the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) being an intergovernmental standards setting body for climate change and greenhouse gas (GHG) management given the enormous expertise in the areas of standards setting on GHG management which has been created over the years. The CDM-

- AP agreed to forward an elaborated recommendation to the Board at a future meeting.
- (b) While exploring Option 2 (see EB 87 meeting report, para. 18 and CDM-AP 73 meeting report, para. 28(c)(ii)), the CDM-AP took into account the ongoing revisions of ISO 14064-3 and 14065 standards. The CDM-AP agreed to recommend that the Board request the secretariat to enhance its participation in potential areas of interest between the work of the Board, the ISO and the International Accreditation Forum in the next 18 to 24 months. This would require the allocation of human resources and an increase in budget for the participation of two appointed experts from the secretariat to allow for increased interaction between and harmonization of rigorous measurement, reporting and verification systems between jurisdictions, which, in the view of the CDM-AP, is highly relevant to the future role of the Board, the secretariat and the DOEs.
25. During the consideration of performance assessment cases, the CDM-AP noticed that further policy guidance to the CDM-AP and CDM-AT is needed. For this reason the CDM-AP agreed to continue working at a future meeting on preparing a recommendation for policy guidance from the Board regarding:
- (a) Assessment situations where DOEs are not active in CDM validation/verification/certification activities and therefore conformance to CDM accreditation requirements cannot be confirmed by the assessment of active CDM validation and verification activities. In this situation, the CDM-AP will consider evidence from other GHG programmes/activities to assess the capabilities of the DOE to meet the CDM accreditation requirements;
- (b) Whether or not DOEs are required to monitor parameters that are contained but not required in the applied methodology and whether or not it is intended for the CDM-AT and CDM-AP to assess voluntarily declared local regulatory requirements or other factors that are not directly required in the methodology (e.g. environmental impact assessment requirements), as per paragraphs 383 and 384 of the Validation and verification standard, version 9.0,<sup>3</sup> in the CDM verification activities. Paragraph 384 is explicit about physical features; however, the requirement includes nothing regarding the need to document the monitoring of other voluntarily declared local regulatory requirements.
26. The CDM-AP noted the clarification by the secretariat that until paragraph 78 of CDM validation and verification standard, version 9.0,<sup>4</sup> is revised with the next revision of the standard, diverging cases will be considered on a case-by-case basis by the Board. The CDM-AP requested the secretariat to provide feedback to the CDM-AT on this matter.
27. The CDM-AP provided initial input to the secretariat on the opportunities to improve the process of hearings when considering the recommendation related to suspension of accreditation of a DOE.

---

<sup>3</sup> CDM-EB65-A04-STAN.

<sup>4</sup> CDM-EB65-A04-STAN.

## Agenda item 5. Conclusion of the meeting

28. The CDM-AP approved the internal and external reports of the seventy-fourth meeting.
29. 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	22 February 2016	CDM-AP 74 meeting report. Initial publication
Decision Class: Operational Document Type: Meeting report Business Function: Governance Keywords: AP, reporting procedure		