

CDM-AP75

Meeting report

CDM Accreditation Panel seventy-fifth meeting

Version 01.0

Date of meeting: 28 to 30 June 2016

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.	Performance management	3
Agenda item 2.3.	Matters related to the panel	3
AGENDA ITEM 3.	RULINGS (CASE-SPECIFIC MATTERS).....	4
Agenda item 3.1.	Regular surveillance assessments	4
Agenda item 3.2.	Performance assessments	4
Agenda item 3.3.	Notifications of change.....	4
Agenda item 3.4.	Other issues	4
AGENDA ITEM 4.	REGULATORY MATTERS	4
Agenda item 4.1.	Procedures.....	4
AGENDA ITEM 5.	RELATIONS WITH FORUMS AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS	5
AGENDA ITEM 6.	OTHER MATTERS	6
AGENDA ITEM 7.	CONCLUSION OF THE MEETING	6

Agenda item 1. Agenda and meeting organization

Agenda item 1.1. Opening

1. Mr. Arthur Rolle, 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
Mr. Arthur Rolle (Chair)	Mr. Anil Jauhri
Mr. Martin Enderlin (Vice-Chair)	Ms. Ann Marie Howard
	Mr. Ricardo Esparta
	Mr. Sven Gunther Kolmetz
	Ms. Verónica Garcíá Malo

Agenda item 1.2. Adoption of the agenda

3. The agenda of the seventy-fifth (AP75) meeting was adopted as presented.

Agenda item 2. Governance and management matters

Agenda item 2.1. Membership issues

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

Agenda item 2.2. Performance management

5. The CDM-AP took note of the updated workplan of the CDM-AP for 2016, the status of requests from the CDM-AP to the secretariat and the fact that the accreditation workflow had been updated in accordance version 12 of the CDM Accreditation Procedure.
6. The CDM-AP took note of a report on the implementation of the 2016 assessment plans.
7. The CDM-AP took note that there were no delays of more than seven days in on-going assessments.
8. The CDM-AP considered the outcome of the performance monitoring of experts on the accreditation roster of experts and agreed on appropriate actions.

Agenda item 2.3. Matters related to the panel

9. The CDM-AP took note of the outcomes of the eighty-eighth and eighty-ninth meeting of the CDM Executive Board (hereinafter referred to as the Board), relevant to the work of the CDM-AP.

10. The CDM-AP noted that no decisions were taken via electronic means since the previous CDM-AP meeting.
11. The CDM-AP took note of a report of the work between the secretariat and the International Organization for Standardization (ISO), particularly in regard to the revisions of ISO 14064-3 and ISO 14065.
12. The CDM-AP considered making a recommendation to the Board regarding potential areas of interest between the work of the Board and ISO. The mandate is based on the CDM panels and working groups workplan (2016), which foresees a recommendation from the CDM-AP at AP75, in regard to the product 'Analysis on potential areas of interest between the work of the Board and ISO', for consideration at the Board's ninetieth meeting (EB90). The CDM-AP decided to defer a recommendation to the Board on this matter to a future meeting.
13. The CDM-AP expressed its appreciation to Mr. Martin Enderlin for his excellent work rendered as chair of the CDM-AP in 2015.

Agenda item 3. Rulings (case-specific matters)

Agenda item 3.1. Regular surveillance assessments

14. The CDM-AP considered six regular surveillance cases of designated operational entities (DOEs). The CDM-AP's recommendations on these cases will be submitted to the Board in confidence.

Agenda item 3.2. Performance assessments

15. The CDM-AP considered two performance assessments of DOEs. The CDM-AP's recommendations on these cases will be submitted to the Board in confidence.

Agenda item 3.3. Notifications of change

16. The CDM-AP took note of three notifications of voluntary withdrawal of accreditation of DOEs (partial and full).
17. The CDM-AP considered seven notifications of change from DOEs.

Agenda item 3.4. Other issues

18. The CDM-AP considered six other issues concerning DOEs. The CDM-AP's recommendations on these cases will be submitted to the Board in confidence.

Agenda item 4. Regulatory matters

Agenda item 4.1. Procedures

19. The CDM-AP provided input on a draft joint concept note with the secretariat, concerning the payment of the initial and re-accreditation fees of USD 15,000 (application fee). The concept note is in response to a mandate from the Board's eighty-seventh meeting to the secretariat and the CDM-AP to jointly analyse impacts of distributing costs evenly across the five-year accreditation term to increase their predictability by spreading out the initial

accreditation fee over the five-year accreditation cycle. The secretariat and the CDM-AP were not able to reach a joint recommendation. Therefore, separate recommendations are contained in the concept note¹, as contained in an annex to the annotated agenda of EB90. The CDM-AP agreed to recommend that the application fee be distributed across the five year accreditation term as follows: USD 5,000 at application (split into two equal amounts and charged with the application and charged after grant of accreditation/re-accreditation) followed by annual payments of USD 2,500 for the four subsequent years. The distribution of the costs across the five-year accreditation term is likely to have a positive psychological impact on DOEs and distributes the costs to the DOEs more evenly. The secretariat's recommendation, to keep the status quo, is also contained in the joint concept note.

20. The CDM-AP provided input on draft diagrams for insertion into the CDM accreditation procedure. This work is in response to the mandate from the Board's eighty-sixth meeting where it requested the secretariat to develop a flow chart of the key steps of the CDM accreditation procedure (version 12) with a view to conducting a minor editorial revision of the procedure to be approved by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board and the Chair and Vice-Chair of the CDM-AP. The CDM-AP provided the following input:
- (a) A flow diagram with swim lanes is preferable;
 - (b) Add deadlines and reference paragraph/section numbers for each action;
 - (c) Cover as many steps in the procedure as possible;
 - (d) Ensure that where an activity ends there are clear links to the next steps in the process.

Agenda item 5. Relations with forums and other stakeholders

21. The CDM-AP interacted with the DOE/AIE Coordination Forum chair, Mr. Werner Betzenbichler, in accordance with the procedure for direct communication with stakeholders. Mr. Betzenbichler provided the following input:
- (a) The upfront invoice of USD 15,000 for re-accreditation is burdensome to DOEs. As with other schemes, an ex-post payment scheme for re-accreditation may be introduced;
 - (b) He requested clarity regarding the continuity of DOEs in the new mechanism under the Paris Agreement. Mr. Betzenbichler expressed his view against developing a new accreditation system, as DOEs were ready and willing to provide services under the new mechanism.
22. The CDM-AP provided input on the proposed approach for the interaction with the CDM assessment team leaders, scheduled to take place at the seventy-sixth meeting of the CDM-AP (AP76). The CDM-AP provided the following input:
- (a) Those cases where the CDM-AP overturned findings of the CDM assessment team should be highlighted for discussion during the interaction;

¹ Concept note: Analysis of impacts on distributing accreditation fee across five-year accreditation term

- (b) Prioritize the full set of questions from team leaders prior to the interaction in order to focus on questions and clarifications that are more relevant;
- (c) The lead assessors are very well versed in their understanding of impartiality requirements. Therefore the focus of the training should be on technical aspects (e.g. programmes of activity and application of methodologies, which are areas where the lead assessors often rely on technical experts) and competence (how to assess examinations, understanding the competence model, how to determine competence);
- (d) The materials prepared for the CDM assessment team interaction should be made available to the CDM-AP one week in advance of AP76;
- (e) Invite technical experts who are working towards team-leader status to the interaction.

Agenda item 6. Other matters

23. The CDM-AP provided input on a draft concept note regarding an analysis of the need for measures to ensure the continued participation of DOEs in the CDM, particularly in underrepresented regions. This work is in response to a request from the eleventh session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of Parties to the Kyoto Protocol to the Board to analyse the need for measures to ensure the continued participation of DOEs in the CDM, in particular in the regions underrepresented in the CDM, taking into account the transparent and prudent management of the resources of the CDM. This work is in line with the 2016 CDM-AP workplan. The CDM-AP provided the following input:
- (a) The analysis should further elaborate on the trend of withdrawals of accreditations;
 - (b) The accreditation of many DOEs is due to expire over the next year and it is not possible to predict how many entities will apply for re-accreditation. The analysis should take this into account.

Agenda item 7. Conclusion of the meeting

24. The CDM-AP approved the internal and external reports of AP75.
25. The CDM-AP Chair closed the meeting.

- - - - -

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
01.0	4 July 2016	CDM-AP 75 meeting report. Initial publication
Decision Class: Operational Document Type: Meeting report Business Function: Governance Keywords: AP, reporting procedure		