

Revision of the accreditation standard workshop

CDM-EB 55 meeting

Bonn, Germany, 26-30 July 2010



Background

- Workshop held on 5 July 2010
- 41 participants, 20 DOEs, AP members
- Objective: present and discuss the main areas of revision of the accreditation standard and gather inputs, concerns and improvement opportunities from the AEs/DOEs, before the finalization of the draft standard for the consideration by EB.



Outcome: Competence criteria and competence criteria

- **Concerns**

- **The new qualification system would exclude many DOE staff, that are highly experienced with many years validating and verifying in the CDM, including qualification in technical areas under the old standard, based only on the fact that they don't have working experience in the area. Experience of such staff should be taken into account (e.g. grandfathering current DOE staff into the new scheme).**



Outcome: Competence criteria and competence criteria

- **Suggestions on number of years/validation/verification /consultancy required for qualification – Para 15 of the concept paper:**
 - **2a: a minimum of 1 year direct working experience in the field for technical areas, and at least 2 years for complex technical areas.**
 - **2c: minimum number of successful qualifications needed to be 2 audits (as an assessor under training) and an additional 2 audits (under observation of a qualified validator/verifier).**
 - **An additional requirement/option could be added, as follows:**
 - 2d) GHG validation or verification in national/regional GHG programs as authorised by the relevant regulatory body**



Outcome: Competence criteria and competence criteria

- **Other suggestions :**
 - **Experience in research and development in new technologies should be recognised and considered for qualification in technical areas**

 - **Replace in the text of the standard in para 59 b, the word Employment by engagement**
(i)Direct work experience in the field gained through employment / engagement with industries and involvement in operations.

 - **Allow non deployment of technical expert during the 2nd or 3rd on-site verification visit, provided that the technical expert participates on the first on-site verification and remains involved as a member of the verification team.**

 - **Consider linking the methodologies to technical areas instead of sectoral scopes. This would facilitate allocation of expertise to projects and avoid asking DOEs to have accreditation in a sectoral scope that is not relevant to the project activity.**



Outcome: Impartiality

- **Define clearly what is meant by CDM consultancy**
Suggestion: the definition should encompass PDD development, Monitoring report development, and consultancy related to taking projects through the validation or verification cycle.
 - **Define the level from which having more contract with a client become a threat to impartiality, the word numerous used in the standard is not clear**
Suggestion: define a share in the business of the DOE that should not be crossed
 - **Request to allow the use of consultants as external validators/verifiers/technical experts, because otherwise it would be very difficult to find qualified expertise**
Suggestion: revise para 156c of the revised accreditation standard to make it specific to the project activity under validation/verification
 - **Request to consider training as threat to impartiality only when it is related to CDM**
 - **Request that the revision of the standard addresses pre-validation and pre-verification activities.**
-



Outcome: Implementation

- **The new version of the technical areas should not apply to projects currently underway**
- **DOEs need to be given time to implement the new procedures and conduct their assessment of validation and verification personnel: grace period**

