

Revision of the CDM accreditation procedure

CDM-EB 56 meeting

Brasília, Brazil, 13-17 September 2010



Conor Barry, Lead, Organization and Stakeholder Development Unit
UNFCCC secretariat, Sustainable Development Programme

Background and action to be taken

- The Accreditation Panel (AP), with the support of the secretariat, has prepared a revised accreditation procedure and recommended it to the EB.
- Basis of the revision:
 - The AP has considered the areas that were not sufficiently clear through its experience in applying the procedure
 - The AP has considered existing requests from CMP and the EB (e.g. protect CDM project activities from undue prejudice from suspension of DOEs)
 - The Panel has considered related work programmes developed and decisions of the EB (e.g. DOE performance monitoring framework)
- Expected of the Board:
 - To consider and adopt a revised accreditation procedure and agree the effective date of implementation.



Main areas of the revision

- Linking with the DOE performance monitoring framework
- Creating a separate section on suspension
- Introducing a complaints/dispute procedures
- Allowing suspension/withdrawal by the EB at any steps
- Integration of multi-site assessment provisions
- Introducing/revising timelines for some steps
- Consistency review including addition of missing steps
 - Appeals by AE/DOE against AP's negative recommendations to the EB
 - Possible decisions by the EB based on AP's recommendations



Scope of accreditation

- Introduction of a new provision:
 - Accreditation is granted to the legal entity applying for it, recognizing the location of its central office and any non-central sites declared by the entity in its application where CDM functions are undertaken.
 - This would imply that the certificate of accreditation will contain name and location of the central office as well as non-central sites.



Desk review and on-site assessment

- Desk review:
 - Speeds up process of resolving minor issues
 - Rejections now done by EB not AP, with possibility for appeal
 - Incorporating possibility for suspension in case of reaccreditation
- On site assessment:
 - Allowing the AP to decide to include non-central sites in the on-site assessment

Performance assessment and Regular on-site surveillance

- Performance assessment:
 - Referring to the DOE performance monitoring framework as criteria for selection of performance assessments;
 - Dealing with the case where the DOE does not send the required documentation to launch the performance assessment;
 - AP’s decision on the outcome: replacing “any other action” by a request seeking additional corrective actions;
- Regular surveillance:
 - Requiring the assessment of all non-central sites unless otherwise decided by the AP;
 - Introducing timelines for notification of the regular on-site surveillance and for tolerance for deviation from the tentative scheduled date;
 - Requiring the AT to undertake a document review before the assessment;



Spot-check

- Introduction of new provisions:
 - Adding possible reasons for triggering a spot-check:
 - Results of the DOE performance monitoring framework that would automatically trigger a spot-check when the threshold is reached
 - Recommendation of the AP as a result of a treatment of a complaint;
 - Clarifying that the reason that has triggered a spot-check shall remain confidential;
 - Allowing the EB to immediately suspend a DOE before conducting a spot-check.
 - (In case a spot-check is triggered as a result of the DOE performance monitoring framework) Requiring the AP to prepare the scope of a spot-check and inform the EB.



Re-accreditation

- Introduction of new provisions:
 - Revising timelines in re-accreditation to shorten them to ensure that the re-accreditation process ends before the expiry of accreditation of a DOE;
 - Clarifying only the central office is to be visited during re-accreditation assessment, but allowing the AP to include other sites;
 - Allowing the AP to reduce the number of sites to be visited during the regular on-site surveillance occurring after the re-accreditation based on results of previous assessments and results of the DOE performance monitoring framework;
 - Allowing the AP to recommend to the EB to extend accreditation of a DOE up to 6 months if delays in the re-accreditation process occur outside the control of the DOE;
 - Clarifying that re-accreditation is valid for 3 years from the date of expiration of its previous accreditation.



Extension of sectoral scopes

- Introduction of a new provision:
 - Revising timelines for extension of sectoral scopes: timelines for reaccreditation shall apply

Notification of changes

- Introduction of new provisions:
 - Adding a type of change to be notified to the AP: allocation of CDM functions to non-central sites, including establishment of new sites
 - Requiring DOEs to notify an unexpected significant change within 10 days of the change taking place



Suspension (new section)

- DOE to be provided relevant information before the hearing;
- Modalities of lifting the suspension have been detailed including actions from the DOE and timelines for assessment by the AT;
- List of possible recommendations by the AP;
- List of possible decisions by the EB.

Note: The AP has agreed that suspension of sites is not adequate as the DOE remain responsible for the work carried out under its responsibility wherever it is carried-out. It has also noted that it is not implementable as there is no way to control such a suspension as a DOE might just shift its activities to another office. The AP consequently agreed not to introduce in the accreditation procedure any provision related to suspension of sites.



Expiration, withdrawal and voluntary withdrawal of accreditation (new sections)

- Expiration and withdrawal of accreditation of DOEs:
 - The entity shall not continue activities;
 - Expiration or withdrawal shall not free an entity of its contractual arrangements.
- Voluntary withdrawal of accreditation application or accreditation by an AE/DOE:
 - The entity shall not continue activities;
 - Expiration or withdrawal shall not free an entity of its contractual arrangements



Handling of appeals

- Introduction of new provisions:
 - Allowing an AE/DOE to appeal against any adverse (negative) recommendation by the CDM-AP;
 - Defining “adverse recommendations” by the AP;
 - Adding “misinterpretation” of the CDM requirements to the scope of appeal;
 - Changing the procedure to allow the appeal panel to assess documentation and the process that led to the appeal before concluding whether the appeal is justified or not.
 - Requiring the appeal panel to make a recommendation to the EB in case the appeal is justified



Handling of complaints against an DOE (new annex)

- Definition of complaints against a DOE and from which parties it can be considered valid
- Definition of the process of :
 - Submission of a complaint;
 - Initial assessment by the secretariat;
 - Notifications and information to and from parties against which a complaint is raised;
 - Assessment and decision by the AP.
- Definition of possible decision by the AP and of the implications of handling of a complaint on the DOE's accreditation status.



Handling of complaints and disputes from an AE/DOE (new annex)

- Definition of complaints and disputes from an AE/DOE
- Definition of the process of:
 - Submission of a complaint/dispute;
 - Initial assessment by the secretariat;
 - Notifications and information to and from parties against which a complaint/dispute is raised;
 - Assessment and decision by the AP or the EB as applicable;
- Hierarchical handling of complaints/disputes:
 - Complaints/disputes against the secretariat or a AT → decision by the AP;
 - Complaints/disputes against the AP → decision by the CDM-EB.
- Definition of possible decision to be taken by the complaints/disputes body.



Effective date of the revised procedure - grace period

- The implementation of the revised procedure will require substantive changes to the workflow (IT system): changing timelines, adding new steps in the process.
- Adopting the procedure with immediate effect may create confusion among AEs/DOEs and CDM-ATs, therefore a grace period allowing time for the modification of the workflow is needed.
- Suggested grace period is 2 months.

