

Agenda item 4.2

Paragraph 39 of the annotated agenda, Annex 6

Revision of CDM Accreditation Procedure

CDM EB 113

Bonn, Germany, 8 – 11 March 2022



Procedural background and purpose

- EB 81 considered an analysis on numbers, frequency and timing of assessments of DOEs and decided on a minimum of one mandatory performance assessment every 20 months for any DOEs on a temporary basis, valid only for two years. This provision was inserted in version 12 of the CDM accreditation procedure and has been extended by the Board three times (latest v15, footnote 7, until 28 May 2022).
 - During interaction with CDM-AT team leaders, AP 90 considered one query regarding the current provision on review of NCs raised by CDM-AT and agreed to change the provision to allow CDM-AT to provide additional information.
 - AP 78 clarified that the DOE may provide evidence to support its clarification or comments on the CDM-AT's findings, during the preparation of the performance assessment reports.
 - Inconsistency is observed with regard to the documents to be submitted by the DOE in its application and the desk review requirement for reaccreditation.
 - AP 91 considered this revision and provided input, which has been reflected in the revised draft CDM accreditation procedure
-



(1) Revision in footnote 7: A minimum of 3 mandatory performance assessments

- Under the current CDM market conditions and CMP 16 decision on functioning of CDM after the end of the 2nd commitment period, it is expected that the number of submissions will remain low.
- Number of submissions for 2020-2021 was slightly higher than previous period. However, it remains at the similar low level when EB decided to extend the validity of this temporary deviation in 2020 (EB 106).
- The number of submissions forecasted in the “CDM two-year business and management plan 2022–2023” is lower than the volume forecasted in the “CDM two-year business and management plan 2020–2021”.
- DOE performance monitoring is now active ,which enables the process to monitor the performance of, and address non-compliance by, DOEs in a systematic manner.
- It is proposed that the validity of footnote 7 be extended for two years, i.e. up to 28 May 2024.



(2) Review of NC raised by CDM-AT

- When submitting request for a review of the NCs, the AE/DOE may provide supporting documentation for the purpose of the review.
- However, there is no such opportunity for the CDM-AT to provide any information for the purpose of the review.
- The information from CDM-AT is only from the on-site assessment report and NC reports.
- It is proposed that:
 - a) A new paragraph be added before para 11 in section 5 of the appendix 7 to the current procedure to reflect additional process for the CDM-AT to provide any information for the review process. This will allow an equal opportunity to the CDM-AT;
 - b) Paras 11 and 19 of the appendix 7 to the current procedure be revised to align the language by allowing the CDM-AT to provide such information.



(3) Process to provide clarification

- In performance assessments, the DOE shall have five days to provide clarification regarding the findings raised by CDM-AT.
- In practice, the DOE at many occasions attempts to submit additional documents through e-mail in order to support its clarification.
- The current version of the CDM accreditation procedure does not explicitly state the opportunity for submission of additional documents to support DOE's clarification.
- AP 78 clarified that the DOE may provide evidence to support its clarification or comments on the CDM-AT's findings, during the preparation of the performance assessment reports.
- It is proposed that the CDM accreditation procedure be revised to include this clarification, i.e. the DOE may also submit additional documents in order to support its clarification.



(4) Inconsistency

- As per appendix 1, DOEs are not required to submit “*Financial statements of the last three years*” in the application for reaccreditation.
- However, financial stability is checked by CDM-AT during the desk review
- This has resulted in DOEs having to submit the document as additional document during the desk review stage.
- It is proposed that this document be included as part of documents to be submitted together with the application for reaccreditation.



Subsequent work and recommendations

- Subsequent work:

It is proposed that:

- The revised CDM accreditation procedure be effective upon adoption without any subsequent work;
- The CDM accreditation workflow be updated to include the functionalities for CDM-ATs to provide any information for the purpose of review of NCs and DOEs to upload additional documents when providing clarifications.

- Recommendation:

The secretariat recommends that the Board adopt the revised CDM accreditation procedure, to be made effective immediately.



Thank You



Agenda item 4.2

Paragraph 39 of the annotated agenda, Annex 6