

CDM-EB81-AA-A02

Concept note

The process for appointment of CDM assessment teams

Version 01.0



United Nations
Framework Convention on
Climate Change

TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page
1. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND.....	3
2. PURPOSE	3
3. KEY ISSUES AND PROPOSED SOLUTIONS	4
3.1. Possible options for the Board	4
4. IMPACTS.....	5
5. SUBSEQUENT WORK AND TIMELINES.....	5
6. BUDGET AND COSTS	6
7. RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD	6

1. Procedural background

1. The Executive Board of the clean development mechanism (CDM) (hereinafter referred to as the Board) at its seventy-ninth meeting adopted the procedure “Selection and performance evaluation of experts on the CDM accreditation roster of experts”, as contained in annex 2 to the meeting report. While considering this procedure, the Board agreed to consider the process for the appointment of assessment teams (AT) and the role of the CDM Accreditation Panel (CDM-AP) in this process. The Board requested the CDM-AP and the secretariat to jointly prepare a concept note, with a view to assessing whether revisions of regulations on this matter are required, for consideration no later than at the eighty-first meeting of the Board.
2. The selection and performance evaluation of experts on the CDM accreditation roster of experts procedure version 1.0 assigns to the secretariat the role of appointing experts from the roster for an assessment, following the principles outlined in Section 6, paragraphs 36 and 37, of the procedure, as follows:
 - (a) Para 36: “The secretariat shall appoint a CDM-AT for an assessment, selecting its members from the Accreditation Roster of Experts (ARoE) in accordance with the CDM accreditation procedure”.
 - (b) Para 37: When appointing members of the CDM Assessment Team (CDM-AT), the secretariat shall take into account the following principles:
 - (i) Competence of the team: members of the CDM-AT shall collectively possess the necessary competence based on the characteristics of the Applicant Entity (AE) and Designated Operational Entity (DOE), the sectoral scopes for which the AE/DOE is applying or is accredited, the project activity or PoA associated with the assessment;
 - (ii) Regional balance: to the extent possible, the CDM-AT should include experts from different regions in order to maintain regional balance and allow capacity-building in all regions;
 - (iii) Use of resources: to the extent possible, all experts on the ARoE should be utilized in assessments, according to their expertise, while ensuring that a balance between external resources and secretariat staff is maintained;
 - (iv) Language: to the extent possible, the CDM-AT should include an expert who has knowledge of the local language relating to the accreditation assessment.

2. Purpose

3. The purpose of this CDM-AP and secretariat joint concept note is to assess whether any revision of the regulations on this matter is required and to inform the Board accordingly at its eighty-first meeting.

3. Key issues and proposed solutions

4. This concept note has been prepared based on the assumption that the Board wishes to receive further information on the provisions of the procedure “Selection and performance evaluation of experts on the CDM accreditation roster of experts” relating to the process for the appointment of CDM-AT and the role of the CDM-AP in this process. The proposed solution is to ensure that the operationalization of the process ensures that the principles outlined in paragraph 37 of the procedure are maintained in a transparent and impartial way and that updates are provided to the CDM-AP and the Board regarding any deviations therefrom.
5. The procedure “Selection and performance evaluation of experts on the CDM accreditation roster of experts” came into effect on 1 June 2014, as per paragraph 13 of the report of the Board on its seventy-ninth meeting. The procedure, as set out in paragraph 36 and 37, requires that the secretariat shall appoint a CDM-AT for an assessment, selecting its members from the ARoE in accordance with the revised CDM accreditation procedure.
6. Previously, the appointment of CDM-ATs to an initial, reaccreditation, regular surveillance or spot check assessment were approved by the chair of the CDM-AP based on proposals made by the secretariat and scrutinized by the CDM-AP which delegated the task of scrutiny to 2 members. This practice was current until 31 Dec 2013 when the CDM Accreditation Procedure Version 11.0 came into effect and moved the responsibility completely to the secretariat.
7. It may be added that the CDM-ATs for performance assessments were already being decided by the secretariat even when CDM-AP was actively involved in the appointment of CDM-ATs for onsite assessments (IA,RS,RA or Spot checks)
8. The secretariat has evaluated the practical implementation of paragraphs 36 and 37 in order to clarify the roles of the secretariat and the CDM-AP and to identify any shortfalls.

3.1. Possible options for the Board

9. The selection procedure adopted by the Board that came into effect on 1 June 2014, has provided the necessary flexibility for the secretariat to act more efficiently in line with any further policy guidance provided by CDM-AP to the secretariat on additional measures to demonstrate impartiality and transparency for appointments of CDM-AT, as appropriate.
10. Currently, the secretariat personnel responsible for appointing the CDM-AT for assessments and final decision-making are largely independent from the experts (secretariat personnel) in the ARoE approved by the CDM-AP.
11. Barriers to efficiency in the CDM accreditation procedure version 11.0 have been addressed by reducing the time of the appointment of CDM-AT for Initial Accreditation (IA), Regular Surveillance (RS), Reaccreditation (RA) and Spot Check (SC) supported by an analysis of the time spent on each step in the accreditation process.¹
12. The benefits of the current approach are that it provides efficiency to the appointment process (shortening the appointment process for example on RS from 14 days on

¹ CDM-AP 67.

average to less than seven days on average) while maintaining the integrity of the system in accordance with international best practices. Compared with the previous process, it reduces one layer of consideration by the CDM-AP.

13. On the other hand, the involvement of CDM-AP, even if it increases the time spent, also adds to the independence and impartiality of the process, or at least the perception of it, which may suffer otherwise especially since secretariat personnel are also engaged in assessments.
14. Typically in Accreditation Bodies (ABs) around the world, the selection of ATs is generally handled by the secretariats but equally typically, generally the secretariat staff in such ABs are not engaged in assessments.
15. The CDM AP and the secretariat do not feel that there is any actual or perceived lack of impartiality or independence in the current practice.
16. It is a common practice in the accreditation business to have a system of regular internal audits as well as the periodic external audits through peer evaluation.
17. The following options are included for consideration by the Board:
 - (a) Option 1. To maintain the provisions in the revised accreditation procedure and in the procedure for selection and performance evaluation of experts on the CDM accreditation roster of experts and to continue to seek policy guidance from the CDM-AP when appointing CDM AT members to assessments and update CDM-AP at each meeting on the appointments made;
 - (b) Option 2. To amend the paragraphs 36 and 37 of the procedure for selection and performance evaluation of experts on the CDM accreditation roster of expert and relevant sections of the CDM accreditation procedure so that the CDM-AP approves the appointment of CDM-AT members to assessments.

4. Impacts

18. The consideration of the Board related to the process for the appointment of CDM-AT members and the role of the CDM-AP in this process and options described in this document enables an informed, consistent, transparent and effective implementation of the accreditation process.
19. If the Board decides to change the provisions on the process for the appointment of CDM-AT members and the role of the CDM-AP in this process, such changes will require a revision of the accreditation procedure version 11.0 as well as changes in the accreditation workflow.

5. Subsequent work and timelines

20. The secretariat will implement the decision as adopted by the Board.

6. Budget and costs

21. If the Board decides to revise the accreditation procedure at a future meeting to reflect a new option, additional costs from the CDM management action plan (MAP) are foreseen related to the proposed course of action.

7. Recommendations to the Board

22. There is no harm in continuing with the current practice (Option 1) unless the Board wishes to strengthen perception of independence and impartiality in which case Option 2 limited to onsite assessments, as per previous practice, could be implemented.
23. Regardless of any option mentioned above the CDM-AP recommends that the Board implement a system of regular internal audits against its documented accreditation system in line with international best practices which inter alia would cover the appointment of ATs besides other accreditation-related activities.

- - - - -

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
01.0	10 November 2014	Initial publication as an annex to the annotated agenda of EB 81.
Decision Class: Regulatory		
Document Type: Information Note		
Business Function: Accreditation		
Key words: appointment of members, establishing assessment teams, role of CDM-AP		