



Bericht

Neunte Sitzung Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (JISC 9)

26.-27. November 2007

Wolfgang Sterk

Tagesordnung

Das Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (JISC) kam am 26.-27. November 2007 zu seiner neunten Sitzung (JISC 9) zusammen. Auf der Tagesordnung standen insbesondere die folgenden Punkte:

1. Akkreditierung von Independent Entities (IEs)
2. Determination Reports
3. Managementplan
4. Zusammenarbeit des JISC mit Anderen
5. Sonstiges

1 Akkreditierung von Independent Entities (IEs)

Der Vorsitzende, Herr Oleg Pluzhnikov, erläuterte den Stand der Arbeit und legte dem JISC zwei Beschlussvorlagen vor (vgl. Anhang):

- Eine Revision des Akkreditierungsverfahrens.
- Eine Klarstellung zur Durchführung von Witnessings.

Das JISC nahm alle Vorlagen des JI-AP an ohne größere Diskussion an.

In seinem Bericht wies Herr Pluzhnikov unter anderem darauf hin, dass das AP über die begrenzten Personalkapazitäten des Sekretariats besorgt sei. Von einigen JISC-Mitgliedern wurde hierzu angeregt, ob nicht andere Mitglieder des JI-Teams die für das AP arbeitenden Personen unterstützen oder

Das JISC beschloss Änderungen des Akkreditierungsverfahrens sowie eine Klarstellung zur Durchführung von Witnessings.

Das JI-AP ist besorgt über die begrenzten Personalkapazitäten des Sekretariats.

die Akkreditierungsgebühren angepasst werden könnten, um besser die tatsächlichen Kosten widerzuspiegeln. Hierauf antwortete das Sekretariat, dass die anderen Mitglieder des JI-Teams ebenfalls ausgelastet seien. Die Akkreditierungsgebühren deckten in der Tat die anfallenden Kosten nicht vollständig ab, dies sei aber von Anfang an klar gewesen. Auf Nachfrage bezüglich der zukünftigen Arbeitsbelastung im Akkreditierungsbereich antwortete das Sekretariat, diese werde gleich hoch bleiben wenn nicht sogar noch weiter wachsen.

2 Determination Reports

Es sind bisher 98 PDDs zur Kommentierung veröffentlicht wurden. Deren Projekte erwarten kumulativ bis 2012 Emissionsreduktionen von 165 Mt CO₂e (siehe Anlage). Am 26. März hatte der erste *determination report* das Verfahren vollständig durchlaufen und gilt nun als endgültig, für ein zweites Projekt, „Rehabilitation of Dolna ArdaHydropower Cascade, Bulgaria“, hatten mindestens drei JISC-Mitglieder ein *Review* beantragt.

Das JISC beschloss, das Projekt einem Review zu unterziehen. Gründe sind Fragen zur Zusätzlichkeit in Bezug auf die Investitions- und finanziellen Barrieren, zur Auswirkung der Installierung einer neuen Einheit auf die bereits installierten Einheiten, die Konsistenz der Abschätzung der Emissionsreduktion sowie die Auswirkungen des Projekts auf Pumpspeicherwasserkraftwerke.

Das JISC beschloss, eine Projekt einem Review zu unterziehen.

Das Sekretariat legte einen Entwurf für ein Verfahren zum Ausscheiden von Projektbeteiligten vor (siehe Anlage).

Das JISC beschloss ein Verfahren zum Ausscheiden von Projektbeteiligten.

Das JISC nahm die Vorlage des Sekretariats ohne größere Diskussion an.

Das Sekretariat hat mit der von JISC 8 beschlossenen Erhebung zur Projektpipelines bei IEs und DFPs begonnen und stellt derzeit die Daten zusammen.

3 Managementplan für 2008/2009

Das Sekretariat stellte eine Anfrage des Exekutivsekretärs zur Änderung der Personalstruktur des JI-Teams vor. Die bisherige Struktur mit drei P4-Teamleitern solle entsprechend den UN-Regeln durch eine neue Struktur mit einem P5-Manger und zwei P4-Teamleitern ersetzt werden (siehe Anlage). Das JISC zeigte sich unglücklich über diese Änderung, da die P5-Stelle international ausgeschrieben werden muss und eine neue Person sich zu-

nächst einarbeiten müsse.

Für das Budget 2008 sind zwei neue Finanzierungszusagen über insgesamt 124.000 USD eingegangen. Falls diese eingelöst werden, verbleibt ein Defizit von 1,41 Mio. USD.

Das Sekretariat stellte erste Überlegungen zur Entwicklung von Managementindikatoren vor, wie von der COP/MOP gefordert. Fatouh Gaye und Daniela Stoycheva werden in Zusammenarbeit mit dem Sekretariat eine erste Liste von potentiellen Indikatoren erstellen.

Das JISC hat derzeit für 2008 noch ein Defizit von 1,4 Mio. USD

4 Zusammenarbeit des JISC mit anderen

Das DOE/AE-Forum diskutiert derzeit eine Änderung seiner Satzung, um auch als Forum für IEs und damit als Kommunikationskanal zwischen IEs und JISC dienen zu können.

Das JISC identifizierte die Notwendigkeit, das Verfahren zum Review von Verifizierungsberichten zu überprüfen. Evgenij Sokolov und Georg Borsting werden für die nächste Sitzung eine Vorlage erstellen.

Das JISC überprüft das Verfahren zum Review von Verifizierungsberichten.

5 Sonstiges

Während der Frage-und-Antwort-Sitzung mit den Beobachtern äußerten einige Beobachter die Befürchtung, es könne negative Auswirkungen auf den Markt haben, dass bereits das zweite Projekt einem Review unterzogen werde. Man solle auch in Betracht ziehen, dass es sich um ein relativ kleines und um ein „early mover“-Projekt handele.

Das JISC antwortete hierauf, es wolle so viele Projekte wie möglich genehmigen, müsse sie aber gründlich prüfen. Der Ausgang des Reviewverfahrens sei zudem offen, das JISC ziele nicht auf eine Ablehnung ab. Eine Sonderbehandlung für bestimmte Projekttypen könne es jedoch nicht geben.

JISC 10 findet am 20-22. Februar 2008 statt.

Dieser Bericht gibt die persönlichen Beobachtungen und Einschätzungen des Autors Wolfgang Sterk wieder. Wolfgang Sterk ist Mitarbeiter der Forschungsgruppe Energie-, Verkehrs- und Klimapolitik des Wuppertal Instituts für Klima, Umwelt, Energie GmbH.

Die geäußerten Einschätzungen sind weder mit der Bundesregierung abgestimmt, noch geben sie die Position des Wuppertal Instituts wieder.

Kontakt:

Wolfgang Sterk

Tel. +49-(0)202 2492-149 (-129 Sekretariat)

Email

wolfgang.sterk@wupperinst.org

**Wuppertal Institut für Klima, Umwelt, Energie GmbH
Döppersberg 19 - 42103 Wuppertal**

Das Wuppertal Institut ist Projektträger des Projektes "JIKO – Entwicklungsphase 2005 – 2007", das im Auftrag des Bundesministeriums für Umwelt, Naturschutz und Reaktorsicherheit durchgeführt wird.

Internet

<http://www.wupperinst.org/Projekte/fg2/1078.html>

Anlagen

JI-AP: Fifth progress report

Oleg Pluzhnikov
Chair, JI-AP

Fatou Gaye
Vice-Chair, JI-AP

Motoharu Yamazaki
UNFCCC secretariat

**Ninth meeting of the Joint Implementation
Supervisory Committee**

Bali, Indonesia
26-27 November 2007

UNFCCC



UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Reporting period

- 24 September – 5 November 2007 (JI-AP 08)

Applications

- 15 applications (JI-AT established for 14 applications)

Roster of experts

- 40 experts from 3 calls

Recommendations to the JISC

- JI accreditation procedure (Version 03)
- Clarification on the timing of witnessing activities

Other outputs

- Revised forms for:
 - Witnessing for “determination” function
 - Evaluation of JI-AT leaders/members
 - Workplan for JI-ATs
- Guidance for JI-ATs for undertaking witnessing activities

- Collaboration with the CDM accreditation process
- Revision of the form for witnessing for the “verification” function
- Organization of 3rd training session for JI-AT experts
- On-line training for JI-AT experts
- Concerns over limited resources of the secretariat staff affecting the support to the work of the JI-AP

- 15 applications, of which 13 are DOEs

Ref No.	Entity name	Sectoral scopes applied
0001	Det Norske Veritas Certification AS (DNV)	1-15 (all scopes)
0002	Japan Quality Assurance Organization (JQA)	1-15 (all scopes)
0003	Deloitte Tohmatsu Evaluation and Certification Organization Co., Ltd (TECO)	1-10, 12-13, 15
0004	Lloyd's Register Quality Assurance Ltd. (LRQA)	1-13
0005	JACO CDM., Ltd.	1-15 (all scopes)
0006	Japan Consulting Institute (JCI)	1-5, 8-11, 13
0007	Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS	1-15 (all scopes)
0008	TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH	1-15 (all scopes)
0009	Spanish Association for Standardisation and Certification (AENOR)	1-15 (all scopes)
0010	SGS United Kingdom Limited	1-15 (all scopes)
0011	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH	1-15 (all scopes)
0012	TÜV Rheinland Japan Ltd.	1-15 (all scopes)
0013	SQS, Swiss Association for Quality and Management Systems	1-15 (all scopes)
0014	KPMG Sustainability B.V. (KPMG)	1-4, 13
0015	Germanischer Lloyd Certification GmbH	1-3, 10

JI -AP: Fifth progress report | Progress of assessment

Ref No.	Entity name	Completeness check	Preliminary consideration	Desk review	On-site assessment	Witnessing
0001	DNV	✓	✓	✓	Site visit done	
0002	JQA	✓	✓	✓	Site visit done	
0003	TECO	✓	✓	✓	Site visit done*	
0004	LRQA	✓	✓	✓	Site visit done	
0005	JACO CDM	✓	✓	✓	Site visit done	
0006	JCI	✓	✓	✓	Site visit done*	
0007	Bureau Veritas	✓	✓	✓	Site visit done	
0008	TÜV SÜD	✓	✓	✓	Site visit done	
0009	AENOR	✓	✓	✓	Site visit done	
0010	SGS UK	✓	✓	✓	Site visit done	
0011	TÜV NORD	✓	✓	✓	Site visit done	
0012	TÜV Rheinland Japan	✓	✓	✓	Site visit done*	
0013	SQS	✓	✓	✓	Site visit done	
0014	KPMG	✓	✓	✓*		
0015	Germanischer Lloyd	✓	✓			

* Conducted after the reporting period.



Main changes

- **On-site assessment**
 - The roles of assessment reports (on-site assessment report, preliminary assessment report, final assessment report) and the timing of applicant IE's commenting on them have been modified to streamline the process as well as to reflect better the issues to be focused at the corresponding stages of reporting;
 - It is made clear that all proposed corrective actions shall be accepted by the JI-AT before the applicant IE starts implementing them.
- **Witnessing activities**
 - The JI-AT leader, in deciding the acceptance of a witnessing opportunity, may consult with the JI-AP;
 - It is made clear that the JI-AP will take into account sectoral scope(s) of a project under witnessing in selecting a methodology expert of the JI-AT for that witnessing;



Main changes (cont.)

- **Witnessing activities (cont.)**
 - Lists of documentary evidences that the applicant IE shall submit to the JI-AT for its witnessing activities have been added;
 - It was made clear that the JI-AT, in preparing a witnessing activity report, shall also prepare non-conformity reports and/or observation reports as appropriate, and submit them together to the applicant IE;
 - The roles of assessment reports (witnessing activity report, non-conformity report, observation report, preliminary assessment report, final assessment report) and the timing of applicant IE's commenting on them have been modified to make them comparable as at the on-site assessment. This modification allows both the applicant IE and the JI-AT to agree on non-conformities and/or observations before the applicant IE proposes corrective actions, as well as reflects better the issues to be focused at the corresponding stages of reporting.

Main changes (cont.)

- **Re-accreditation**
 - The number of witnessing activities will be “decided” by the JI-AP based on the accredited independent entity’s performance in the previous accredited period.
- **Issuing indicative letter**
 - The provisions have been simplified to avoid confusion;
- **Appeals**
 - A new step has been introduced before the appeal panel starts its review on the appeal that the appeal panel checks if the appeal relates to the issues that are allowed to address (i.e. the qualification of the JI-AT and/or noncompliance with procedures);
 - The JISC shall always consider the case at the next meeting (electronic decision is not made possible).
 - After the decision by the JISC on the case, a copy of the appeal panel report will be made available to the appellant.

Main changes (cont.)

- Other
 - Time frame for actions by the JI-AT and applicant IE at each step of assessment has been modified where appropriate, and made consistently expressed in “days”.



Background

- The focus of on-site assessment is to assess whether the applicant IE has a capacity (e.g. policy/procedures, resources) in place.
- The focus of witnessing activities is to assess whether the applicant IE is implementing its tasks effectively in line with the documented policy and procedures.
- Effectiveness of a witnessing activity is questionable if significant non-conformities are found at the on-site assessment and if the witnessing activity has started before the closure of the non-conformities.

Clarification

- After the completion of the site-visit of the on-site assessment, JI-ATs can proceed with witnessing activities if:
 - No non-conformity was identified during the on-site assessment; or
 - Outstanding non-conformities do not substantially affect the applicant IE's:
 - i. Legal identity;
 - ii. Identification of conflict of interest situation;
 - iii. Contract review process;
 - iv. Demonstrated competence of the resources for contract review, assessment team and technical review;
 - v. JI determination procedure

Update on the status of submission of project design documents, determination reports and designated focal points

Francisco Arango
UNFCCC
secretariat

<http://ji.unfccc.int>
ji-info@unfccc.int

Ninth meeting of the
Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee
(JISC 09)

Nusa Dua, Bali, Indonesia
November 2007



UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Project design documents (PDDs)

98 PDDs have been published for comments:

- Emission reductions 2008 - 2012: ~ 165 million tonnes CO₂ equ.
- Various technologies:
 - Renewable energy (biomass, wind, hydro)
 - Methane avoidance (gas distribution, landfills, coal mine)
 - Destruction of nitrous oxide from chemical processes (nitric acid production)
 - Energy efficiency (manufacturing industries, district heating)
 - Fuel switch (manufacturing industries, transportation, power generation)
- Host Parties:
 - Bulgaria (7 projects)
 - Estonia (4)
 - Germany (2)
 - Hungary (1)
 - Latvia (1)
 - Lithuania (7)
 - Poland (7)
 - Romania (2)
 - Russian Federation (49)
 - Slovakia (1)
 - Ukraine (17)

Determinations regarding PDDs

First determination deemed final on 26 March 2007:

"Switch from wet-to-dry process at Podilsky Cement"

Second determination to be considered by the JISC at its ninth meeting:

"Rehabilitation of Dolna Arda Hydropower Cascade, Bulgaria"

Update on status | Designated focal points

Participation requirements

Parties involved in JI projects shall inform the secretariat of their designated focal points and national guidelines and procedures for approving JI projects:

- 30 Annex I Parties have informed of their designated focal points
- 21 Annex I Parties have submitted their procedures for approving JI projects

Designated focal point	National guidelines and procedures
Austria	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Belarus*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Belgium	
Bulgaria	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Canada	
Czech Republic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Denmark	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
European Community	
Finland	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
France	

Designated focal point	National guidelines and procedures
Germany	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Hungary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Ireland	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Italy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Japan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Liechtenstein	
Lithuania	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Luxembourg	
Netherlands	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
New Zealand	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Poland	
Portugal	

Designated focal point	National guidelines and procedures
Romania	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Russian Federation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Slovenia	
Spain	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Sweden	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Switzerland	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Ukraine	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
United Kingdom	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

* The CMP, by its Decision 10/CMP.2, adopted an amendment to Annex B to the Kyoto Protocol, adding Belarus to it.



Draft procedures for the withdrawal of project participants

*Francisco Arango
UNFCCC secretariat*

*<http://ji.unfccc.int>
ji-info@unfccc.int*

Ninth meeting of the
Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee
(JISC 09)

Nusa Dua, Bali, Indonesia
November 2007



UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Withdrawal of project participants

Background

At its **eighth meeting** the JISC agreed on:

- Draft **modalities of communication** of project participants with the JISC
- Draft procedures for **including additional project participants or Parties involved** in joint implementation projects after final determination under the verification procedure under the JISC
- At the same meeting, the JISC requested the secretariat to prepare **draft procedures for the withdrawal of project participants or Parties involved in JI projects**, as appropriate, for consideration by the JISC at its ninth meeting.



Withdrawal of project participants

Background

Definitions

Party involved:

A Party that provides a written project approval.

Project participant:

A Party involved; or

A legal entity authorized by a Party involved to participate in the JI project.



UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Withdrawal of project participants

Draft procedure

- The following information shall be submitted to the secretariat in accordance with the modalities of communication.
 - A statement by the project participants that wish to withdraw.
 - Revised modalities of communication signed by all remaining project participants.
- The information above can be channelled through an AIE at the time of submission of a verification report (project participants cannot withdraw from the time of publication of a verification report until finalisation of the process).
- Legal entities may withdraw completely from the JI project, a Party involved in the JI project may only withdraw from its role as a project participant.
- The information is made available on the UNFCCC JI website by the secretariat.



JI MAP and Status of Resources

Resources, Strengthening the
structure and Indicators

Strengthening

- Based on a request from the Executive Secretary
- Current structure 3 P4s as Team Leaders (Management, Project cycle and Accreditation)
- New Structure: 1 P5 Manager, 2 P4s as Team Leaders (Project Cycle and Accreditation)

Reasons for Strengthening

- HR issue that P4 cannot report to another P4 (UN NY)
- Independent assessment of CDM and JI staff structure
- Accountability issues with regards to income from private sector (e.g. determination fees)
- More relevant role in UNFCCC managerial committees (important due to expected scarcity of resources)
- Similarities with the CDM

Costing

- The change will not have a financial impact on the MAP mainly due to timing of recruitment. No need to revise the MAP at this stage
- However a thorough analysis of the staffing in JI needs to be carried out with the view to be reflected in a MAP revision in mid-2008

Costing

- The change will not have a financial impact on the MAP mainly due to timing of recruitment. No need to revise the MAP at this stage
- However a thorough analysis of the staffing in JI needs to be carried out with the view to be reflected in a MAP revision in mid-2008

Supplementary Resources

As of 26 November 2007

- Core allocation used entirely (additional given/JI AP)
- Income in 2007: USD 1,878,061
- Expenditure in 2007: USD 930,728
- Expected Expenditure 31/Dec/2007: USD 1,050,000
- Expected Carry-over into 2008: USD 828,081
- Shortfall in 2008: USD 1,534,569
- Expected Income (pledges): USD 124,000 (balance 1.41 million)
- Required for staff (1.5 year): USD 1.2 million
- Operational Cushion from fees: USD 158,842

Indicators

- In 3/CMP.2, the COP/MOP requested the JISC to
 - (a) Identifying and implementing, wherever warranted by and compatible with the principles and the purpose of joint implementation, further measures aimed at strengthening the joint implementation process and its responsiveness to the needs of Parties and stakeholders;
 - **(b) Adopting appropriate management indicators;**

Role of Indicators

RBM Indicators make it possible to demonstrate results.

Indicators can also help in producing results by providing a reference point for monitoring, decision-making, stakeholder consultations and evaluation. In particular, indicators can help to:

- Measure progress and achievements;
- Clarify consistency between activities, outputs, outcomes and goals;
- Ensure legitimacy and accountability to all stakeholders by demonstrating progress;
- Assess project and staff performance.

Type of indicators

- **Situational** (impact) indicators, which provide a broad picture of whether the developmental changes that matter to the UN are actually occurring (impact indicators)

and situational indicators are essentially the same, although the former may be more

specific and the latter may be more generic);

- **Outcome** indicators, which assess progress against specified outcomes;
- **Output** indicators, which assess progress against specific operational activities.

Example of Indicators

- Possibility of divide the indicators in 5 groups and measure performance with respect to:
- **JISC**: Number of decisions taken
- **JIAP** : number of recommendations provided to JISC
- **AIEs**: Number of AIEs (increase/expected level)
- **Determination**: Percentage of JI projects determined compared to requests made
- **Secretariat and IT**: support to the organization of meetings / daily visitor to the site

Next Steps

- As for CDM: prepare an initial list
- Nominate 1 or 2 JISC members to finalize list of indicators
- Present final list for discussion and eventual approval at next JISC or JISC11
- Dedicate staff to this

Schedule of Meetings 2008 | JISC & AP

Schedule 2008

JI-AP 9	31 January to 1 February
JISC 10:	20-22 February
JI-AP 10	16-17 March
JISC 11:	7-9 April
JI-AP 11	19 - 20 May
JISC 12:	15-17 June (SB28 2-13 June)
JI-AP 12, 13	??
JISC 13:	8-10 September
JI-AP 14,15	??
JISC 14:	26-28 November (CMP4 1-12 Dec)

