

Recommendation

JISC recommendations on the review of the joint implementation guidelines to SBI 42

Version 01.0



United Nations
Framework Convention on
Climate Change

1. Recommendations on the review of the joint implementation guidelines to the Subsidiary Body for Implementation

1. In response to the request by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol at its tenth session to elaborate recommendations for consideration by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation at its forty-second session, on the review of the joint implementation guidelines, the JISC makes the following recommendations.

1.1. Joint implementation in the future climate regime

2. The review of the JI guidelines was mandated by CMP 1¹ to build the experiences and lessons learned from the operation of the mechanism during the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol (CP1, 2008–2012) into the second commitment period (CP2, 2013–2020). The current status and timelines indicate that the revised JI guidelines will not be operational before the second half of CP2 – due to the need to finalize negotiations on this issue and to manage the transition from one set of guidelines to the other.
3. Furthermore, it is likely that JI will suffer from a prolonged period of low demand in the period up to 2020, given the prevailing levels of mitigation ambition. The progress in the ratification of CP2 and the current inability to issue CP2 emission reduction units (ERUs) also present important threats to the continued operation of the mechanism.
4. At the same time, the work that Parties are conducting under the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) on the 2015 agreement indicates that different commitment structures and mechanisms will be relevant as of 2020, accompanied by changes to rules for measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) and for the accounting of progress towards commitments.
5. It is expected that, over time, more countries will take on quantitative emission limits, although these may often be of a sector-based nature as well as economy-wide. This is of particular relevance for JI, as it is a mechanism that provides for the crediting of activities in sectors or economies that are subject to quantitative emission limits (environments with “capped” emissions). However, the long-term perspective of JI will require it to be integrated into the underlying MRV and accounting systems that will be developed for the 2015 agreement.
6. It is therefore recommended that, in continuing their review of the JI guidelines, Parties seriously consider them in light of the emerging picture of mechanisms for the post-2020 period, currently discussed under the ADP. The growing number of Parties that could make use of a mechanism such as JI, and the developments in MRV and accounting rules, are of particular relevance.
7. It is further recommended that Parties take note of the considerable investment that has been made by the JISC and by the Parties that is reflected in the current draft text. This draft builds on years of experience with the implementation of JI and provides for an enhanced mechanism with greater transparency and international oversight. Should

¹ Decision 9/CMP.1, paragraph 8.

Parties consider that a crediting mechanism functioning among countries that take on quantitative emission limits is to form a part of the post-2020 architecture, this investment and experience should be utilized to the fullest and the review of the JI guidelines can provide a future blueprint.

1.2. JISC conformity assessment process

8. One of the proposed functions of the JISC is the assessment of the conformity of JI host Parties with the modalities and procedures adopted by the CMP and the minimum requirements and procedures set by the JISC.² Parties would be required to rectify any identified non-conformities and provide evidence of the rectification to the JISC.³
9. Further provisions would also be needed with regard to any consequences of non-conformities being identified or left unaddressed. The environmental integrity of JI would necessitate that a continuing failure to rectify identified non-conformities should trigger a sufficient consequence to incentivize compliance, such as suspending a Party's ability to submit a notice of acceptance of the verification of emission reductions and removals.
10. It is therefore recommended that the following provisions be added to the draft "Modalities and procedures for the implementation of Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol":
 - (a) Amendment of paragraph 56: "Unless non-conformities raised in accordance with paragraph 13(e) above have not been rectified in accordance with paragraph 36 above, the JISC shall ...";
 - (b) Additional paragraph 13bis: "The JISC shall elaborate its procedures for the implementation of paragraph 13(e) above, for consideration by the CMP, and shall subsequently recommend to the CMP revisions to such rules as needed."

1.3. JISC review processes

11. A further proposed function of the JISC under the draft JI modalities and procedures is to review the registration of JI activities and the issuance of ERUs by host Parties.⁴ The current text suggests that reviews should be conducted on a random basis. Such random selection in auditing is generally used where there is a low risk of error, the error has low impact and all activities have a similar chance of error. It may be argued that this is insufficiently robust to support the international oversight role of the JISC. It would be necessary to clearly state the consequences of a review identifying problems.
12. It is therefore recommended that the following provision be amended in the draft "Modalities and procedures for the implementation of Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol":
 - (a) Amendment of paragraph 13(f): "Undertaking reviews of JI activities as set out in paragraphs 48 and 56 below and, where appropriate, postponing or declining its recording of a registered JI activity or its endorsement of an issuance of ERUs."

² FCCC/SBI/2014/L.34, paragraph 13(e).

³ FCCC/SBI/2014/L.34, paragraph 36.

⁴ FCCC/SBI/2014/L.34, paragraph 13(f) – this could also potentially extend to reviews of any post-registration changes to a JI activity; cf. paragraph 49.

1.4. Convergence of common functions

13. The draft modalities and procedures include references to synergy between JI and the clean development mechanism (CDM): paragraph 8 on minimum technical requirements and paragraph 40 on the accreditation of entities to validate activities and verify emission reductions. Indeed, these paragraphs point to technical work which is of the same nature and is needed by both mechanisms. Both the CDM and JI have technical panels working on the accreditation of third-party entities. While JI does not have a methodological panel, it uses the CDM methodologies developed by the CDM methodological panels and working groups.
14. The case of minimum technical requirements refers to standards and procedures that define the nature of crediting activities and the MRV rules for estimating emission reductions and removals. Technically, the issues and challenges associated with these requirements are the same, irrespective of which mechanism the activities are registered under. The mechanisms stand to benefit from combining resources in undertaking this work, as participants in the mechanisms would benefit from being able to work within the same or similar requirements in their activities under both mechanisms and across all the regions in which they are active.
15. In the case of accreditation, synergy and alignment between the mechanisms could be expected to improve quality and efficiency in operating the mechanisms and reduce transaction costs for those being accredited.⁵ It would provide for the consistent use of best practices, consistency in approach to the same issues and standards, and significant cost savings for the regulatory bodies, the secretariat, project participants and other stakeholders.
16. While the immediate examples considered in the current draft modalities and procedures concern JI and the CDM, in the longer term it would be worthwhile considering synergy in the context of mechanisms under the 2015 agreement.
17. It is therefore recommended that Parties consider ways to encourage and build upon synergy between JI and the CDM, as well as with other mechanisms that may become relevant under the 2015 agreement.

1.5. Crediting periods

18. A number of issues relating to crediting periods remain open in the draft JI modalities and procedures. The period over which a JI activity can generate credits is a fundamental determinant of whether the activity is financially viable. Longer crediting periods will tend to increase financial viability but provide less long-term confidence that the emission reductions remain real and additional. Shorter crediting periods with options for renewal allow for more frequent reassessment of the baseline, and potentially additionality, thus increasing the assurance that emission reductions are real and additional, but also reducing certainty on the volume of ERUs issued over the life of a JI activity and increasing transaction costs associated with the JI activity.
19. The current draft modalities and procedures link crediting periods to the commitment period of the underlying agreement. Such timing is very arbitrary for participants in JI

⁵ Recommendation of the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee on the accreditation system for joint implementation aligned with that of the clean development mechanism – FCCC/SBI/2014/5.

activities and bears no relation to the period needed for financial viability or environmental integrity. As such, there is merit in setting the crediting period at the appropriate length for the JI activity while being clear that issuance can only occur when the host Party has established a quantified emission limit for the relevant period. This would allow JI activities to be implemented for the long term in the context of governments undertaking to take on long-term quantitative commitments.

20. The draft modalities and procedures currently allow flexibility to the participants in a JI activity to choose the length of their crediting period, up to a maximum number of years. It would be beneficial to include an assessment of the appropriate length of the crediting period within the minimum technical requirements set for JI. A number of factors would be relevant in this assessment, such as technology, activity type, activity scale, barriers, lifetime of equipment, country contexts and others.
21. It is therefore recommended that the following amendments be made to the draft modalities and procedures:
 - (a) Additional paragraph 10(a)bis: “Ensure that the length of crediting periods, and renewals thereof, are appropriate to the JI activity”;
 - (b) Deletion of elements in paragraph 43 referring to the expiry of the commitment period.

1.6. Scope of appeals

22. Under the draft JI modalities and procedures it is stated that any decision taken by the JISC may be subject to appeal by affected stakeholders. This appeal is to be conducted in accordance with provisions to be determined by the CMP.
23. The implications of the wording “any decision” are very broad and could be interpreted to extend to decisions of a procedural or intermediate nature. To prevent the appeals process from becoming overly complex and a burden on procedural decisions, it would be beneficial to narrow the scope of appealable decisions to those of a final nature where they impact directly on stakeholders or Parties. In particular, this would be final decisions in relation to an activity, accreditation of independent entities and conformity assessments.
24. It is therefore recommended that the following amendment be made in the draft “Modalities and procedures for the implementation of Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol”:
 - (a) Amendment of paragraph 59: “A final decision in relation to an activity, accreditation of independent entities or conformity assessments taken by the JISC in accordance with these modalities and procedures may be subject to appeal by affected stakeholders, in accordance with provisions to be determined by the CMP.”

- - - - -

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
01.0	13 March 2015	JISC 36, Annex 3 Initial adoption.

Decision Class: Regulatory
Document Type: Recommendation (to the SBI)
Business Function: Governance
Keywords: JISC, SBI, appeal, crediting period, JI guidelines, modalities and procedures
