

**Annex 4****DRAFT PROCEDURES FOR APPRAISALS OF DETERMINATIONS
UNDER THE VERIFICATION PROCEDURE UNDER THE
JOINT IMPLEMENTATION SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE****Note by the secretariat**

1. At its second meeting, the JISC considered draft procedures for reviews under the verification procedure under the JISC prepared by the secretariat. It discussed the operationalisation of paragraphs 35 and 39 of the JI guidelines, including the organisation of requests for reviews, forms to be used for requests for reviews and the meeting of tight deadlines. It revised the draft procedures on this basis, but decided to continue the discussions, in particular with regard to deadlines and criteria for reviews, at its next meeting, and requested the secretariat to prepare draft terms of reference for experts to participate in review teams.
2. On this basis the secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the JISC:
 - (a) Revised the draft procedures for reviews under the verification procedure under the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (annex 3 of the annotations to the proposed agenda of the third meeting of the JISC); and
 - (b) Prepared draft procedures for appraisals of determinations under the verification procedure under the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (annex 4 of the annotations to the proposed agenda of the third meeting of the JISC) as well as draft terms of reference for experts appraising determinations or participating in review teams under the verification procedure under the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (annex 5 of the annotations to the proposed agenda of the third meeting of the JISC).



**PROCEDURES FOR APPRAISALS OF DETERMINATIONS
UNDER THE VERIFICATION PROCEDURE UNDER THE
JOINT IMPLEMENTATION SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE**

Version 01

A. Background

1. Paragraphs 30–45 of the annex to decision 9/CMP.1 on guidelines for the implementation of Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol (hereinafter referred to as JI guidelines) define the verification procedure under the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (JISC) (hereinafter referred to as the Track 2 procedure).
2. The Track 2 procedure is the determination by an independent entity, accredited pursuant to appendix A of the JI guidelines, of whether a project and the ensuing reductions of anthropogenic emissions by sources or enhancements of anthropogenic removals by sinks meet the relevant requirements of Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol and the JI guidelines.
3. In accordance with paragraph 3 (f) of the JI guidelines the JISC shall be responsible for the review procedures set out in paragraphs 35 and 39 of the JI guidelines.
4. The present document defines procedures for appraisals of determinations pursuant to paragraphs 33 (hereinafter referred to as determinations) and 37 (hereinafter referred to as verifications) of the JI guidelines to assist the individual JISC members in their decisions on whether to request a review.
5. With regard to appraisals of determinations and verifications the JISC draws on a roster of experts established by it.¹

B. Procedure for appraisals of determinations referred to in paragraph 33 of the JI guidelines

1. Background

6. According to paragraphs 33 and 34 of the JI guidelines the accredited independent entity (AIE) shall:
 - (a) Determine whether:
 - (i) The proposed JI project has been approved by the Parties involved;
 - (ii) The project would result in a reduction of anthropogenic emissions by sources or an enhancement of anthropogenic removals by sinks that is additional to any that would otherwise occur;
 - (iii) The project has an appropriate baseline and monitoring plan in accordance with the criteria set out in appendix B of the JI guidelines;

¹ The JISC may also draw on this roster of experts when setting up review teams (see “Procedures for reviews under the verification procedure under the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee”). The terms of reference for experts to be involved in appraisals of determinations and/or verifications are defined in “Terms of reference for experts appraising determinations or participating in review teams under the verification procedure under the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee”.



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

- (iv) Project participants have submitted to the AIE documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project, including transboundary impacts, in accordance with procedures as determined by the host Party, and, if those impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the host Party, have undertaken an environmental impact assessment in accordance with procedures as required by the host Party;

(b) Make its determination publicly available through the secretariat, together with an explanation of its reasons, including a summary of comments received and a report of how due account was taken of these.

7. According to paragraph 35 of the JI guidelines the determination regarding a project design document (PDD) shall be deemed final 45 days after the date on which the determination is made public, unless a Party involved in the project or three of the members of the JISC request a review by the JISC. If such a review is requested, the JISC shall finalize the review as soon as possible, but no later than six months or at the second meeting following the request for review. The JISC shall communicate its decision on the determination and the reasons for it to the project participants and the public. Its decision shall be final.

2. Appraisal procedure

8. As soon as the determination by an AIE has been made publicly available the secretariat informs the JISC members and alternate members via the JISC listserv on the name of the project, the link to the UNFCCC JI web page where the determination report can be found and the opening (the day after announcement) and closing dates for requests for review according to paragraph 35 of the JI guidelines.²

9. In consultation with the Chair of the JISC, the secretariat shall identify two experts for the appraisal of the determination from the roster of experts established, inter alia, for this purpose. In assigning the task the specific expertise of the experts has to be taken into account in relation to the specific project concerned. One of the experts shall be an expert in baseline setting and monitoring.

10. The two experts assigned to undertake the task will be informed and shall have a maximum of 2 days to indicate whether they have a conflict of interest or not. If a conflict of interest situation exists another expert shall be assigned.

11. The experts shall prepare an appraisal using the JI determination appraisal form (F-JI-DA) contained in appendix 1 to this document.³ The appraisal shall indicate whether the requirements of Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol and the JI guidelines and further relevant requirements defined by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (COP/MOP) or the JISC with regard to determinations are met and appropriately dealt with by the AIE and provide reasons in case these conditions are not fulfilled. The appraisal shall also include suggestions on how the issues identified could be avoided, if appropriate.

12. The experts shall submit their appraisals to the secretariat within 15 calendar days through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC JI website.

² See “Procedures on public availability of documents under the verification procedure under the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee”.

³ This form can be downloaded from section “Reference/Forms” on the UNFCCC JI website <<http://ji.unfccc.int/Ref/Forms.html>> and/or obtained electronically from the UNFCCC secretariat.



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

13. The secretariat will forward the appraisals to the JISC within one working day as an input for its consideration of the determination.

C. Procedure for appraisals of verifications referred to in paragraph 37 of the JI guidelines

1. Background

14. According to paragraphs 37 and 38 of the JI guidelines the AIE shall:

(a) Upon receipt of a monitoring report referred to under paragraph 36 of the JI guidelines, make a determination of the reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources or enhancements of anthropogenic removals by sinks reported by project participants in accordance with appendix B of the JI guidelines, provided that they were monitored and calculated in accordance with paragraph 33 of the JI guidelines;

(b) Make its determination under paragraph 37 of the JI guidelines publicly available through the secretariat, together with an explanation of its reasons.

15. According to paragraph 39 of the JI guidelines the determination regarding reported reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources or enhancements of anthropogenic removals by sinks shall be deemed final 15 days after the date on which it is made public, unless a Party involved in the project or three of the members of the JISC request a review by the JISC. If such a review is requested, the JISC shall:

(a) At its next meeting or no later than 30 days after the formal request for the review decide on its course of action. If it decides that the request has merit, it shall perform a review;

(b) Complete its review within 30 days following its decision to perform the review;

(c) Inform the project participants of the outcome of the review, and make public its decision and the reasons for it.

2. Appraisal procedure

16. As soon as the verification by an AIE has been made publicly available the secretariat informs the JISC members and alternate members via the JISC listserv on the name of the project, the link to the UNFCCC JI web page where the verification report can be found and the opening (the day after announcement) and closing dates for requests for review according to paragraph 39 of the JI guidelines.⁴

17. In consultation with the Chair of the JISC, the secretariat shall identify two experts for the appraisal of the verification from the roster of experts established, inter alia, for this purpose. In assigning the task the specific expertise of the experts has to be taken into account in relation to the specific project concerned. An expert having already been involved in an appraisal of a determination for a specific project shall not be selected for the appraisal of a verification for the same project, whenever possible.

18. The two experts assigned to undertake the task will be informed and shall have a maximum of 2 days to indicate whether they have a conflict of interest or not. If a conflict of interest situation exists another expert shall be assigned.

⁴ See “Procedures on public availability of documents under the verification procedure under the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee”.



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

19. The experts shall prepare an appraisal using the JI verification appraisal form (F-JI-VA) contained in appendix 2 to this document.⁵ The appraisal shall indicate whether the requirements of Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol and the JI guidelines and further relevant requirements defined by the COP/MOP or the JISC with regard to verifications are met and appropriately dealt with by the AIE and provide reasons in case these conditions are not fulfilled. The appraisal shall also include suggestions on how the issues identified could be avoided, if appropriate.

20. The experts shall submit their appraisals to the secretariat within 6 calendar days through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC JI website.


21. The secretariat will forward the appraisal to the JISC within one working day as an input for its consideration of the verification.

⁵ This form can be downloaded from section “Reference/Forms” on the UNFCCC JI website <<http://ji.unfccc.int/Ref/Forms.html>> and/or obtained electronically from the UNFCCC secretariat.



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

APPENDIX 1

	JI DETERMINATION APPRAISAL FORM (F-JI-DA) (This form is to be completed by an expert preparing an appraisal of a determination pursuant to paragraph 33 of the JI guidelines.)
C O N F I D E N T I A L	
Name of expert	
P r o j e c t	
Title and reference number of proposed JI project	
Host Party(ies)	
Project participants	
Small-scale project (yes/no)	
Brief description of project	
Length of crediting period	
Annual average of estimated emission reductions over the crediting period (tonnes of CO₂ equivalent)	
Name of accredited independent entity (AIE) that performed the determination pursuant to paragraph 33 of the JI guidelines	
A p p r a i s a l	
All requirements of Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol and the JI guidelines and further relevant requirements are met and appropriately dealt with by the AIE (yes/no)	
Identification of issues where requirements of Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol or the JI guidelines or further relevant requirements are not met and/or appropriately dealt with by the AIE	
Suggestions on how the issues identified could be avoided, if appropriate	



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

APPENDIX 2

	JI VERIFICATION APPRAISAL FORM (F-JI-VA) (This form is to be completed by an expert preparing an appraisal of a determination pursuant to paragraph 37 of the JI guidelines.)
C O N F I D E N T I A L	
Name of expert	
P r o j e c t	
Title and reference number of JI project	
Host Party(ies)	
Project participants	
Small-scale project (yes/no)	
Length of crediting period	
Annual average of estimated emission reductions over the crediting period (tonnes of CO₂ equivalent)	
Name of accredited independent entity (AIE) that performed the determination pursuant to paragraph 33 of the JI guidelines	
E m i s s i o n r e d u c t i o n s / E n h a n c e m e n t s o f r e m o v a l s	
Monitoring period (DD/MM/YYYY - DD/MM/YYYY)	
Determined emission reductions / enhancements of removals (tonnes of CO₂ equivalent)	
Name of accredited independent entity (AIE) that performed the determination pursuant to paragraph 37 of the JI guidelines	
A p p r a i s a l	
All requirements of Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol and the JI guidelines and further relevant requirements are met and appropriately dealt with by the AIE (yes/no)	
Identification of issues where requirements of Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol or the JI guidelines or further relevant requirements are not met and/or appropriately dealt with by the AIE	
Suggestions on how the issues identified could be avoided, if appropriate	