

FOURTEENTH PROGRESS REPORT OF THE JOINT IMPLEMENTATION ACCREDITATION PANEL (JI-AP)

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
I. INTRODUCTION.....	2
II. STATUS OF APPLICATIONS FOR ACCREDITATION.....	2
III. RECOMMENDATION FROM THE JI-AP	2
IV. STATUS OF ROSTER OF EXPERTS	2
V. OTHER OUTPUTS OF THE JI-AP	2
VI. ISSUES UNDER CONSIDERATION.....	3
Annex 1: Status of applications for accreditation	4
Annex 2: Forms	6
• Final assessment report (version 04) (F-JI-FR)	
• Report on witnessing activity (Determination) (version 03) (F-JI-WRdet)	
• Report on witnessing activity (Verification) (version 03) (F-JI-WRver)	
• Work plan for regular on-site surveillance for JI-AT (version 01) (F-JI-Wsur)	
• Work plan for spot-check for JI-AT (version 01) (F-JI-Wsc)	

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This fourteenth progress report covers the period from 16 August 2009 to 25 September 2009. During this period the Joint Implementation Accreditation Panel (JI-AP) held one meeting (JI-AP 19) on 24-25 September 2009.

II. STATUS OF APPLICATIONS FOR ACCREDITATION

2. Since the end of the previous reporting period, there was no new application from independent entities (IEs) for the joint implementation (JI) accreditation process. Therefore, the number of applications since the opening of the process of receiving submissions of applications on 6 October 2006 by the end of the present reporting period remains the same as in the previous reporting period, i.e. 15 applications in total.

3. The JI-AP has already selected members of joint implementation assessment teams (JI-ATs) and agreed on the workplans for all 15 applications in previous reporting periods. Of these, the JI-AP had decided to put on hold the start of the JI-AT's assessment work for one application until the applicant IE submits additional documents relating to its application for additional sectoral scopes as reported in the sixth progress report. This applicant IE had not submitted the additional documents by the end of the present reporting period. Consequently, the assessment work has started for 14 applications by respective JI-ATs.

4. Desk reviews and on-site assessment have been successfully completed for 14 applications during previous reporting periods. As a result, a letter indicating successful completion of the desk review and the on-site assessment (indicative letter) has been issued by the JI-AP to 14 IEs in accordance with paragraph 55 of the "Procedure for accrediting independent entities by the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (version 05)" (hereinafter referred to as JI accreditation procedure). For the present reporting period, no desk review or on-site assessment has been conducted by the JI-AT for the remaining one applicant IE due to the reason described in paragraph 3 above. The details of the applications and the status of processing them are presented in annex 1.

5. By the end of the present reporting period, 18 witnessing opportunities submitted from nine applicant IEs have been accepted by respective JI-AT leaders, in accordance with paragraphs 57 of the JI accreditation procedure. Of these, five witnessing opportunities were withdrawn by the IEs, hence currently 13 witnessing activities were in the pipeline, underway or have been completed. These figures have not changed since the last reporting period. Corresponding PDDs or monitoring reports have been published on the UNFCCC website subsequently for all of them.

6. Of these 13 witnessing activities, five had been completed in previous reporting periods, which subsequently led to the accreditation by the JISC of three IEs by the end of the last reporting period. No new witnessing activity has been completed in the present reporting period, nor no witnessing activity is underway, hence eight are still in the pipeline. Therefore there is no new recommendation from the JI-AP to the JISC on accreditation of an IE.

III. RECOMMENDATION FROM THE JI-AP

7. There is no recommendation by the JI-AP for the present reporting period.

IV. STATUS OF ROSTER OF EXPERTS

8. Since the end of the previous reporting period, the JI-AP did not add or withdraw any experts to/from the roster. Therefore, the number of experts on the roster remains the same as in the previous reporting period, i.e. 41 experts in total.

V. OTHER OUTPUTS OF THE JI-AP

9. Following the revision of the JI accreditation procedure to version 05 by the JISC at its seventeenth meeting, the JI-AP developed as well as revised some of the forms to be used by JI-ATs in their assessments of IEs and adopted them as contained in annex 2.

VI. ISSUES UNDER CONSIDERATION

10. The JI-AP has been considering measures to further improve the JI accreditation process. The measures under consideration are:

- (a) Elaboration of JI accreditation standards/requirements document;
- (b) Management of JI-AT experts, including the development of an on-line training course for experts on the roster.

- - - - -

Annex 1: Status of applications for accreditation

UNFCCC Ref. No.	Entity name	Sectoral scopes applied	Accreditation steps								
			Completeness check	Preliminary consideration	Workplan	JI-AT establishment	Desk review	On-site assessment	Indicative letter	Witnessing activity	Accreditation ¹
JI-E-0001	Det Norske Veritas Certification AS (DNV)	1-15	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	2 opportunities accepted	
JI-E-0002	Japan Quality Assurance Organization (JQA)	1-15	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	1 opportunity accepted (1 withdrawn)	
JI-E-0003	Deloitte Tohmatsu Evaluation and Certification Organization (Deloitte-TECO) ²	1-10, 12-13, 15	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
JI-E-0004	Lloyd's Register Quality Assurance Ltd. (LRQA)	1-13	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	1 opportunity accepted	
JI-E-0005	JACO CDM., LTD (JACO)	1-14	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	1 opportunity accepted	
JI-E-0006	Japan Consulting Institute (JCI)	1-5, 8-11, 13	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
JI-E-0007	Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS (BVC Holding SAS) ³	1-15	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	3 opportunities accepted (1 completed) (1 withdrawn)	✓ (II)
JI-E-0008	TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH (TÜV- SÜD)	1-15	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	3 opportunities accepted (1 completed) (2 withdrawn)	✓ (III, VI)

UNFCCC Ref. No.	Entity name	Sectoral scopes applied	Accreditation steps								
			Completeness check	Preliminary consideration	Workplan	JI-AT establishment	Desk review	On-site assessment	Indicative letter	Witnessing activity	Accreditation ¹
JI-E-0009	Spanish Association for Standardisation and Certification (AENOR)	1-15	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
JI-E-0010	SGS United Kingdom Ltd. (SGS)	1-15	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	4 opportunities accepted (2 completed) (1 withdrawn)	✓ (II, III)
JI-E-0011	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH (TÜV NORD)	1-15	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	1 opportunity accepted	
JI-E-0012	TÜV Rheinland Japan Ltd. (TÜV Rheinland) ⁴	1-15	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	2 opportunities accepted	
JI-E-0013	Swiss Association for Quality and Management Systems (SQS)	1-15	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
JI-E-0014	KPMG Advisory N.V. (KPMG) ⁶	1-4, 13	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
JI-E-0015	Germanischer Lloyd Certification GmbH (GLC)	1-3, 7, 10, 13	✓	✓	✓ ⁵	✓					

Legend:

✓ = stage completed

1) Accreditation is granted for all sectoral scopes applied for. Roman numbers in brackets indicate the sectoral groups for which witnessing activities have been successful to date. For more details on how accreditation is granted, confirmed or suspended with regard to sectoral groups, see section B.3 and annex 2 of the JI accreditation procedure (version 05).

2) Formerly named as “Tohmatsu Evaluation and Certification Organization Co., Ltd”.

3) Formerly named as “Bureau Veritas Certification Holding S.A.”.

4) Formerly applied from “TÜV Industrie Service GmbH, TÜV Rheinland Group”.

5) The JI-AP decided to re-visit the workplan once the applicant IE has submitted documents relating to its application for additional sectoral scopes.

6) Formerly named as “KPMG Sustainability B.V.”.

Annex 2: Forms

- **Final assessment report (version 04) (F-JI-FR)**
- **Report on witnessing activity (Determination) (version 03) (F-JI-WRdet)**
- **Report on witnessing activity (Verification) (version 03) (F-JI-WRver)**
- **Work plan for regular on-site surveillance for JI-AT (version 01) (F-JI-Wsur)**
- **Work plan for spot-check for JI-AT (version 01) (F-JI-Wsc)**

**Name of entity
and
Address of site(s) assessed**

UNFCCC ref. no. of entity

Type of assessment
(please tick appropriate box(es))

On-site assessment

1

Initial witnessing activity ☐

9

Ex-post witnessing activity ☐

9

Project name under witnessing:

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \end{array} \right)$$

Function assessed in the case of witnessing activity:

Determination¹

☐

Verification²

☐**Sectoral scope(s) assessed**

Corresponding sectoral group

JI-AT leader's name**JI-AT member(s)' name(s)**

Executive summary of JI-AT's evaluation regarding the entity's compliance with the JI accreditation standards and requirements:

Please provide a summary for each of the following aspects as a minimum:

In the case of on-site assessment

- Legal identity
- Sufficiency in human resources
- Financial stability and liability coverage
- Internal procedures for carrying out JI function
- Competence for carrying out the functions in the sectoral scope(s) under assessment
- Existence of responsible management structure and quality assurance procedures
- Independency/impartiality
- Arrangements for safeguarding impartiality

In the case of initial or ex-post witnessing activity

- Sufficiency in human resources
- Internal procedures for carrying out JI function
- Availability of necessary expertise covering the sectoral scope(s) under assessment
- Existence of responsible management structure and quality assurance procedures
- Any other aspects relating to the JI accreditation standards and requirements recognized by the JI-AT

Summary of non-conformities and corrective actions implemented (as applicable):

¹ Determination regarding project design document in accordance with paragraph 33 of the JI guidelines.

² Determination regarding emission reductions or enhancements of removals in accordance with paragraph 37 of the JI guidelines.

Comments by entity on draft final assessment report:

Description of how comments by entity have been addressed, refer to non-conformity forms as applicable:

Recommendation to the JI-AP regarding issuance of indicative letter (in the case of on-site assessment), initial accreditation (in the case of initial witnessing activity) or confirmation of accreditation (in the case of ex-post witnessing activity):

JI-AT leader's signature:

Date:



REPORT ON WITNESSING ACTIVITY (DETERMINATION)

(Complete one form for each witnessing activity)

Name of entity and Address of site(s) assessed, if any	
UNFCCC ref no. of entity	
Title and reference number of the JI project under witnessing	
Sectoral scope(s) witnessed	
Methodology used	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved CDM methodology, Reference: <input type="checkbox"/> Other methodology
Activity (project) witnessed (describe in brief the nature of the activity witnessed e.g. single assessor or team, dates, duration, small/large-scale projects)	
Name of JI-AT leader	
Names of JI-AT member(s) (indicate the expert on baseline setting and monitoring)	

Evaluation

(Key: S = Satisfactory, NS = Not satisfactory, NA = Not Applicable)

Criteria (fill as applicable to the activity witnessed)	Rating	Comments
1. Assessment of effective planning by the entity witnessed 1.1. Does the entity effectively apply its procedures to keep up-to-date with the decisions of the JISC related to determination activities, including criteria on baseline-setting and monitoring? 1.2. Is the allocation of the resources appropriate to the scope of determination by the entity? 1.3. Has all the pertinent documentation been identified prior to the determination? 1.4. Does the entity use checklists for performing determination activities (general or specific)? Are the checklists or other means used comprehensive?		
2. Project assessment details for the determination 2.1 Does the entity check effectively the contents of the PDD submitted by project participants to confirm that all the information referred to in paragraph 31 of the JI guidelines is attached? 2.1.1 Does the entity check if the requirements listed in paragraph 2 of the "Clarification regarding the public availability of documents under the verification procedure under the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee" are fulfilled?		

<p>2.2 Does the entity handle appropriately the publication of PDDs through the secretariat?</p> <p>2.3 Does the entity handle appropriately the comments submitted by Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC accredited observers?</p> <p>2.4 Does the entity check whether the project has been approved by the Parties involved?</p> <p>2.5 Does the entity check whether project participants are authorised by a Party involved?</p> <p>2.6 Does the entity check effectively if the definition and justification of the project boundary by project participants is appropriate?</p> <p>2.6.1 Does the entity check effectively if the project participants undertook the assessment of the potential leakage of the proposed JI project and explained which sources of leakage are to be calculated and which can be neglected?</p> <p>2.7 Does the entity check effectively whether the project would result in a reduction of anthropogenic emissions by sources or enhancements of anthropogenic removals by sinks that is additional to any that would otherwise occur?</p> <p>2.7.1 Does the entity check effectively the approach for the demonstration of additionality chosen by project participants and the justification provided?</p> <p>2.8 Does the entity check effectively whether the project has an appropriate baseline in accordance with the criteria set out in appendix B to the JI guidelines?</p> <p>2.8.1 Does the entity check the approach and selection of option for the establishment of the baseline chosen by project participants and the justification provided?</p> <p>2.9 Does the entity check effectively whether the project has an appropriate monitoring plan in accordance with the criteria set out in appendix B of the JI guidelines?</p> <p>2.10 Does the entity check effectively the calculation/estimation of the emission reductions/enhancement of removals presented in the PDD?</p> <p>2.11 Does the entity check effectively that the selection of the crediting period by project participants conforms with requirements for JI projects?</p> <p>2.12 Does the entity check effectively whether project participants have submitted the information on environmental impacts referred to in paragraph 33 (d) of the JI guidelines?</p>		
--	--	--

<p>2.13 Does the entity provide its reasons for the determination opinion?</p> <p>2.14 Does the entity handle appropriately confidential information?</p> <p>Only for projects applying a clean development mechanism (CDM) approved methodology:</p> <p>2.15 Does the entity check effectively whether project participants apply correctly the CDM approved methodology?</p> <p>Only for land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) JI projects:</p> <p>2.16 Does the entity check effectively whether a project aimed at enhancing net anthropogenic removals by sinks conforms to definitions, accounting rules, modalities and guidelines under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol?</p> <p>Only for small-scale (SSC) projects:</p> <p>2.17 Does the entity check effectively whether the project meets the threshold and conforms to the categories and provisions for JI SSC projects?</p>		
<p>3. General comments</p> <p>3.1. Was work systematically approached and implemented?</p> <p>3.2. Did the entity's team provide the impression that the entity will be able to maintain a consistent quality level in its work over time?</p> <p>3.3. In case the entity established a team, did the leader of the entity's team control the determination activity?</p>		
<p>General comments and recommendations:</p>		
<p>Leader of the JI-AT (Signature):</p>	<p>Date:</p>	



REPORT ON WITNESSING ACTIVITY (VERIFICATION)

(Complete one form for each witnessing activity)

Name of entity and Address of site(s) assessed, if any		
UNFCCC ref no. of entity		
Title and reference number of the JI project under witnessing		
Sectoral scope(s) witnessed		
Methodology used	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved CDM methodology, Reference: <input type="checkbox"/> Other methodology	
Activity (project) witnessed (describe in brief the nature of the activity witnessed e.g. single assessor or team, dates, duration, small/large-scale projects)		
Name of JI-AT leader		
Names of JI-AT member(s) (indicate the expert on baseline setting and monitoring)		
Evaluation		
<i>(Key : S = Satisfactory, NS = Not satisfactory , NA = Not Applicable)</i>		
Criteria (fill as applicable to the activity witnessed)	Rating	Comments
1. Assessment of effective planning by the entity witnessed 1.1. Does the entity effectively apply its procedures to keep up-to-date with the decisions of the JISC related to determination activities, including criteria on baseline setting and monitoring? 1.2. Is the allocation of the resources appropriate to the scope of determination by the entity? 1.3. Has all pertinent documentation been identified prior to the assessment? 1.4. Does the entity use checklists for performing verification activities (general or specific)? Are the checklists or other means used comprehensive? 1.5. Does the entity record the name of the entity that has carried out the PDD determination and its date for the project in question? 1.6. Does the entity have a proper record keeping of previous determination activities regarding emission reductions or enhancements of removals concerning the project under witnessing? 1.7. Has the entity recorded any findings in an earlier verification report? If yes, how was the findings accounted for?		

1a) Conduct an opening meeting with project participants (on project site) 1.8. Has the meeting been conducted effectively?		
1b) Skills and technique Did the (lead) assessor(s) of the entity: 1.9. Remained within the scope of work defined? 1.10. Remained objective, unbiased? 1.11. Concluded based on objective evidence? 1.12. Showed knowledge of the project participants and the project? 1.13. Showed ability to identify instances of non-conformity of a project and/or submitted monitoring report? 1.14. Based all findings on adequate factual evidence and referenced where necessary? 1.15. Showed ability to make well substantiated decisions and justify them to the project participants and is the report in English?		
1c) Meeting(s) of entity assessment team witnessed Did the entity assessment team demonstrate: 1.16. Ability to consolidate findings? 1.17. Ability to ensure that scope of assessment was covered? 1.18. Ability to discuss and conclude on contents and strategy of closing meeting with project participants?		
1d) Conduct closing meetings with project participants 1.19. Has the meeting been conducted effectively?		
1e) Reporting by entity to project participants 1.20. Clear and concise, orally and in writing (indicate if language other than English is used)		
1f) Entity's personnel skills 1.21. Ability to understand complex projects? 1.22. Coverage and interpretation of the requirements?		
2. Verification process Has the entity:		

<p>2.1. Followed its procedure effectively to make the monitoring report publicly available in accordance with paragraph 36 of the JI guidelines and relevant procedures developed by the JISC?</p> <p>2.2. Followed its procedure effectively to determine the emission reductions or enhancements of removals reported by project participants in accordance with appendix B of the JI guidelines and relevant decisions and procedures developed by the JISC, provided that they were monitored and calculated in accordance with the project's PDD with a positive determination pursuant to paragraph 35 of the JI guidelines?</p>		
<p>3. General comments</p> <p>3.1. Was work systematically approached and implemented?</p> <p>3.2. Did the entity's team provide the impression that the entity will be able to maintain a consistent quality level in its work over time?</p> <p>3.3. In case the entity established a team, did the leader of the entity's team control the verification activity?</p> <p>3.3.1. Was the entity's assessor or its team leader sidetracked?</p> <p>3.3.2. How did the team perform under pressure?</p> <p>3.3.3. Did the entity team show the capacity to adapt to circumstances as necessary?</p>		
<p>General comments and recommendations:</p>		
<p>JI-AT leader's signature:</p>	<p>Date:</p>	



WORK PLAN FOR REGULAR ON-SITE SURVEILLANCE FOR JOINT IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT TEAM

Name of entity:	UNFCCC ref. no. of entity:
Sectoral scope(s) accredited for:	
Scopes and results of past assessments (e.g. on-site assessment, witnessing activities and spot-checks, as applicable):	
Results of the JISC's consideration of past determinations and/or verifications:	
Areas/focus of the assessment:	

[illegible]