

Annex 4

**INFORMATION NOTE REGARDING THE CALL FOR PUBLIC INPUTS REGARDING
THE REPORT ON EXPERIENCES WITH THE VERIFICATION PROCEDURE UNDER
THE JOINT IMPLEMENTATION SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE****A. Introduction**

1. As requested by the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (JISC) at its twenty-first meeting, the secretariat opened a call for public inputs on experiences with the verification procedure under the JISC in the period 22 April - 21 May 2010. In total, 3 inputs (Det Norske Veritas Certification-DNV; Mr. Mihai Brasoveanu, Local Project Coordinator-Danish Energy Agency; and World Bank) were received, providing information on certain joint implementation (JI) related topics presented in the call for public inputs. The stakeholders welcomed the decision by the JISC to require inputs regarding the experience with the verification procedure under the JISC, and provided valuable inputs on substantive and procedural issues. This document presents an overview of four key areas represented in the inputs received.

B. Accreditation

2. Considering the limited number of accredited independent entities (AIEs), one of the inputs required JISC to speed up the accreditation process in order to increase the number of AIEs available to the project participants (PPs) including the introduction of a system for receiving comments from PPs on AIEs activity resulting in possible requests by the JISC for performance appraisal of AIEs.

3. Based on similar reasons, another input proposed JISC to consider ways for encouraging accreditation of local independent entities resulting in the increase of the number of AIEs available, reduction of delays in the verification process, promotion of competition between AIEs and enhancement of national practices and standards application.

4. Another input highlighted that due to the limited capacity of AIEs, the preparation and delivery of final determination/verification reports takes a significant time resulting in negative impacts on the following phases of the process. It was suggested that JISC introduces a "standard contract" between the AIEs and PPs with clear rights, responsibilities and deadlines that would improve the determination/verification process and secure a higher level of predictability.

5. Considering the role and responsibility of AIEs in assessing methodological approaches and options selected by PPs (allowed by the flexibility of the JI guidelines), it is of outmost importance for AIEs, as presented in one input, to ensure professional sectoral regional and national expertise, including through facilitating access to external expertise.

6. One of the inputs received suggested JISC to proceed with the accreditation standard as a predictable guideline for requirements and processes increasing the possibilities for dialogue between AIEs, and supporting the applicants for a better and quicker understanding of the requirements.

C. Involvement of different actors and communication

7. Two of the inputs received suggested JISC to take a more proactive, leading role in coordinating actions among different actors, providing more opportunities for dialogue and promoting channels of communication. For example, it was proposed that in addition to the existing public calls and workshops the JISC establishes other formal channels facilitating a broad dissemination of decisions taken and ensuring general and project specific feedback. A working/brainstorming group on project-based mechanisms was also proposed for providing recommendations on different topics of common interest, including the issues presented in paragraph 13.

8. Similarly, it was suggested that designated focal points (DFPs) should be stimulated in adopting a more active role for establishing reliable institutional framework and predictable procedures, through promotion of experience exchanges, permanent dialogue and capacity building in both JI Track 1 and Track 2.

9. As one input pointed out, the procedures and information requirements regarding JI Track 1 vary considerably between JI host countries hindering the implementation of projects, and in this respect the JISC should facilitate the cooperation and communication between DFPs regarding standardizing requirements and providing a similar set of required information.

10. One input recommended JISC to establish formal communication channels to facilitate interpretation and further development of the Determination and Verification Manual (DVM) as a starting point for increased transparency on determination/verification process.

D. Guidelines and guidance

11. It was suggested that JISC allocates in the JI guidelines, specific timeframes and deadlines to each phase in the process of developing a JI project (preparation of the documents, project implementation, determination, and verification) in order to increase the predictability for PPs of when their projects will be considered.

12. Considering that the uncertainties regarding the JI mechanism should be reduced in order to give the PPs the possibility to continue developing projects, JISC was encouraged in one input to maintain flexibility through clear guidance and decisions, including the further elaboration of the DVM.

13. One input proposed JISC to encourage and support simplified and innovative methodology approaches, including multi-project baselines and simplified additionality, allowing for example, multiple measures in a project activity, and developing a simplified set of rules and baselines, and a simplified approach for additionality demonstration.

E. Post-2012 framework

14. One organization recommended JISC to take its leading role in contributing to the preparation and involvement of stakeholders in the present dialogue regarding the existing approaches and emerging changes driven by the possible future carbon market mechanisms.

15. In this respect, it was suggested to JISC to adopt a consistent and predictable approach regarding the evolution of the JI mechanism in the post-2012 framework by:

- (a) Providing sufficient period for transition for projects under development;
- (b) Excluding retroactive use of new JI requirements; and
- (c) Ensuring predictable treatment of early mover projects, facing a high level of regulatory risk.

16. Considering the existing differences between JI Track 1 and Track 2 approaches, another input suggested JISC to clarify the existence and use of both approaches in the post-2012 framework, concerning the expected volumes, types of projects, and possible regulatory differences.
