



Annex 3

**DRAFT REVISION OF THE JOINT IMPLEMENTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN
FOR 2010–2011***

* The highlights in this draft indicate main changes to the previous version of the “Joint implementation management plan 2010–2011” (version 01)



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

**JOINT IMPLEMENTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN
2010–2011
(version 02)**

I. Executive summary

A. Experience to date

1. The first year of operation of the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (JISC) was 2006 and by October of that year the verification procedure under the JISC (hereinafter referred to as the Track 2 procedure) was officially launched. Following this operationalization of the procedure, the JISC started receiving submissions of project design documents (PDDs) through independent entities (IEs) and subsequently determinations¹ and verifications.² As at 30 September 2010, 234 PDDs, 27 determination reports, 27 monitoring reports and 22 verification reports had been submitted. Although the project caseload over this period has been smaller than initially assumed by various stakeholders, this has been due to factors outside the direct control of the JISC.

2. During 2008–2009 the JISC has developed and further refined standards, procedures guidance and clarifications for the Track 2 procedure, and issued clarifications on several matters. Experience so far has suggested that the process is functioning well, and feedback received, including through workshops and round-table consultations, indicates that stakeholders are generally satisfied with the performance of the JISC to date.

B. Key objectives of the joint implementation management plan 2010–2011

3. Based on the estimated project caseload in 2010–2011 and the ongoing work of accrediting IEs, while taking into account the resource situation to support the work on joint implementation (JI), the joint implementation management plan (JI-MAP) for 2010–2011 foresees:

- (a) Continued uncertainty in the project caseload;
- (b) Continued review of standards, procedures, guidance and clarifications of the Track 2 procedure and the accreditation process;
- (c) Continued interaction between the JISC and IEs;
- (d) Continued interaction between the JISC and designated focal points (DFPs) of Parties involved in JI projects as well as project participants;
- (e) Continued activities in providing information and raising awareness about JI;
- (f) Continued review of the resources needed to ensure that the JISC and the secretariat sustain the operation of the JI process and implementation of decisions of the Conference of the Parties serving as meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP).

¹ In the present document, “determination” means determination regarding a PDD in accordance with paragraph 33 of the annex to decision 9/CMP.1.

² In the present document, “verification” means determination of emission reductions or removal enhancements in accordance with paragraph 37 of the annex to decision 9/CMP.1.



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

C. Key assumptions regarding project caseload and accreditation work in the 2010–2011 biennium

4. For various reasons, including a delay in finalization of national guidelines and procedures for approving JI projects by some Parties included in Annex B to the Kyoto Protocol and recent market developments, the number of projects submitted in the first two years of the operation of the Track 2 procedure³ was lower than earlier expected. With the start of the first commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol in 2008 and publication of national guidelines and procedures for approving JI projects by many Parties (29 as at 30 September 2010), the caseload assumption presented in the JI-MAP for 2008–2009 was for the submission of 50–75 cases (PDDs and determinations) per year as well as the start of submission of monitoring reports and verifications. In the course of this biennium the submission rate was lower than the expected levels indicated in the JI-MAP 2008–2009. Estimates were based on indications from IEs and were subject to change owing to the uncertainty regarding the number and timing of submission of JI projects under the Track 2 procedure. Given the continued ongoing uncertainty in the expected number of submissions, and noting however the expected lower frequency of submission of PDDs and greater frequency of determinations, monitoring reports and verifications, it is reasonable to continue to assume a level of submissions of 50–75 cases (PDDs, determinations, monitoring reports and verifications) per calendar year. However, the JISC notes the need to closely monitor the status of submissions and continue to work with IEs and DFPs to improve the reliability of information available for estimating its project related workflows.

5. As in the previous management plan, the assumption of up to two additional applications for accreditation from IEs during the biennium remains. With the revision to the accreditation process, the estimation of specific activities within the accreditation workflows (e.g. number, timing and nature of witnessing activities and performance assessments), the estimation of associated resources and work effort have changed from the previous biennium.

6. However, the JI-MAP attempts to take into account potential budget implications of changes in the key assumptions, notably the growth in submissions of determinations and verifications. This is one of the areas of greatest uncertainty the JISC is faced with in terms of planning its workload and associated resource needs. Therefore, this potential growth is addressed through ensuring an initial resource assessment in the JI-MAP that provides capacity to handle periods of growth while allowing time for appropriate resource deployment if increases are sustained. Taking this into account, the JI-MAP highlights areas where under alternative scenarios the resources and activities would need to be increased.

7. The JISC, with a view to ensuring the efficient and cost-effective functioning of the Track 2 procedure, and recognizing that the level of activities is to some extent uncertain, continues to try to limit resource requirements where possible. In addition, the JISC notes that despite the uncertainty with regard to the timing of determinations and verifications, and further growth in project submissions in general, the present resource requirements need to be maintained to ensure the adequate operation of the Track 2 procedure. In case the available resources are expected to be continuously below the budget, the JISC will prioritize the work on maintaining the project cycle and accreditation processes. As a further means to increase efficiency the JI-MAP does consider how to engage general temporary assistance and consultancy as an alternative to creating posts as well as increased costs sharing of cross-cutting activities and support within the SDM programme.

8. The JI-MAP, notwithstanding the fact that activities of the JISC need to continue to take into account the availability of resources, reflects the following for the biennium 2010–2011:

³ IEs have been able to submit PDDs as of 26 October 2006.



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

- (a) An increase in the contribution to secretariat-wide support service costs (USD 304,575 per year);
- (b) An increase in costs for the provision of information technology support by the secretariat;
- (c) An increase in costs paid towards legal, knowledge management, public information, and managerial support provided by relevant staff members of the SDM programme;
- (d) JI-related work will not be funded by the UNFCCC core budget (in 2008–2009 was USD 728,394 per year).

9. On the basis of the current estimate of resource requirements, taking into account elements referred to in paragraphs 4–8 above, the budget for JI related work for the biennium 2010–2011 would be USD 6,865,273. The estimated resource requirements for the biennium, including lower estimations of associated costs for some activities, result in a total funding requirement for the biennium being slightly higher (by 12 per cent) than that of the last biennium (USD 6,131,175) (see chapter V below for details), although there is a year on year decrease of 3 per cent between 2009 and 2010.

10. Considering the income as of 30 September 2010, which is less than half of the budget for the biennium 2010–2011, the allocation of the budget will be prioritized in the following order:

- (a) Maintaining the project cycle process and the accreditation process to handle submissions of PDDs, determination reports, monitoring reports, verification reports, and applications for accreditation;
- (b) Convening meetings of the JISC and its accreditation panel (JI-AP) to consider project and accreditation cases as well as to develop/revise standards, procedures, guidance and clarifications;
- (c) JISC's interaction with IEs, DFPs and project participants to receive inputs on the development/revision of standards, procedures, guidance and clarifications;
- (d) Outreach and awareness raising activities by the JISC and the secretariat to improve overall understanding of JI.

11. In line with the prioritization of work referred to in paragraph 10 above, the required resources and number of meetings of the JISC, the JI-AP and DFP and IE round-table consultations and/or workshop under the low-income circumstances (hereinafter referred to as “contingency plan”) are presented in parenthesis in the table below.

Table 1. Summary of resources regarding the joint implementation management plan 2010–2011

	2009 ^a	2010	2011
Total annual budget (USD)	3 520 490	3 423 597 (2 692 174) ^b	3 441 676 (2 710 254) ^b
Professional (P) staff	9	8 (6) ^b	8 (6) ^b
General service (G) staff	5	3 (3) ^b	3 (3) ^b
Number of meetings (JISC / JI-AP / DFP and IE round-table consultations and/or workshop)	6 / 6 / 2	5 / 6 / 1.5 (4 / 4 / 1) ^b	5 / 6 / 1.5 (4 / 4 / 1) ^b

^a Taken from the JI-MAP 2008-2009 (Version 02) for comparison.

^b Figures in parenthesis indicate those under the contingency plan referred to in paragraph 11 above.

Abbreviations: DFP=designated focal point for joint implementation, IE=independent entity, JISC = Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee, JI-AP = Joint Implementation Accreditation Panel, JI-MAP=joint implementation management plan.



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

II. Introduction

12. The JI-MAP is intended to strengthen the capacity of the JISC and its support structure, including the Joint Implementation Accreditation Panel (JI-AP), accredited independent entities (AIEs) and the secretariat, to address the requirements arising from CMP decisions and the challenges of the JI process.

13. The JI-MAP for 2010–2011 was initially presented as part of the report of the JISC to the CMP at its fifth session.⁴ The JI-MAP reflects changes that have occurred since the previous JI-MAP was adopted. These are: new requirements and support needs identified by the JISC; an increase in costs due to implementation of the secretariat policy of cost recovery for activities not funded from the core budget; increase in costs associated with the JI share of SDM programme costs; ceasing of UNFCCC core programme budget funding for JI; decrease in the number of expected meetings.

14. The JI-MAP is based on a proposal made to the JISC by the Executive Secretary. It draws on the annex to decision 9/CMP.1,⁵ as well as on subsequent decisions of the CMP concerning JI, and the experience of the JISC to date. It has been elaborated to provide the JISC, and all other actors working on JI, with complete information on what is required to deliver JI in terms of roles, functions, caseload and budget needs.

15. In accordance with decisions 3/CMP.2, 3CMP.3 and 5/CMP.4, the JISC has continuously reviewed and assessed the adequacy of the previous JI-MAPs and, in considering the JI-MAP for 2010–2011, has applied lessons learned. In line with the process and guidance adopted by the CMP in its decision 3/CMP.2, each version of the JI-MAP is published as an annex to the report of the JISC meeting at which it is adopted. The JISC will continue to ensure any further versions of the JI-MAP are made available in accordance with this decision.

16. The JISC is aware of the responsibility delegated to it by the provisions included in decision 3/CMP.2 on budgetary matters through the management plan, and it invites the CMP to take note of this JI-MAP and to provide appropriate guidance or clarifications to the JISC and the secretariat, particularly on the implementation of decision 3/CMP.2, paragraphs 9 and 10 (a),⁶ with a view to ensuring that the arrangements are satisfactory and provide the necessary accountability.

17. In addition, the JISC would like to draw the attention of Parties to the status of progress towards becoming self-financing. Decision 3/CMP.3 stated an aim for the JISC to be self-financing as of 2010 at the earliest. To date this has not been achievable due to the lower than expected submission of projects under the Track 2 procedure, and thus a lower than expected income inflow from the charging of fees.

18. [The JISC revised the JI-MAP for 2010–2011 at its twenty-third meeting to reflect the financial situation for supporting the work on JI as of 30 September 2010. The present version of the JI-MAP introduces a contingency plan under the low-income scenario by prioritizing areas of work to be performed by the JISC, the JI-AP and the secretariat.]

⁴ FCCC/KP/CMP/2009/18 (Part I).

⁵ Decision 9/CMP.1, annex.

⁶ The CMP requested the JISC to emphasize its executive and supervisory role by, inter alia, establishing or strengthening its support structure as necessary, and that this role should include the general management and organization of its work.



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

III. Key lessons learned to date

19. A highlight in the biennium 2008–2009 was the consideration of a further 11 determinations and three verifications under the Track 2 procedure (as at 30 September 2009). With the consideration of verifications, and the accreditation of the IEs involved in the verification, the first project successfully completed the entire Track 2 procedure cycle. The JISC thus has continued to gain experience with the operation of the Track 2 procedure through the consideration of projects at the determinations and verifications stages, as well as through the IEs' submission of a further 87 PDDs over the biennium (as at 30 September 2009, resulting in a total number of 194 PDDs). **By 30 September 2010, the total number of PDDs submitted to the secretariat increased to 234.** As the project submission experience continues to grow, the JISC will continue to consider ways to improve the functioning of the Track 2 procedure. In this regard, the JISC has developed and will continue to develop and revise standards, procedures, guidance and clarifications for the operation of the Track 2 procedure, as appropriate.

20. The JISC has noted over the four and a half years of its operation the need to continuously engage and develop strong communication channels with various stakeholders in JI so as to collect diverse views of stakeholders over the operation of the Track 2 procedure and reflect them as appropriate in the further improvement of the Track 2 procedure.

21. The JISC has increased its interaction with IEs over the biennium 2008–2009 through regular interaction with the forum of designated operational entities and accredited independent entities (DOE/AIE coordination forum) at JISC meetings and through dedicated round-table consultations. In addition, the JISC has encouraged IEs to provide views through submissions to the various calls for public inputs on developments of JISC documents and on issues of concerns to the JISC. The JISC has been continuing these practices in 2010. The JISC has also attempted to engage DFPs more actively, but has had less success than hoped. The JISC plans to increase its efforts for interaction with DFPs in the biennium 2010–2011 through round-table consultations and dedicated DFP events. Since mid-2009 the JISC also has been interacting with project participants on a regular basis **by inviting identified project developer groups to JISC meetings and their inputs for interaction at the meetings, as well as through dedicated round-table consultations.** Clear communications and understanding of each other's roles in the process remain a high priority for the JISC, hence the JISC will continue to look for means for furthering the interaction with various stakeholders to ensure efficient and transparent operation of the Track 2 procedure.

22. A well-established support structure is crucial to the operation of the Track 2 procedure. This must provide institutional memory and impartial substantive support, elements that are fundamental to the success of the work of the JISC. Such a support structure is in place and has taken shape during the first four and half years of the JISC, but it needs to be maintained **and adjusted depending on the number of submissions of PDDs, determinations and verifications, or applications for accreditation over this biennium.** The adjustment should be through adequate and predictable funding and timely deployment of human resources. The JI-MAP presents a budget that would allow for the delivery of all tasks contained in the plan including those mandated by the CMP in relevant decisions, in particular the tasks given in decision 3/CMP.2, paragraphs 10 and 11, decision 3/CMP.3, paragraph 6 (c), and 3/CMP.5, paragraphs 14, 16 (b)-(c) and 17.

23. The level of human resources set in the JI-MAP for the previous biennium remains adequate for the operation of the Track 2 procedure, noting the need to **adjust resources expeditiously should the assumption on the workload substantially changes.** The JISC intends to keep this under careful review to take account of the evolution of the process, as the work shifts from the PDD submission phase to the determination and verification phases, and to ensure its preparedness to handle any spikes in activity or sustained increase in determinations and verifications.



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

IV. Joint implementation management plan 2010–2011 by focal area

24. This section of the JI-MAP provides an overview of planned activities and caseload assumptions for the three focal areas of work (project cycle; accreditation; and management, information system and communication) in 2010–2011, and indicates differences from activities carried out in these areas in 2008–2009.

25. The planned main changes in the focal areas for the biennium 2010–2011 from the biennium 2008–2009 are as follows:

- (a) Fewer JISC meetings;
- (b) More accreditation assessment activities;
- (c) Fewer training activities of external experts for accreditation assessments;
- (d) Increased activities to enhance interaction, communication and knowledge sharing and management;
- (e) Enhanced provision of dedicated legal, communication, knowledge management and management support services;
- (f) Increased information system support and services.

26. The present JI-MAP does not foresee the transfer of any analytical preparatory work from the JISC and the JI-AP to the secretariat. However, in light of developments under consideration by Parties and possible needs arising for further substantive support to the JISC, this may need consideration in the course of the biennium. Pending any decisions in this regard by the CMP or the JISC, associated resources requirements would need to be identified and taken into account in revisions of the JI-MAP, subject to an appropriate increase in the income.

A. Project cycle

27. The secretariat will continue to provide support to the JISC in 2010 and 2011 throughout the full project cycle of the Track 2 procedure. This will include, for example, managing the JI Track 2 project submission process and associated communications, handling public calls for input on substantive matters relating to the project cycle and public calls for experts for appraisals of determinations/verifications, preparing documentation for consideration by the JISC, and coordinating external experts for appraisals of determinations/verifications. In addition, the secretariat will continue to assist the JISC in developing and revising standards, procedures, guidance and clarifications relating to the project cycle. The caseload is estimated at 50–75 projects (PDDs, determinations, monitoring reports and verifications) per year, distributed equally throughout the period (estimates continue to be preliminary, as it is not possible to base estimates on past experience). This area of work is characterized by short process turnover times (requiring coordination of external experts and/or JISC members/alternate members) and continuous, uninterrupted workflow throughout the year. Within this area of work, the maintenance (continuous operation) of the project cycle process is the top priority under the contingency plan referred to in paragraph 11 above.

28. The estimated annual caseload of 50–75 cases is uncertain. If the caseload over the course of the biennium increases or decreases beyond this estimate, further revision of the JI-MAP may be necessary, including reconsideration of the required associated financial and human resources. The budget for the 2010–2011 biennium takes this uncertainty into account in order to maintain the capacity to add resources at short notice if needed.



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

29. The secretariat will also continue to support the JISC in its interaction with DFPs. In this capacity, in conjunction with the staff working on management and communication, it will ensure that DFPs are provided with the necessary information and the means to fulfil their roles.

30. It should be noted that as the number of projects in the system increases, the JISC will consider how the secretariat could further support it in the various steps of the workflow, and though additional functions are not foreseen at present, the JISC may revise this in the JI-MAP in the future.

Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

Table 2. Planned activities in the project cycle focal area

Actor	Activities in JI-MAP 2010–2011 v02	JI-MAP 2010–2011 v02 assumptions	JI-MAP 2008–2009 assumptions	Actual situation in 2008–2009
JISC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct appraisals/reviews of determinations by AIEs, as required Make decisions with regard to determinations under review Provide explanations for its decisions regarding determinations that have come under review Provide further guidance and clarifications on the Track 2 procedure Commence appraisals/reviews of determinations by AIEs and coordinating entities under programmes of activities Conduct appraisals/reviews of verifications by AIEs, as required Make decisions with regard to verifications under review Provide explanations for its decisions regarding verifications Report to the CMP on outcomes of the Track 2 procedure Ensure transparency of the process and adequacy of information available to stakeholders Implement CMP decisions with regard to the Track 2 procedure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50–75 cases per year (PDDs, determinations, monitoring reports and verifications) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50–75 cases per year (PDDs and determinations) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 59 cases per year (PDDs and determinations) 67.5 cases per year (PDDs, determinations, monitoring reports and verifications) <p>Total submissions in 2008-2009</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 103 PDD submissions – 15 determination submissions – 10 monitoring reports – 7 verifications
Experts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare inputs to appraisals of determinations submitted Participate in review teams as appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 experts per case for appraisal inputs (determinations) 20 appraisals per year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 experts per case for appraisal inputs (determinations) Use of experts for review teams 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roster of 27 experts, 23 of whom have been engaged on one or more occasions to provide inputs on determinations

Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

Actor	Activities in JI-MAP 2010–2011 v02	JI-MAP 2010–2011 v02 assumptions	JI-MAP 2008–2009 assumptions	Actual situation in 2008–2009
Secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct completeness checks of PDDs submitted • Conduct completeness checks of determinations submitted • Conduct completeness checks of monitoring reports submitted • Conduct completeness checks of verifications submitted • Prepare draft procedures and clarifications for the JISC, as requested • Manage the operation of the project cycle workflow (including appraisals/reviews of determinations and verification) • Manage public calls for input on substantive matters and for specific expertise • Maintain a publicly available list of JI projects (including their status) • Make publicly available relevant information on JI projects • Manage communication with stakeholders related to the project cycle workflow • Manage the collection of fees to cover administrative expenses of the JISC • Ensure accuracy and adequacy of information in the JI information system and on the UNFCCC JI website • Manage communication of project information from the JI information system to the international transaction log • Administration of the designated focal point interface 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perform indicated activities and support to above caseload • 3 (2)^a P staff • 1 G staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perform indicated activities and support to caseload assumptions above • 4 P staff • 2 G staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities performed and above caseload supported • 3 P staff • 1 G staff

^a Figures in parenthesis indicate those under the contingency plan referred to in paragraph 11 above.

Abbreviations: AIE=accredited independent entity, CMP=conference of the parties serving as meeting of the parties to the Kyoto protocol, JISC = Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee, PDD=project design document.



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

B. Accreditation

31. The secretariat will continue to provide support to the accreditation-related activities under the JISC in 2010 and 2011. This will include, for example, handling applications for accreditation from IEs, supporting activities of assessment teams (JI-ATs) during their assessments of IEs, providing technical support to the JISC and the JI-AP on their consideration of accreditation-related policy issues, preparing documentation for consideration by the JISC and the JI-AP, providing administrative support to organizing JI-AP meetings, handling public calls for input on substantive matters relating to accreditation and public calls for experts for the roster of JI-ATs and replacement of JI-AP members. Within this area of work, the maintenance (continuous operation) of handling applications for accreditation and assessments of IEs is the top priority under the contingency plan referred to in paragraph 11 above.

32. The secretariat also supports the JISC in its interaction with applicant IEs and AIEs. In this capacity, based on the decision by the JISC, the secretariat will continue to provide secretarial support to facilitate the organization of meetings of the DOE/AIE coordination forum.

33. The JI-MAP for 2008–2009 rectified the heavily under-resourced situation in 2008–2009 regarding the work on accreditation. Nevertheless, the continued pressure to move the accreditation process forward as fast as possible, given that the first commitment period is well underway and thus the need to accredit IEs to verify emission reductions or removal enhancements from JI projects, will require the JISC to maintain, if not increase, the support and resources for this work over time.

34. In addition, to ensure the credibility of the work of AIEs, which is vital for successful operation of the Track 2 procedure, the JISC will need to closely monitor and consider measures to further strengthen the performance of AIEs as appropriate. Another element that the JISC will need to keep under careful review is the possible lack of competent experts for the assessment of IEs. This difficulty may prompt the need to consider modifications to the JI-MAP in future to ensure appropriate resources and support for this assessment work.

35. The caseload for the biennium 2010–2011 presented in table 3 is estimated, based on the fact that there are currently 15 applications for accreditation by the JISC and the assumption that there will be two new applications in this biennium. There is an uncertainty in the estimated caseload, which may significantly increase depending on, inter alia, the progress of JI project approvals by Parties involved and the impact of the outcome of the on-going Conference of the Parties (COP) negotiations on the present operation of and future of project-based mechanisms. If this happens, further revision of the JI-MAP may be necessary, including a reconsideration of the required financial and human resources.

Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

Table 3. Planned activities in the accreditation focal area

Actor	Activities in JI-MAP 2010–2011 v02	JI-MAP 2010–2011 v02 assumptions	JI-MAP 2008–2009 assumptions	Actual situation in 2008–2009
JISC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decide on accreditation of entities Review the accreditation procedure and adopt its revisions as appropriate Review other regulatory documents and adopt their revisions or new documents as appropriate Review accreditation standards and make recommendations to the CMP for consideration as appropriate Report information to the CMP on the accreditation of IEs Initiate spot-checks of AIEs as appropriate and determine whether accredited IEs (AIEs) continue complying with the accreditation standards Implement CMP decisions with regard to accreditation Provide guidance and clarifications on the accreditation process Provide guidance to the JI-AP to draft regulatory documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Up to 14 decisions on initial accreditation Up to 80 decisions on confirmation of accreditation for sectoral groups or on performance assessments Up to 15 decisions on the result of regular on-site surveillance Up to 5 decisions on the result of spot-checks 10 decisions on the development or revisions of regulatory documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Up to 56 decisions on accreditation 10 decisions related to clarifications and/or guidance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 decisions on initial accreditation No decision on confirmation of accreditation for sectoral group No decisions on the result of regular on-site surveillances (as the process is newly introduced in Sep. 2009) No decisions on the results of spot-checks (as no spot-check was initiated) 8 decisions on the development or revisions of regulatory documents
JI-AP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider the results of JI-AT's assessments of IEs and intervene in the assessments as appropriate Recommend accreditation decisions to the JISC Draft regulatory documents for consideration by the JISC Participate in JISC workshops and/or round-table consultations, as appropriate Monitor performance of JI-AT experts and maintain the roster of experts Provide training and further guidance to JI-AT experts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2010: 6 (4)^a meetings 2011: 6 (4)^a meetings Up to 14 recommendations to the JISC on initial accreditation Up to 80 recommendations or notifications to the JISC on confirmation of accreditation for sectoral groups or on performance assessments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2008: 6 meetings 2009: 6 meetings Up to 70 recommendations/decisions relating to initial application screening, on-site assessments and witnessing activities Evaluation and selection of up to 20 new assessment team experts 5 procedural documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2008: 6 meetings 2009: 6 meetings 3 recommendations on initial accreditation No recommendation on confirmation of accreditation for sectoral group No recommendations on the result of regular on-site surveillance (as the process was newly

Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

Actor	Activities in JI-MAP 2010–2011 v02	JI-MAP 2010–2011 v02 assumptions	JI-MAP 2008–2009 assumptions	Actual situation in 2008–2009
		assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Up to 15 recommendations to the JISC on the result of regular on-site surveillance Up to 5 recommendations to the JISC on the result of spot-checks 10 recommendations to the JISC on the development or revisions of regulatory documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 clarification/ guidance documents 2 training sessions for assessment team experts 	<p>introduced in Sep 2009)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No recommendation on the result of spot-checks (as no spot-check was initiated) 18 recommendations or decisions on the development or revisions of regulatory documents
JI-AT experts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct desk reviews and on-site assessments Conduct witnessing activities Conduct performance assessments Conduct regular on-site surveillances Conduct spot-checks as appropriate Verification of implementation of corrective actions by IEs Preparation of assessment reports Conduct additional assessment work as requested by the JI-AP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk reviews: 3 On-site assessments : 3 Witnessing: 40 Performance assessments: 40 Verification of corrective actions: 249 Reports: 83 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk reviews 2008/9: 3 On-site assessments 2008/9: 3 Witnessing 2008/9: 51 Verification of corrective actions 2008/9: 199 Reports 2008/9: 195 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk reviews: 0 On-site assessments: 14 Witnessing: 5 Verification of corrective actions: 50 Reports: 118

Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

Actor	Activities in JI-MAP 2010–2011 v02	JI-MAP 2010–2011 v02 assumptions	JI-MAP 2008–2009 assumptions	Actual situation in 2008–2009
Secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide substantive support to the JISC and the JI-AP • Undertake completeness check of the application documentation • Undertake administrative steps to establish JI-ATs • Provide support and facilitate other accreditation-related procedural steps • Prepare draft regulatory documents and guidelines for consideration by the JISC and/or the JI-AP • Facilitate the organization of meetings of the DOE/AIE coordination forum • Provide support to the DOE/AIE coordination forum for its interaction with the JISC • Manage public calls for experts for the JI-AT roster • Manage public calls for experts for the replacement of JI-AP members and prepare shortlist of candidates for consideration by the JISC • Maintain publicly available information with regard to the accreditation process and accreditation status • Collect the application fees and oversee the implementation of the agreed fee structure for assessment activities • Provide information for the JI information system and the UNFCCC JI website • Draft JI-AP progress report to each JISC meeting • Support the development/organization of trainings for experts on the roster for JI-ATs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perform indicated activities and support to assumptions above • 2 P staff • 1 G staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perform indicated activities and support to assumptions above • 2 P staff • 1 G staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities performed and above tasks supported • 2 P staff • 1 G staff

a Figures in parenthesis indicate those under the contingency plan referred to in paragraph 11 above.

Abbreviations: AIE=accredited independent entity, CMP=conference of the parties serving as meeting of the parties to the Kyoto protocol, IE=independent entity, JISC = Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee, JI-AP = Joint Implementation Accreditation Panel, JI-AT=joint implementation assessment team.



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

C. Management, information system and communication

36. In addition to the substantive work referred to in sections A and B above, the secretariat:

- (a) Prepares and organizes meetings of the JISC (see chapter VI below for the tentative schedule of meetings in 2010 and 2011);
- (b) Drafts and finalizes the JI-MAP and the annual report of the JISC to the CMP;
- (c) Identifies and manages necessary human and financial resources;
- (d) Identifies and coordinates special activities such as legal support, knowledge management, outreach, communication and media relations;
- (e) Is responsible for secretariat interactions and supporting JISC interactions with relevant stakeholders (e.g. DFPs and IEs) and representation to and relations with other organizations.

37. In addition to those listed above, the secretariat also provides or coordinates the support to the UNFCCC process on JI and relevant issues relating to the carbon market. It ensures cooperation with other secretariat programmes working on, inter alia, the international transaction log, national communications and inventories and Parties' compliance with commitments under the Kyoto Protocol.

38. The secretariat also assists the JISC in developing new procedures, further revising existing procedures and providing other substantive support to ensure that COP and CMP decisions are implemented and that the JISC is able to continue providing a robust framework for the JI Track 2 implementation.

39. The UNFCCC JI information system is based on open source software, which provides for sophisticated electronic workflows relating to the project cycle and procedures, integrating users with different access rights and roles within and outside the secretariat. The system stores documentation relating to the JI project cycle and displays information to users, including the general public, according to their role. The development, programming and maintenance of the system had been undertaken by dedicated staff members within the SDM programme until June 2010. In line with a secretariat-wide decision to centralize information technology related developments, staff involved in these activities does not belong directly to the SDM programme from June 2010. However, adequate mechanisms are being put in place within substantive programmes to ensure full control over priority setting and quality of deliverables. Because the JI processes are evolving, redesign and reprogramming of the system are likely to be required during the biennium 2010–2011. The management of quality and continuous demand of new or modified features of the JI information system will require continuous attention. The system, which is to a large extent modelled on that of the CDM, should help to ensure accurate, cost-effective and timely implementation of the various elements of the JI process. This area of work also covers the technical support and administration of the various extranets and listservs supporting the JI process, and handles connectivity and data transmission to the international transaction log as necessary. The secretariat buys equipment for the JI information system and services. The cost of equipment, previously covered to a large extent by the secretariat's core budget, is fully reflected in the JI MAP for 2010–2011.

40. As of the biennium 2010–2011, services provided by other parts of the secretariat are also included in the JI-MAP, in order to reflect the true cost of the JI mechanism. As in the past, the secretariat's support to the JI process has explored ways to reduce costs by sharing resources with that to the CDM process. The restructuring of the SDM programme in May 2010 will further help this effort.



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

41. The secretariat plans and organizes outreach activities such as workshops, side events at sessions of the COP/CMP bodies and question-and-answer sessions of the JISC. In 2008–2009, the secretariat has worked to proactively engage the media and to improve communication with stakeholders, by improving the quality and timeliness of responses to queries, facilitating the work of the JISC in responding to unsolicited communication, supporting the JISC in its implementation of calls for public inputs and by improving the UNFCCC JI website. In the biennium 2010–2011, the secretariat will continue its efforts to reach out to other target groups and stakeholders, and provide additional outreach support.

Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

Table 4. Planned activities in the management, information system and communication focal area, by different actors: management

Actor	Activities in JI-MAP 2010–2011 v01	JI-MAP 2010–2011 v02 assumptions	JI-MAP 2008–2009 assumptions	Actual situation in 2008–2009
JISC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify its process and information needs 	-	-	-
Secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify its process and information needs Design, develop, programme and maintain the UNFCCC JI information system Maintenance of designated focal point interface Expansion of system, in particular tools for handling electronic decision-making and roster of experts Manage the procurement of equipment Provide for interaction between the JI information system and the international transaction log, and with the main UNFCCC website Provide technical support for internal and external users Maintain servers and specific hardware Design and develop electronic workflows as needed Conduct systems risk analysis and business continuity planning Software redevelopment and improvement as needed Analysis and input to the secretariat records management process and system implementation System maintenance and technical support Implement and oversee data/system quality assurance and quality control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perform indicated activities and support the JISC 1 P staff 0.5 G staff Use of external contractors Use of other secretariat staff, charged against JI resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perform indicated activities and support the JISC 1 P staff 1 G staff Use of external contractors Use of other secretariat staff, charged against JI resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activities performed and tasks supported 1 P staff 0.5 G staff Use of external contractors Use of other secretariat staff, charged against JI resources



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

Actor	Activities in JI-MAP 2010–2011 v01	JI-MAP 2010–2011 v02 assumptions	JI-MAP 2008–2009 assumptions	Actual situation in 2008–2009
Secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and improve the UNFCCC JI website, including design and content management Develop and implement a media and communications strategy for JI Respond to public and media queries Organize question-and-answer sessions, side events and other outreach activities Develop and document communication procedures Review JISC documentation for readability and impact Design information and outreach strategies and materials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perform indicated activities and support to the JISC 10 JISC meetings 3 workshops and/or round-table consultations 2 (1)^a P staff 1.5 (0.5)^a G staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perform indicated activities and support to the JISC 10 JISC meetings 2 workshops and/or round-table consultations 2 P staff 1.5 G staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activities performed and tasks supported 5 JISC meetings 1 P staff 0.5 G staff

^a Figures in parenthesis indicate those under the contingency plan referred to in paragraph 11 above.

Abbreviations: CMP=conference of the parties serving as meeting of the parties to the Kyoto protocol, IE=independent entity, JISC = Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee.



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

V. Available resources in support of joint implementation in 2010–2011

42. In the biennium 2008–2009, the work on JI was funded from a combination of financial resources, namely the core budget of the UNFCCC, voluntary contributions and fees from accreditation applications and for processing verification reports. Since the budget of JI will be fully financed by non-core funds in the biennium 2010–2011, this chapter presents information on supplementary funding and fees for consideration by Parties.

A. Status of supplementary funding to joint implementation

43. Decision 5/CMP.4 recalls the need for contributions to the Trust Fund for Supplementary Activities by Parties included in Annex I to the Convention in order to fund administrative expenses from implementing Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol. Table 5 presents the status of the sources of supplementary funding for JI as at 30 September 2010 against the expenditure and reserve by the end of the biennium 2010–2011. Although the current balance (surplus) amounts to USD 1.5 million, it is far from sufficient for JI to fully implement its work programme in 2010–2011 considering the budget for the biennium presented in Table 6 below.

Table 5. Status of supplementary funding, fees and expenditure for joint implementation as at 30 September 2010
(United States dollars)

Item	2010–2011 total (as at 30 Sep 2010)
Income	
Carry-over from 2009 ^a	862 237
Voluntary contributions by Parties (income available) ^b	2 018 063
Fees from accreditation applications	0
Fees for processing verification reports (including advance payment) ^c	1 592 471
Total income	4 472 771
Expenditure	
JI expenditure	1 394 982
Less fees set aside as reserve	1 592 471
Balance of funds	1 485 318

a Does not include fees for processing verification reports (incl. advance payment) received in 2007–2009.

b Includes only those received (i.e. funds pledged but not transferred are not included) for the biennium 2010–2011 regardless of the date of receipt.

c Accumulated amount from the beginning of the JI process until 30 September 2010.

B. Proposed budget for the biennium 2010–2011

44. Chapter IV above has defined the areas of work and nature of services to be provided by the JISC, JI-AP, external experts and the secretariat in the 2010–2011 biennium for JI. The assumptions underlying the budgetary requirements will require continued review and consideration over the course of the biennium in accordance with decision 3/CMP.2. Table 6 indicates the proposed budget by focal area and year.⁷

⁷ A portion of the funding for JI is expected to cover costs associated with broader JI-related activities (e.g. Track 1 and future negotiations support) and work of the SDM programme of the secretariat, in particular managerial support.



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

Table 6. Budget summary, 2010–2011
(United States dollars)

Focal area	2010	2011	2010–2011 total
Project cycle	550 427 (346 625) ^a	550 427 (346 625) ^a	1 100 854 (693 250) ^a
Accreditation	854 509 (749 458) ^a	870 508 (765 458) ^a	1 725 017 (1 514 916) ^a
Management, information system and communication	1 624 796 (1 286 372) ^a	1 624 796 (1 286 372) ^a	3 249 592 (2 572 744) ^a
Subtotal	3 029 732 (2 382 455)^a	3 045 731 (2 398 455)^a	6 075 463 (4 780 910)^a
13% overhead	393 865 (309 719) ^a	395 945 (311 799) ^a	789 810 (621 518) ^a
Total	3 423 597 (2 692 174)^a	3 441 676 (2 710 254)^a	6 865 273 (5 402 429)^a

^a Figures in parenthesis indicate those under the contingency plan referred to in paragraph 11 above.

45. In order to establish a reserve of funds from accrued fees in 2012 as indicated in table 5 above, JI will rely almost entirely on voluntary contributions from Parties to fund its activities in the biennium 2010–2011. With an adequate build-up of resources received from fees for processing verification reports during the biennium 2010–2011, it may be possible to make JI self-sustainable by 2012. In consideration of the resource requirements for the biennium 2010–2011, Parties will be urged to make voluntary contribution to ensure the continued operations of JI. With the carry-over of USD 0.9 million from the previous biennium, JI will require USD 2.6 million in 2010 and 3.4 million in 2011, respectively, to implement the envisaged work and planned activities with regard to consideration of determinations and verifications as well as the accreditation of IEs in 2010–2011. Taking into account the income to date since the beginning of 2010 presented in Table 5 above, this means additional USD 4.0 million (USD 2.5 million under the contingency plan referred to in paragraph 11 above) is required for the biennium 2010–2011.



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

Table 7. Budget summary by activity area, comparison 2009–2010

Activity area	2009 (USD)	2010 (USD)	Change between 2009 and 2010 (%) *
1. Meetings and activities of the JISC	266 000	332 499 (266 000) ^a	25 (0) ^a
2. Activities relating to accreditation of IEs and review of determinations	380 800	437 600 (330 800) ^a	15 (-13) ^a
3. Technical workshops and round- table consultations (AIEs, DFPs)	149 999	132 000 (88 000) ^a	- 12 (-41) ^a
4. Structure and support to activity areas 1–3	1 674 082	2 127 631 (1 697 655) ^a	27 (1) ^a
Total (1–4)	2 470 881	3 029 730 (2 382 455) ^a	23 (-4) ^a
Overhead	321 215	393 867 (309 719) ^a	23 (-4) ^a
Supplementary funding total	2 792 096	3 423 597 (2 692 174) ^a	23 (-4) ^a
UNFCCC core budget funding total	728 394	0	- 100
Total	3 520 490	3 423 597 (2 692 174)^a	- 3 (-24)^a

^a Figures in parenthesis indicate those under the contingency plan referred to in paragraph 11 above.

Abbreviations: AIE = applicant independent entity, DFP = designated focal point, IE = independent entity, JISC = Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee.

Note: Increase in rows 1, 2 and 4 are largely due to the shift in costs from core to supplementary funding as of 2010.

46. Table 8 provides a breakdown of the planned activities (by source of funding) for the biennium 2010–2011.

Table 8. Allocation by activity (total for biennium 2010–2011)

Activity area	Activity	Total
I. Meetings and activities of the JISC	JISC meetings	10 (8) ^a meetings
II. Activities relating to accreditation of IEs and review of determinations	JI-AP meetings	12 (8) ^a meetings
	Accreditation case processing	2 new applications
	Caseload processing	100–150 cases
III. Technical workshops and round-table consultations	Workshops	3 (2) ^a workshops
IV. Structure and support to activity areas 1–3	Staffing	11 (9) ^a officials plus GTA

^a Figures in parenthesis indicate those under the contingency plan referred to in paragraph 11 above.

Abbreviations: GTA = general temporary assistance, IE=independent entity, JISC = Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee, JI-AP = Joint Implementation Accreditation Panel.



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

C. Detail of the budget for 2010–2011

47. This section provides details of the JI budget for the year 2010–2011 by focal area.

1. Project cycle

Table 9. Budget for the project cycle focal area in 2010–2011
(United States dollars)

Project cycle costs	Supplementary funding
Appraisals and review expertise	40 000 (40 000) ^a
Further specialized expertise	4 000 (0) ^a
Staff	1 053 854 (650 250) ^a
Overtime	3 000 (3 000) ^a
13% overhead	143 110 (90 123) ^a
Total	1 243 964 (783 373)^a

^a Figures in parenthesis indicate those under the contingency plan referred to in paragraph 11 above.

2. Accreditation

Table 10. Budget for the accreditation focal area 2010–2011
(United States dollars)

Accreditation costs	Supplementary funding
Two-day meetings of the JI-AP	482 800 (325 200) ^a
Specialized expertise relating to accreditation	130 400 (78 400) ^a
Travel related to on-site assessments and witnessing activities	57 200 (57 200) ^a
JI-AT expert training (30 participants for 2 two-day trainings, plus online training system)	234 000 (234 000) ^a
Staff	815 617 (815 616) ^a
Overtime	5 000 (4 500) ^a
13% overhead	224 252 (196 939) ^a
Total	1 949 269 (1 711 855)^a

^a Figures in parenthesis indicate those under the contingency plan referred to in paragraph 11 above.

Abbreviations: JI-AP = Joint Implementation Accreditation Panel, JI-AT = joint implementation assessment team.



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

3. Management, information system and communication

**Table 11. Budget for management, information system and communication focal area
2010–2011**
(United States dollars)

Management, information system and communication costs	Supplementary funding
JISC meetings (venue, webcast and attendance of 14 members)	665 000 (532 000) ^a
Technical workshops	263 999 (176 000) ^a
Hardware/software for web interface	40 000 (40 000) ^a
UNFCCC shared cost and services	466 700 (378 512) ^a
Consultancy and/or temporary assistance	49 738 (0) ^a
10% share of SDM shared staff costs	416 600 (416 600) ^a
Travel	235 000 (156 666) ^a
Staff	1 104 305 (866 066) ^a
Overtime	8 250 (6 900) ^a
13% overhead	422 447 (334 457) ^a
Total	3 672 039 (2 907 201)^a

^a Figures in parenthesis indicate those under the contingency plan referred to in paragraph 11 above.

Abbreviations: JISC = Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee, SDM = Sustainable Development Mechanisms Programme (of the UNFCCC secretariat).



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

VI. Schedule of meetings of the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee and Joint Implementation Accreditation Panel in 2010–2011

A. Schedule of meetings for 2010

1. Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

Meeting number	Dates ^a	Location
Twentieth meeting	22–24 February 2010	Bonn, Germany
Twenty-first meeting	12–14 April 2010	Bonn, Germany
Twenty-second meeting	15–16 June 2010	Bonn, Germany
Twenty-third meeting (extraordinary meeting)	21–23 October 2010	Bonn, Germany

a Includes informal consultations.

2. Joint Implementation Accreditation Panel

Meeting number	Dates	Location
Twenty-first meeting	21–23 January 2010	Bonn, Germany
Twenty-second meeting	22–24 March 2010	Bonn, Germany
Twenty-third meeting	19–20 May 2010	Bonn, Germany
Twenty-fourth meeting	tbd	Bonn, Germany

B. Tentative schedule of meetings for 2011

1. Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

Meeting number	Dates ^a	Location
Twenty-fourth meeting	tbd	Bonn, Germany
Twenty-fifth meeting	tbd	Bonn, Germany
Twenty-sixth meeting	tbd	Bonn, Germany
Twenty-seventh meeting	tbd	tbd

a Includes informal consultations.

2. Joint Implementation Accreditation Panel

Meeting number	Dates	Location
Twenty-fifth meeting	tbd	Bonn, Germany
Twenty-sixth meeting	tbd	Bonn, Germany
Twenty-seventh meeting	tbd	Bonn, Germany
Twenty-eighth meeting	tbd	Bonn, Germany

- - - - -