



Annex 1

**MEASURES TO STREAMLINE AND FURTHER IMPROVE
JOINT IMPLEMENTATION ACCREDITATION PROCESS AND FUNCTIONING**



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

I. BACKGROUND

1. In its annual report to CMP6, the JISC has noted that difficulties continued to be faced with regard to the financial status of the resources for the work under the JISC for the biennium 2010–2011. The JISC noted that the lack of contributions by parties could prevent some of the envisaged work and planned activities relating to the consideration of determinations and verifications, as well as the accreditation of independent entities (IEs), from being undertaken.
2. The JISC also, based on its report on experience with the verification procedure under the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee and possible improvements to the future operation of joint implementation, has agreed to make recommendations on:
 - (a) Specific action areas around which it wishes to re-orientate its present work programme to focus on activities that offer the greatest value to the evolution of JI during the remainder of the current commitment period;
 - (b) Recommendations it wishes to make to the CMP in relation to JI in the longer term beyond 2012, including recommendations on the continuation of activities under the FCCC/KP/CMP/2010/9 4 verification procedure under the JISC and the initiation by the CMP, at its seventh session, of the first review of the JI guidelines.
3. As a tool to meet the objective set in 2, the JISC has identified the following action areas:
 - (a) Increasing the numbers and capacity of accredited independent entities;
 - (b) Major revisions in the procedures currently implemented under JI, including further means of streamlining the accreditation process by building on synergies with and lessons learned from other accreditation processes, including the possibility of removing the provision requiring a witnessing activity as part of the initial accreditation of an independent entity and with a view to the possible development of a unified accreditation process for JI and the CDM. This approach could involve making accreditation as an AIE subject to the fulfilment of a subset, as necessary, of the total requirements of a unified accreditation process.
4. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP), at its sixth session, requested the JISC to implement the action areas in section VI of the "Report on experience with the verification procedure under the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee and possible improvements to the future operation of joint implementation" with appropriate prioritization, taking into account the latest financial situation as well as the financial projections, with a view to accelerating the JI process without undermining its credibility and environmental integrity, in particular with respect to:
 - (a) Further improving the verification procedure under the Committee, by enhancing the clarity of its documents, setting time limits in the JI project cycle, making use of electronic decision making, in particular in relation to reviews, and encouraging and supporting project-based innovative methodological approaches;
 - (b) Further streamlining the accreditation process, by building on synergies with and lessons learned from other accreditation processes.
5. It is however recognised that streamlining the JI accreditation process alone wouldn't achieve the objective of making JI an efficient and competitive mechanism. The streamlining and the improvement of the JI accreditation should be done in conjunction with all other action areas identified in the JI report on experience with the verification procedure under the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee and possible improvements to the future operation of joint implementation.



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

II. OBJECTIVES

6. The secretariat based on the mandates outlined in paragraph 3 above and taking into account the budgetary constraints that JI is facing, has prepared a discussion paper containing options and proposals for streamlining JI accreditation for the consideration of the JI accreditation panel (JI-AP). The paper was revised to take into account views expressed by JI-AP members.
7. The proposals detailed below aim to achieve further streamlining of the JI accreditation in order:
- (a) To increase the number of competent AIEs available in the market;
 - (b) To ensure efficient operation of the JI accreditation given the resources available.
8. The proposals are divided into three sections:
- (a) Streamlining of the JI accreditation process that would mainly involve revisions of the accreditation procedure;
 - (b) Streamlining JI accreditation operations. This section deals mainly with the administrative part of the accreditation such as the functioning of the JI-AP, qualification of assessment team members and administration of the accreditation process;
 - (c) Proposals for better integration between the JI accreditation process and the JI project cycle.
9. The first section referred to in para. 8a aim at achieving the objective of increasing the number of AIEs available in the market while the second and the third sections (8b and c) aim at providing ways to ensure an efficient functioning of the JI accreditation.

III. STREAMLINING JI ACCREDITATION PROCESS

A. Current situation

10. The JI accreditation process as revised by the JISC at its twenty-first meeting though not reflected yet in the JI accreditation procedure is composed of the following steps:
- (a) Desk review;
 - (b) On-site assessment;
 - (c) Witnessing activity: one witnessing activity before initial accreditation;
 - (d) Performance assessments that will be undertaken after accreditation;
 - (e) Regular on-site surveillance;
 - (f) Spot check.
11. Since the commencement of the JI accreditation, 16 entities have applied for accreditation. To date, the JISC accredited four independent entities. Since then, one AIE had withdrawn from JI accreditation on its own request, leaving three AIEs in the market. Eleven entities have been granted indicative letters and some of them have witnessing activities in process. It is likely that three additional IEs that are currently at the initial witnessing stage would be accredited in the near future and may be increasing the number of AIEs to six. Eight IEs are provisionally acting as AIEs based on their CDM accreditation.
12. The analysis of the current situation suggests that the resources invested in the JI accreditation process are not commensurate with the results achieved to date (only three AIEs). It is also observed that



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

many IEs that are provisionally accredited based on their CDM accreditation could operate in the market without being eligible, under the current accreditation process, for any control by the JI-AP as they are still not accredited within the JI system and therefore not eligible for performance assessments or regular on-site surveillance.

13. The impact of the low number of AIEs is not clear, as it is only one of many factors impacting on the implementation of projects and issuance of ERUs. However, it appears that the development of JI projects may be being hindered by the relatively low number of AIEs available to provide determination and verification services, as well as by the speed at which determinations and verification reports are prepared. Furthermore, the benefits of increasing the number of local independent entities applying for accreditation under JI, in addition to increasing the number of AIEs available and reducing delays in determination and verification, could contribute to the enhancement of national practices and the application of JI guidance.

B. Proposals of options for streamlining JI accreditation process

14. To increase the number of available AIEs in the market, while ensuring their competence, five options are outlined bellow from the most conservative to the most drastic. Options 1 and 2 could be implemented in the short term (within two JISC meetings). Option 3 and 4 in the medium term (three to four JISC meetings) and the option 5 is for the long term as it requires a CMP decision.

15. Each of the options is detailed bellow with its implications, pros and cons, timelines and prerequisites. An overview of these options is also presented in appendix 1.

1. Option 1: Limiting the revision of the JI accreditation process to the changes already agreed by the JISC with few adjustments

16. In this option, it is proposed to only revise the accreditation procedure to incorporate the changes in the accreditation process as previously agreed by the JISC at its twenty-first meeting. The agreed changes are:

- (a) To maintain one successful witnessing activity before granting accreditation;
- (b) To replace ex-post witnessing activities with performance assessments after accreditation.

17. However, as the JISC and CMP have requested further streamlining of the accreditation process, keeping only what was previously agreed though not yet implemented is not sufficient. Therefore, in order to facilitate obtaining witnessing activities for the IEs and consequently facilitate their accreditation, it is also proposed:

- (a) To explicitly mention in the accreditation procedure that Track 1 projects are eligible as witnessing activities;
- (b) To take some punitive actions against project participants or developers who refuse that the IE offers their project as witnessing opportunity by interalia, refusing the request for determination of such projects when it is submitted by another AIE.

18. This option may be implemented only if concerns of IEs and project participants regarding delays in the project cycle (due to the needs of the accreditation process) are addressed and a clear separation between the assessment of the witnessed project itself and the accreditation process is ensured. It is however very difficult to ensure such a separation especially in cases where the IE had shown incompetence in assessing the project, and this had resulted in denying the accreditation for the IE or in a very lengthy assessment process.



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

19. It is also proposed to streamline, shorten and/or introduce timelines for each step of the accreditation process, in order to ensure timely completion of assessment activities and decision making by the JI-AP and the JISC at the appropriate time.

20. Regarding the number and nature of performance assessments to be selected, it is proposed to use the outcome of the discussion and the agreement reached at the twenty-third meeting of the JI-AP.

21. The agreed formula to define the number of performance assessments to be assigned to each entity is:

- (a) At least one performance assessment each year;
- (b) One performance assessment for each 20 submissions of determinations/verifications;
- (c) One performance assessment for two requests for reviews of determinations/verifications.

22. The JI-AP has further agreed to keep the criteria for the selection of projects for performance assessments flexible, while guided by the following general principles:

- (a) Balance of sectoral scopes;
- (b) Balance of the project scale;
- (c) Balance of host Parties and regions;
- (d) Balance of projects using the JI-specific approach and the approved CDM methodology approach regarding the methodology used;
- (e) Balance of the determination and verification functions.

23. The choice of adopting this option may eventually facilitate access to AIEs by facilitating the access to witnessing activities. It may however divert more projects from Track 2 to Track 1 due to the fear of the punitive actions referred above.

24. This option involves the revision of the accreditation procedure only. The decision to adopt it depends on the sole decision of the JISC. Therefore, it could be implemented within one JISC meeting.

2. Option 2: Aligning the steps of JI accreditation procedure with the steps of CDM accreditation procedure (desk review, on-site assessment, performance assessments...)

25. It is proposed in this option to remove the pre-accreditation witnessing activities in addition to the changes already agreed by the JISC at its twenty-first meeting (see paragraph 16. above) but which had not yet been reflected in the procedure.

26. This option proposes to completely remove witnessing activities (pre accreditation and post accreditation) and their replacement by performance assessments that will occur after accreditation is granted. The accreditation is therefore granted upon successful completion of the on-site assessment.

27. The performance assessment will allow checking the implementation of the AIE system and their ability to determine PDDs and verify emission reductions or removal enhancements in compliance with the system's requirements.

28. To ensure further confidence in the AIE system that was accredited without undergoing a witnessing activity, the JISC or the JI-AP may decide to use the first request of determination/verification as a performance assessment.



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

29. Regarding the number and nature of performance assessments to be selected, it is also proposed to use the outcome of the discussion and the agreement reached at the twenty-third meeting of the JI-AP as explained above in option 1 (paragraph 20, 21 and 22 above).

30. For this option, it is further recommended, to take appropriate measures to strengthen the on-site assessment to ensure sufficient confidence in the AIE system before granting accreditation.

31. Given the specific nature of the on-site assessment, such strengthening may be achieved through strengthening elements that have an impact on its outcome through the main steps of its delivery:

- (a) Before the site visit: by strengthening:
 - (b) The assessment team member's competence via strengthening the process of qualification, training and monitoring of them;
 - (c) Preparation for the site visit via clear and elaborated definition of scope and objective of the assessment, improved preparatory meetings and improved planning and division of tasks between team members;
 - (d) Assessment tools via elaboration of guidance on assessment of specific requirements;
 - (e) During the on-site assessment: via improving the assessment forms by providing clear questions and examples of questions to ask;
 - (f) After the on-site assessment: by providing guidance on how to fill-in different forms, experience sharing and regular feedback from the JI-AP.

32. It is also proposed to streamline, shorten and or introduce timelines for each step of the accreditation process, in order to ensure timely completion of assessment activities, decision making at the appropriate time and keeping in the process only IEs that have real interest in carrying out activities for the JI process.

33. If this option is adopted, a case per case consideration of the applicant IEs for which an indicative letter has been issued and provisional AIEs would have to be undertaken to assess whether the JI-AP has full confidence in accrediting these entities based on the on-site assessment that had already been carried out, or whether there is a need for additional assessment activities. Additional assessment activities such as additional desk review, and/or additional focused on-site assessment before granting accreditation may be considered.

34. The need and the nature of the additional assessment work may be decided based on whether the entity is a provisional AIE or not, the date of issuance of indicative letter, the date on which the on-site assessment was undertaken, the quality of project submissions by the entities that are currently provisional AIE, and/or a combination of some of these options.

35. The choice of this option would allow capitalizing on the experience gained and proven by another accreditation process which is in this case the CDM accreditation process. The adoption of a similar option by the CDM has resulted in an increase of the number of DOEs accredited but also in cleaning up the pipeline from entities that do not have the competence or the interest in carrying out the CDM work.

36. The decision to adopt this option depends on the sole decision of the JISC and could be implemented within a maximum of two JISC meetings.



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

3. Option 3: Aligning the JI accreditation process (procedure, standard and functioning) with the CDM accreditation process steps and carrying out combined/joint assessment resulting in two reports for decision making of the two accreditation panels (JI and CDM)

37. This option is an advanced version of option 2. It involves adopting option 2 with all the changes in the accreditation procedure, the strengthening of the on-site assessment and carrying any required additional assessment to ensure the competence of AIEs. It also requires:

- (a) Full alignment of the CDM and JI accreditation procedures including the timelines;
- (b) Adoption of a common accreditation standard. Specificities of each of the processes (CDM and JI) could still be preserved by having separate chapters for each of the processes;
- (c) The use of the same roster of experts that are qualified in both CDM and JI, which also involves the use of the same qualification criteria.

38. Practically, this option would involve the alignment of the accreditation cycles and carrying out joint assessments using a joint assessment team. The assessment would result in two reports. One report for the CDM-AP containing the common areas and CDM specific requirements And another report for the use of the JI-AP containing also the assessment of the common areas but also the assessment of the JI specific requirements. Each of the two panels would make its recommendation independently to their relevant decision making body (JISC or EB).

39. The choice of this option would:

- (a) Result in an easier management of accreditation for IEs/AIEs, as all, except one, are also operating within the CDM system. It would allow them to have an integrated management system and would save significant costs related to maintaining systems based on two different accreditation standards having different requirements. It would also avoid the assessment of the common areas twice which would again save time and cost for the IEs/AIEs;
- (b) Allow a mutual learning between the two processes. JI would particularly benefit from it as the learning curve in CDM is bigger due to the volume of work that increases the learning from the issues faced;
- (c) Save operation and administration cost from the secretariat side as CDM accreditation workflow could be used and accreditation for both processes can be processed at the same time;
- (d) The involvement of the JI-AP, if the current financial situation continues, could be in this option kept minimal and focused on JI specific issues such as JI specific requirements in the JI accreditation standard.

40. Adoption of this option would however also require finding means, mainly in the common areas, for harmonization of the currently different technical terms between JI and CDM accreditation standard originated respectively from the wording in Guidelines for the implementation of Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol (JI Guidelines) and Modalities and procedures for a clean development mechanism as defined in article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol (CDM Modalities and Procedures).

41. The adoption of this option would require a common decision by the JISC and the EB and intensive collaboration between the CDM and JI accreditation panels in order to align their processes and documentation.



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

42. The JISC may decide to adopt this option even in case of lack of cooperation from the EB that may not see a need for such streamlining and alignment at present. However, a unilateral alignment with the accreditation process of JI with the CDM would be necessary in such case. The JI accreditation procedure and standard would need to be aligned with the CDM procedure and the standard. The JI accreditation standard would keep only the requirements specific to JI and refer for the common areas to the CDM accreditation standard. Regarding the administrative and operational part, the restructuring of the secretariat would ensure its alignment among the two processes (use of the accreditation workflow, process management of IEs/AIEs...).

43. The adoption of this option necessitates the revision of the accreditation procedure and the accreditation standard. It requires also the review of other processes like the qualification of assessment team members and the administration of the work within the secretariat. The implementation of this option requires a common decision by the EB and the JISC.

44. Nevertheless and as explained in paragraph 42. above, the JISC could go ahead without the consent of the EB. This option could be implemented within two to three JISC meetings.

45. It is also to be noted that this option could be implemented gradually by implementing first option 2.

4. Option 4: Full integration of CDM and JI accreditation processes including the accreditation panels

46. This option involves the full integration of the two accreditation processes (JI and CDM) in order to have a single process and single accreditation to be granted. The CDM and JI accreditation panels would have to be integrated in order to have one decision making body.

47. A common decision by the JISC and the EB is needed for such an option.

48. The adoption of this option would allow a substantive cost and time saving for both the JI and CDM accreditation processes as well as for AIEs and DOEs.

49. The adoption of this option implies the redesign of the whole accreditation process and resolving the issues of different terminologies used in the JI guidelines and the CDM modalities and procedures.

50. This option requires decision both from the JISC and the EB and also possibly from the CMP. It could be implemented in the medium term (by mid 2012).

51. It is also to be noted that option 4 could be implemented gradually by implementing first option 2, then 3 before the full integration specified in option 4.

5. Option 5: Delegation of the administration of JI accreditation programme to IAF-recognized national accreditation body(ies) but retain policy development and final accreditation decision within JISC

52. This option consists of the delegation of the administrative and the assessment parts to an International Accreditation Forum (IAF)-recognized national accreditation body(ies) that would be responsible for managing process related matters to accreditation, carrying out assessment and recommending an accreditation decision for the JISC.

53. In this option, policy related matter will be kept within the UNFCCC via the JI-AP.

54. This option would free-up the JI-AP from discussing case related matters; it would also reduce the resources needed to support the JI accreditation process from the accreditation side.

55. This option is proposed based on experience of other GHG emission schemes that are using certifiers accredited by independent accreditation bodies of whom they have recognised the accreditation.



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

56. However, if this option is adopted, there would be no control upon the quality of the work done by an external body and no control on how the JI requirements are being complied with. A second party auditing of the external accreditation body(ies) may have to be carried out. In such cases the costs reduced by not having internal resources would be balanced by the resources needed for second party auditing.

57. The adoption of this option implies the redesign of the whole accreditation process. It requires decision both from the JISC and CMP and could be implemented in the long term (after 2012).

IV. STREAMLINING JI ACCREDITATION OPERATIONS

58. Currently, the JI-AP is developing its own accreditation procedures, standard, qualification system of its assessment team members and is using its meetings to supervise the operations of the accreditation process.

59. In 2008–2009, the JI-AP held six meetings each year. In 2010, only three meetings were held due to budgetary constraints. This has resulted in delays in processing some cases and in the finalisation of some policy issues. The situation is likely to continue through 2011 and beyond, due to insufficient financial resources for JI functioning. It is therefore proposed to seek ways to optimize the use of the available resources to ensure proper functioning of the accreditation process including consideration of cases and policy matters. Some of the ways that the JI-AP could consider are detailed bellow.

60. The suggestions proposed bellow are independent of the option to streamline the accreditation process proposed earlier. Some of these suggestions would have to be implemented depending on the option chosen. However it is possible to implement them independently.

A. Enhance the use of electronic means for decision making:

61. To achieve that it is proposed to:

- (a) Prioritise the consideration of cases and ensure that accreditation decisions are made in a timely manner by taking decisions on case-related matters via electronic means. This proposal would not put a significant burden on JI-AP members taking into account the limited number of cases processed. Complicated cases where panel members express different views may be considered through teleconferences that allow direct discussions and interaction between the members and facilitate reaching a consensual decision. Only cases for which strong and un-reconciled views are expressed would be delayed and considered at the next JI-AP meeting;
- (b) Undertake preliminary discussions on policy and strategic issues via email and teleconferences so that the meeting time is devoted to the finalization of decisions on the issues and discussions on ways to further improve the accreditation process.

B. Capitalise on the experience learnt by the implementation and the revisions of the CDM accreditation standard for revisions to the JI accreditation standard

62. The JI and CDM accreditation standards are very similar. As per past experience, the CDM, due to greater volume of work and longer time of operation, usually identifies issues for revision of the standard before JI. In majority of the cases JI can learn from CDM experiences. Therefore, it is suggested to:

- (a) Undertake an analysis of both standards to identify common areas and the differences;
- (b) For the areas that are different, identify the ones that in the planned revision of the JI accreditation standard with a view to harmonizing the approach with that of the CDM accreditation standard except for JI specific areas;



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

- (c) Have as a policy that when a revision of the CDM accreditation standard occur in these areas, to analyse only these revisions and take a decision whether it would continue to meet the needs of JI accreditation process. If yes, then adopt it with no further work. If not, introduce these areas into the areas of difference between JI and CDM accreditation standards;
- (d) Focus the work of the JI-AP only on areas that are different between the JI and CDM accreditation standards and that has to remain to be so, due to CMP decisions or any other issues specific to each of the mechanisms.

63. It is also to be noted that the JI-AP had decided last year, the JI-AP had decided to undertake a revision of the JI accreditation standard with regard to "Competence in technical areas within the sectoral scope" and "Ensuring impartiality". Such a revision will further reduce the areas of differences between the JI-accreditation standard and the CDM accreditation standard and would make easier the alignment of those standards.

C. Strengthen the qualification and monitoring process of JI assessment team members

64. The qualification system of assessment team members including on-going training is a costly process. The set of requirements, knowledge and competence needed for qualification of CDM and JI assessment team members are very similar. Therefore, the use of the experts qualified by the CDM and focusing the efforts of the JI-AP on monitoring the performance of those experts and on their training only on areas that are specific to JI would save costs for the functioning of JI and ensure the use of very experienced experts.

65. It is proposed to use qualified experts on the roster of CDM assessment teams who have benefited from training undertaken by the CDM-AP and the secretariat and have more experience in the process due to the number of assessments performed under the CDM accreditation process.

D. Increase efficiency and time of operation of the administration of the accreditation process

66. It is proposed to align the JI accreditation procedure to the CDM accreditation procedure in order to make use at very little cost and adjustments of the already functional IT infrastructure used in the CDM accreditation process. This is proposed given the big similarities between the two processes especially if options other than option 1 and 5 on streamlining JI accreditation process are chosen. This choice would save significant costs for a new design of the JI IT infrastructure and would increase the efficiency and operation time for the processing of case-related matters which would allow a better use of secretariat resources in JI policy related issues.

E. Proposals for better integration between JI accreditation process and JI project cycle

67. Currently there is almost no interaction between the JI accreditation process and the JI project cycle. They work independent. The introduction of the performance assessments, data generated from the project cycle will be used as criteria for determining the number and the nature of performance assessments, which would allow a certain degree of mutual learning between the two processes.

68. However, the data generating from the accreditation process is not utilised in the JI project cycle. It is therefore suggested that the secretariat undertakes work on ways on how data generating from the accreditation process may be used in the project cycle process. Some of the outcome of this may be to use such data to reduce the number of projects checked for AIEs that have proven to have a compliant and stable management system.

69. In addition, though distinct from the accreditation process, the JISC would examine approaches to reducing the quantity and form of assessments conducted in the project cycle for entities which are performing in accordance with the expected quality standards. This will require the JI-AP to consider the



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

relationship between both regular on-site surveillance and performance assessments and assessments conducted in the project cycle process. At the simplest level, this would require the number and nature of performance assessments to be determined by the outcome of project submissions. At a more complex level this could involve integrating project cycle assessments as part of the performance assessment process.

70. Having such a close linkage between the accreditation process and the project cycle process would improve the efficiency of both processes and would ensure an optimised use of the resources.

- - - - -



Appendix 1

**OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSED OPTIONS TO STREAMLINE
JI ACCREDITATION PROCESS**



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

Option	Pros	Cons	Documents to be revised	Decision - making Body	Timelines for implementation
Option 1: Limiting the revision of the JI accreditation process to the changes already agreed by the JISC with few adjustments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Quickly implementable- Minimum adjustment required	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- May not address the requests from JISC and CMP for further streamlining of the JI accreditation- May not result on the expected outcome which is facilitating access to the market for AIEs as the barrier of the pre- accreditation witnessing activity will still remain- Entities provisionally accredited could still carry out work without any control from the JI-AP on their compliance with the requirement before their accreditation by the JISC- Delay in the project used as witnessing while waiting for the outcome of the accreditation process.	JI accreditation procedure	JISC	1 to 2 JISC meetings
Option 2: Aligning the steps of JI accreditation procedure with the steps of CDM accreditation procedure (Desk review, on-site assessment, Performance assessments...)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Quickly implementable- Would allow to quickly have in the market AIEs that have proven their compliance with the JI accreditation requirements- Cleaning up the pipeline from entities that do not have the competence or the interest in carrying out the CDM work)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Allowing to the market IEs that may not have experience and have not yet proven their competence in determining/verifying real projects (this could be resolved) by using the first request for determination/verification as performance assessment.	JI accreditation procedure	JISC	2 JISC meetings



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

Option	Pros	Cons	Documents to be revised	Decision - making Body	Timelines for implementation
Option 3: Aligning the JI accreditation process (procedure, standard and functioning) with the CDM accreditation process steps and carrying out combined/joint assessment resulting in two reports for decision making of the two accreditation panels (JI and CDM)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Same than option 2;- Cost saving for the AIEs and DOEs- Use of the CDM experienced assessment team members- Better mutual learning between the two processes- Cost saving for the JI-AP for the qualification of its expert- Focuses the work of the JI accreditation panel on the JI specifics	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Same as option 2;- If the CDM -AP and the EB are not receptive to the idea, then JI would have to align unilaterally with the CDM accreditation process and uses its documentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ JI accreditation procedure▪ JI accreditation standard	JISC	2 to 3 JISC meetings
Option 4: Full integration of CDM and JI accreditation processes including the accreditation panels	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Same as option 3- Dramatic save costing for both processes and for the AIEs and DOEs- Greater efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Depend on a common decision and agreement between JISC and EB	Redesign of the whole CDM and JI accreditation process including the panels	JISC + EB	Mid next year
Option 5: Delegation of the administration of JI accreditation programme to IAF-recognized national accreditation body(ies) but retain policy development and final accreditation decision within JISC	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Free-up some resources from the JI-AP and secretariat side	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- No control on the conducting and the outcome of the assessments carried out by an external body- Administrative complications related to the nature of a UN organization and its ability to subcontract a service to a national body- Implementation would take a long time.	Redesign of the whole JI accreditation process	JISC + CMP	After 2012