

REPORT OF THE JI ACCREDITATION PANEL (JI-AP)

Twenty-seventh meeting of the JI-AP version 01.1*

2 - 3 February 2012

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
I. INTRODUCTION	2
II. STATUS OF APPLICATIONS FOR ACCREDITATION	2
III. CASE-SPECIFIC ISSUES	2
IV. STATUS OF ROSTER OF EXPERTS.....	2
V. OTHER ISSUES UNDER CONSIDERATION.....	2
VI. NEXT MEETING OF THE JI-AP.....	3

* This version has been issued to include the missing forms.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This progress report covers the period from 5 August 2011 to 3 February 2012. During this period the Joint Implementation Accreditation Panel (JI-AP) held one meeting (JI-AP 27), on 2 - 3 February 2012. The JI-AP 27 meeting was originally planned to take place in October 2011, and was postponed to February 2012 due to the status of on-going accreditation assessment activities, policy discussions and cost effectiveness.

II. STATUS OF APPLICATIONS FOR ACCREDITATION

2. The total number of entities currently under consideration by the JI-AP is 12, including 11 accredited independent entities (AIEs) and one applicant entity (AE). Within the reporting period, one AE withdrew its application and one entity was accredited by the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (hereinafter referred to as the JISC).

3. At its twenty-sixth meeting, the JI-AP had elaborated the modalities of the additional focused on-site assessments, appointed JI-ATs and launched eight such assessments of the AIEs accredited as of 1 August 2011, in accordance with the decision of the JISC at its twenty-fifth meeting. These assessments are currently on-going.

4. Regular surveillance assessments have been initiated for three other entities, and are currently also on-going. In accordance with the "Procedure for Accrediting Independent Entities by the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee" (JI accreditation procedure), performance assessments will also be initiated for all accredited entities throughout 2012.

III. CASE-SPECIFIC ISSUES

5. The JI-AP considered a withdrawal of accreditation of one entity. The notification on this case will be submitted for the consideration of the JISC under confidentiality.

6. In accordance with the modalities for additional focused on-site assessments, the JI-AP considered the non-conformities raised by JI-ATs in four of such assessments, as well as the proposed corrective actions by AIEs. No recommendation is required to be forwarded to the JISC at this time.

7. The JI-AP also considered two notifications on change. No recommendation is required to be forwarded to the JISC at this time.

IV. STATUS OF ROSTER OF EXPERTS

8. No changes were effected to the roster of experts during the present reporting period. The number of experts on the roster remains 37 in total.

V. OTHER ISSUES UNDER CONSIDERATION

9. The JI-AP reviewed the assessments carried out in 2011 and agreed on individual assessment plans for each AIE for 2012. The assessment plans, outlining dates of the regular surveillance visits, as well as planned number of performance assessments, will be sent to each AIE individually. These plans will be kept under review, in accordance with relevant provisions of the JI accreditation procedure.

10. The JI-AP considered two guidance documents for JI-ATs regarding conduction of on-site assessments and performance assessments. These guidance documents will be made available to JI-ATs shortly.

11. The JI-AP also agreed on the complaints forms F-JI-CD to support implementation of the appendixes 4 and 5 of the JI accreditation procedure. The forms are attached to this report.


12. The JI-AP also considered a draft ethical conduct statement for JI-AT experts. The JI-AP agreed on the text and requested the secretariat to include relevant requirement into the terms of reference for the JI-ATs.

13. The JI-AP held its first direct interaction with the clean development mechanism accreditation panel (CDM-AP) by means of a joint session of both panels. During this session the JI-AP and the CDM-AP considered the existing mandates and discussed possible areas for collaboration, including alignment of the CDM and JI accreditation procedures, standards and practices. While recognizing existing boundaries, members of the JI-AP and the CDM-AP identified a number of possible “quick-wins” to benefit from synergies between the two accreditation processes and reduce unnecessary burden on the entities. This work will be continued at a next joint session.

VI. NEXT MEETING OF THE JI-AP

14. The dates for the next JI-AP meeting (JI-AP 28) are currently under discussion and will be defined based on the progress of the accreditation assessment cases.

- - - - -

	COMPLAINTS AND DISPUTES FORM (FOR AIEs)	
Name, address and contact information of the complaining applicant IE/AIE		
Subject of the complaint	<div data-bbox="564 566 762 600">[] The JI-AP</div> <div data-bbox="564 649 762 683">[] The JI-AT</div> <div data-bbox="564 732 829 766">[] The secretariat</div> <div data-bbox="564 857 1181 891">Please provide exact name and titles, if known:</div>	
Information on the project or assessment relevant to the complaint:		
Area of the complaint	<div data-bbox="564 1449 1246 1482">[] Compliance with the JI accreditation procedure</div> <div data-bbox="564 1532 893 1565">[] Unethical behaviour</div> <div data-bbox="564 1615 1350 1648">[] Disagreement on a non-conformity raised or not closed</div> <div data-bbox="564 1697 917 1731">[] Other, please specify:</div>	
Summary of the complaint:		


Please provide as well all the necessary documentation to substantiate your complaint.

I declare that the information given in this form is correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signed	
Name (<i>print</i>)	
Date	

History of the document

Version	Date	Nature of revision
01	XX XXX 2012	Initial Adoption

	COMPLAINTS AND DISPUTES FORM (STAKEHOLDERS OTHER THAN AIEs)	
Name, address and contact information of the complainant		
Status of the complainant	<input type="checkbox"/> A project participant, client of an AIE <input type="checkbox"/> Other entity that submitted comments during the global stakeholder consultation process	
Subject of the complaint	Please provide exact name of the AIE:	
Information on the project or assessment relevant to the complaint:		
Area of the complaint	<input type="checkbox"/> Performance of the AIE in cases, where it has not complied with its own accredited system or JI requirements <input type="checkbox"/> Comments submitted during the global consultation process were not taken into account <input type="checkbox"/> Fraud or unethical behaviour <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please specify:	

Summary of the complaint:

Please provide all the necessary documentation to substantiate your complaint.

Please provide as well evidence that you have exhausted all possibilities of complaints / disputes / appeals within the AIE's system.

I declare that the information given in this form is correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signed	
Name (<i>print</i>)	
Date	

History of the document

Version	Date	Nature of revision
01	XX XXX 2012	Initial Adoption