



SUSTAINABILITY

Issues track 2 JI

JI Workshop 9 and 10 September 2008

ADVISORY

KPMG in CDM and JI

- ◆ Involved in several early projects, mainly under the ERUPT programme (2001-2005)
- ◆ Validated CDM projects as DOE (scope 1,2,3 and 13)
- ◆ Seeking accreditation as AIE

Many differences between CDM and JI

- ◆ JI has less prescriptive guidance → Bigger responsibility of the AIE and the Host Country
- ◆ In JI Host Countries have something to lose (in track 1 and 2)
- ◆ Risk: The lowest level of requirements becomes the standard
- ◆ However the opposite seems to be the case: Approved track 2 projects applied the CDM approach
- ◆ JI was not intended to be the same as CDM because it is under a capped environment
- ◆ The AIEs have a shared responsibility to keep the standard high but to respect the differences between CDM and JI

CDM methodologies

◆ CDM methodologies are not always applicable:

- Emission reduction projects for which no CDM methodology applies
- Technology in annex 1 countries can differ

◆ Example

- Many JI countries have District Heating Systems with Combined Heat and Power generation (CHPs)

◆ AIEs also assess the methodology applied if no CDM methodology is available (will take more time)

Conclusion

- ◆ CDM and JI are different ball games
- ◆ Different countries were involved in the establishment of CDM and JI and the rules differ
- ◆ AIE's and Host Countries have a bigger role and responsibility in JI
- ◆ Interaction between AIE is important for consistency

Contact details

KPMG Sustainability

Eric Koudijs

Koudijs.eric@kpmg.nl

Tel: +31 20 656 4503

Mob: +31 65155 3429