

# **Approach on DOE suspension**

## **Twenty-first meeting of the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee**

Motoharu Yamazaki  
UNFCCC secretariat

Bonn, Germany  
13-14 April 2010



## **JI accreditation process and CDM accreditation process are administered under separate authority**

- JISC – JI-AP – JI-ATs
- CDM EB – CDM-AP – CDM-ATs

## **The only “link” between the two processes is “provisionally acting AIEs” status based on CMP decision (10/CMP.1)**

- DOEs at the time of JI accreditation process started (15 Nov 2006) may act provisionally as AIEs in the sectoral scopes and functions accredited under the CDM

## **Accreditation requirements between the two processes are similar**

- If an entity’s accreditation is suspended/withdrawn under one process, the entity may no longer meet accreditation requirement under the other process too

## **JI-AP 22 considered the issue**

- Options
- Pros and cons
- Recommended approach

### Option 1

- Status quo (JISC does not consider the entities' accreditation status under the CDM)

### Option 2

- JISC takes into account the accreditation status under CDM, analyzes the situation and takes appropriate actions including suspension or withdrawal

### Option 3

- JISC automatically suspends or withdraws accreditation if CDM EB suspends or withdraws the accreditation of the entity

## Approach on DOE suspension | Pros and cons

	Pros	Cons
<b>Option 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintains complete authority by JISC/JI-AP</li> <li>• Good predictability of accreditation status for stakeholders</li> <li>• Easy administration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May miss entities' possible incompliance with accreditation requirements</li> <li>• May continuously give rise to questions on the "double standards" under UNFCCC</li> </ul>
<b>Option 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enables frequent detection of entities' possible non-compliance with accreditation requirements</li> <li>• Enables timely suspension/withdrawal</li> <li>• Allows JISC/JI-AP to assess the case</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires additional resources for constant monitoring and immediate actions</li> <li>• Makes JI accreditation status less predictable</li> <li>• Administration could be complicated</li> </ul>
<b>Option 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevents entities from further functioning under potential non-compliance</li> <li>• Relatively easy administration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires additional resources</li> <li>• Loses some authority and control by JISC/JI-AP</li> <li>• Makes JI accreditation status very unpredictable</li> <li>• Unfairly inflicts financial damage to entities if the reason for suspension/withdrawal is not relevant to JI accreditation requirement</li> <li>• Judgment of suspension/withdrawal may not be consistent between the two authorities</li> </ul>

## Option 2 - Possible modality

1. JI-AP considers reason for suspension/withdrawal by CDM EB
2. If JI-AP finds the reason clearly or potentially affects the entity's compliance with JI accreditation requirements, it recommends JISC on actions
3. JISC shall not suspend/withdraw until it conducts a spec-check and subsequently decides negatively
4. In case entities are still "applicant IEs", JI-AP may take into account the suspension/withdrawal under CDM in the assessment of the entities under JI accreditation

## Other aspect of consideration

1. Reciprocity between JI and CDM accreditation processes?
  - Suspension/withdrawal under JI ↔ Suspension/withdrawal under CDM