

 REPORT ON WITNESSING ACTIVITY (DETERMINATION)	
Name and address of applicant or accredited independent entity (IE)	
UNFCCC ref no. of IE	
Site visit made by the JI-AT	
Address of the site(s) visited	
Title, reference number and brief description of the JI project under witnessing (project, scale, dates, duration, etc.)	
Sectoral scope(s) witnessed	
Methodology used	<input type="checkbox"/> JI specific approach <input type="checkbox"/> Approved CDM methodology, ref. no. and version:
Determination witnessed (determination team member(s), technical expert(s), internal reviewer, operational management, dates, duration, etc.)	
JI-AT leader's name	
JI-AT member(s)'s name (indicate the expert in baseline setting and monitoring)	
Has documentary evidence been provided to the JI-AT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Proposal and contract review report – Evidence of the impartiality and competence of the IE's team and internal reviewer involved in the determination – Determination plan – Corresponding PDD – Draft determination report, including the outcomes of the internal review – Final determination report 	

INSTRUCTIONS:

- The purpose of a witnessing activity is to assess whether the IE is effectively implementing its documented policies, procedures and systems for meeting JI accreditation requirements while the IE is performing a determination or verification and whether it has the required competence within the sectoral scope(s) under witnessing. The scope of a witnessing activity includes the assessment of substantive decision-making capacity of the IE, inter alia, in assessing baseline and monitoring methodologies. For this purpose, the JI-AT shall assess whether the IE has effectively checked whether the project participant(s) has followed all applicable JI project rules and requirements.
- The JI accreditation requirements are contained in the “Joint implementation accreditation standard (version 01)” (Standard) and other JISC documents as appropriate. While conducting the assessment and filling out the following table, the JI-AT shall refer to the Standard for the complete text of the requirements.
- With regard to compliance with the requirements, the JI-AT shall use one of the following options for the “Rating” column: S = Satisfactory, NS = Not satisfactory, NA = Not Applicable.
- The JI-AT shall substantiate, in the “Comments” column, for both “S” and “NS” ratings.

- For the requirements presented in the second column in the table below, “did the IE (effectively) check” is asking whether the IE (effectively) checked, took appropriate actions and, as applicable, ensured that the project requirement was met.
- All questions in section 2 in this form (Determination work) relate to the detailed tasks that the IE is expected to carry out in a determination, which are not accreditation requirements per se (the parts of the first column pasted in grey, with no paragraph reference to the Standard, indicates that these tasks are not accreditation requirements). Nevertheless, the quality of execution of these tasks tells the JI-AT about the IE’s competence and/or appropriate implementation of its policies, procedures and systems for determinations, which are accreditation requirements. Therefore, each “NS” rating in section 2 triggers a “NS” rating in the appropriate accreditation requirement(s) in section 3 (Process for performing the determination) and/or section 4 (Competence). For each “NS” rating in section 2, the reference to the corresponding “NS” rating in section 3 and/or section 4 shall be indicated in the “Comments” column in section 2.
- For each “NS” rating in sections 1, 3 and 4, the JI-AT shall raise a non-conformity (NC) and support its decision by providing detailed information in the form “F-JI-NC”.
- Section 5 (General comments) does not relate to specific accreditation requirements. It aims at providing a general view of the IE’s work.
- The JI-AT may ask the IE to provide any other additional information deemed necessary to conduct the assessment.

Reference to paragraph in the Standard	Requirement	Rating	Comments
1. Process for preparing the determination			
76-78	Did the IE effectively implement its proposal and contract review procedure by conducting beforehand a review of: – The proposal made to the project participant(s), including checking and ensuring availability of competent and impartial determination personnel?		
	– The contract with the project participant(s), including checking and ensuring availability of competent and impartial determination personnel?		
46-47	Did the IE effectively implement its impartiality procedure before signing the contract with the project participant(s)?		
79-80	Did the IE effectively implement its team member selection procedure?		
70-71	Did the IE use external personnel, and if yes, did the IE effectively implement its external personnel utilization procedure?		
73-75	Did the IE subcontract any determination work to another legal entity, and if yes, did the IE effectively implement its subcontracting procedure?		
2. Determination work			
	2.1 Has the IE identified all the pertinent documentation prior to the determination?		
	2.2 Did the IE check effectively the contents of the PDD submitted by project participant(s) to confirm that all the information referred to in paragraph 31 of the JI guidelines is attached?		
	2.2.1 Did the IE check and ensure if the requirements listed in paragraph 2 of the “Clarification regarding the public availability of documents under the verification procedure under the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee” are fulfilled?		
	2.3 Did the IE handle appropriately the publication of PDD through the secretariat?		
	2.3.1 Was the PDD submitted to the secretariat by the operational management?		
	2.4 Did the IE handle appropriately the comments submitted by Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC accredited observers?		
	2.5 Did the IE effectively check whether the project has been approved by the Parties involved?		

	2.6	Did the IE effectively check whether project participant(s) are authorised by a Party involved?		
	2.7	Did the IE effectively check if the definition and justification of the project boundary by project participant(s) is appropriate?		
	2.8	Did the IE effectively check if the project participant(s) undertook the assessment of the potential leakage of the proposed JI project and explained which sources of leakage are to be calculated and which can be neglected?		
	2.9	Did the IE effectively check whether the project would result in a reduction of anthropogenic emissions by sources or enhancements of anthropogenic removals by sinks that is additional to any that would otherwise occur?		
	2.9.1	Did the IE effectively check the approach for the demonstration of additionality chosen by project participant(s) and the justification provided?		
	2.10	Did the IE effectively check whether the project has an appropriate baseline in accordance with “Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring”?		
	2.10.1	Did the IE check the approach and selection of option for the establishment of the baseline chosen by project participant(s) and the justification provided?		
	2.11	Did the IE effectively check whether the project has an appropriate monitoring plan in accordance with “Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring”?		
	2.12	Did the IE effectively check the calculation/estimation of the emission reductions/enhancement of removals presented in the PDD?		
	2.13	Did the IE effectively check that the selection of the crediting period by project participant(s) conforms with requirements for JI projects?		
	2.14	Did the IE effectively check whether project participant(s) have submitted the information on environmental impacts referred to in paragraph 33 (d) of the JI guidelines?		
	2.15	Did the IE provide its reasons for the determination opinion?		
	2.16	Did the IE handle appropriately confidential information?		

	<p>Only for projects applying an approved CDM methodology:</p> <p>2.17 Did the IE effectively check whether project participant(s) have applied correctly the approved CDM methodology?</p>		
	<p>Only for land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) JI projects:</p> <p>2.18 Did the IE effectively check whether a project aimed at enhancing net anthropogenic removals by sinks conforms to definitions, accounting rules, modalities and guidelines under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol?</p>		
	<p>Only for small-scale (SSC) projects:</p> <p>2.19 Did the IE effectively check whether the project meets the threshold and conforms to the categories and provisions for JI SSC projects?</p>		
	<p>Only for bundled SSC projects:</p> <p>2.20 Did the IE effectively check whether the bundled SSC projects meet all requirements to be categorized as JI bundled SSC projects as defined in “Provision for joint implementation small-scale projects” adopted by the JISC?</p>		
	3. Process for performing the determination		
81-82	<p>Did the IE effectively implement its determination procedure for carrying out the determination in accordance with all requirements by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Preparing and fulfilling a determination plan in accordance with the requirements? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Using tools to systematically and consistently carry out the determination, such as determination protocol or check-list? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Using tools to specifically assess application of the baseline and monitoring methodology by the project participant(s), such as methodology/approach check-list? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Preparing a final determination opinion and report that takes into account the internal review’s results 		
84-86	Did the IE effectively implement its procedure for internal reviews?		
84	Did the internal review effectively identify deficiencies, if any, in the draft determination opinion and report and enable to produce a final determination opinion and report that meet all applicable requirements?		

87-88	Did the IE effectively implement its determination approval procedure?		
	Is the determination opinion and report approved by the operational management?		
39	Was the determination report submitted to the secretariat by the operational management?		
4. Competence			
53	Does the operational management have sufficient competence relevant to the sectoral scopes in which the IE operates?		
54	Do the determiner(s) and determination team leader have the knowledge and understanding of the JI guidelines, relevant decisions of the CMP and the JISC, including all determination requirements, and the “Determination and verification manual”?		
55	Does the determination team collectively have the required knowledge and understanding?		
56	Do the determination team have the required competence for assessing application of baseline and monitoring methodologies?		
58	Does the determination team, with technical expert(s) if applicable, collectively have the sufficient competence for assessing process technologies, project design, environmental impacts, financial aspects and other technical aspects of the JI project relevant to determination?		
59	Does the determination team leader have the additional required competence?		
60	Do technical expert(s) used in the determination, if any, have: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Specialized knowledge and sufficient expertise in technical aspects of the JI project undergoing determination? – Sufficient understanding of the determination? 		
61	Does the internal reviewer have the required knowledge?		
62	Does the internal reviewer have the required competence?		
5. General comments			
	Was the determination work systematically approached and carried out?		
	How is the general presentation and quality of the determination report?		
	Did the IE’s determination team provide the impression that the IE will be able to maintain a consistent quality level in its work over time?		
	Any other observation on the IE’s work?		

Conclusions and recommendations:	
JI-AT leader's signature:	Date: