



## REPORT ON WITNESSING ACTIVITY (DETERMINATION)

*(Complete one form for each witnessing activity)*

<b>Name of entity and Address of site(s) assessed, if any</b>		
<b>UNFCCC ref no. of entity</b>		
<b>Title and reference number of the JI project under witnessing</b>		
<b>Sectoral scope(s) witnessed</b>		
<b>Methodology used</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Approved CDM methodology, Reference: .....</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other methodology</b>	
<b>Activity (project) witnessed (describe in brief the nature of the activity witnessed e.g. single assessor or team, dates, duration, small/large-scale projects)</b>		
<b>Name of JI-AT leader</b>		
<b>Names of JI-AT member(s) (indicate the expert on baseline setting and monitoring)</b>		
<b>Evaluation</b>		
<i>(Key: S = Satisfactory, NS = Not satisfactory, NA = Not Applicable)</i>		
<b>Criteria (fill as applicable to the activity witnessed)</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>1. Assessment of effective planning by the entity witnessed</b>  1.1. Does the entity effectively apply its procedures to keep up-to-date with the decisions of the JISC related to determination activities, including criteria on baseline-setting and monitoring?  1.2. Is the allocation of the resources appropriate to the scope of determination by the entity?  1.3. Has all the pertinent documentation been identified prior to the determination?  1.4. Does the entity use checklists for performing determination activities (general or specific)? Are the checklists or other means used comprehensive?		
<b>2. Project assessment details for the determination</b>  2.1 Does the entity check effectively the contents of the PDD submitted by project participants to confirm that all the information referred to in paragraph 31 of the JI guidelines is attached?  2.1.1 Does the entity check 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?		

<p>2.2 Does the entity handle appropriately the publication of PDDs through the secretariat?</p> <p>2.3 Does the entity handle appropriately the comments submitted by Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC accredited observers?</p> <p>2.4 Does the entity check whether the project has been approved by the Parties involved?</p> <p>2.5 Does the entity check whether project participants are authorised by a Party involved?</p> <p>2.6 Does the entity check effectively if the definition and justification of the project boundary by project participants is appropriate?</p> <p>2.6.1 Does the entity check effectively if the project participants 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?</p> <p>2.7 Does the entity check effectively 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?</p> <p>2.7.1 Does the entity check effectively the approach for the demonstration of additionality chosen by project participants and the justification provided?</p> <p>2.8 Does the entity check effectively whether the project has an appropriate baseline in accordance with the criteria set out in appendix B to the JI guidelines?</p> <p>2.8.1 Does the entity check the approach and selection of option for the establishment of the baseline chosen by project participants and the justification provided?</p> <p>2.9 Does the entity check effectively whether the project has an appropriate monitoring plan in accordance with the criteria set out in appendix B of the JI guidelines?</p> <p>2.10 Does the entity check effectively the calculation/estimation of the emission reductions/enhancement of removals presented in the PDD?</p> <p>2.11 Does the entity check effectively that the selection of the crediting period by project participants conforms with requirements for JI projects?</p> <p>2.12 Does the entity check effectively whether project participants have submitted the information on environmental impacts referred to in paragraph 33 (d) of the JI guidelines?</p>		
--	--	--

<p>2.13 Does the entity provide its reasons for the determination opinion?</p> <p>2.14 Does the entity handle appropriately confidential information?</p> <p><b>Only for projects applying a clean development mechanism (CDM) approved methodology:</b></p> <p>2.15 Does the entity check effectively whether project participants apply correctly the CDM approved methodology?</p> <p><b>Only for land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) JI projects:</b></p> <p>2.16 Does the entity check effectively 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><b>Only for small-scale (SSC) projects:</b></p> <p>2.17 Does the entity check effectively whether the project meets the threshold and conforms to the categories and provisions for JI SSC projects?</p>		
<p><b>3. General comments</b></p> <p>3.1. Was work systematically approached and implemented?</p> <p>3.2. Did the entity's team provide the impression that the entity will be able to maintain a consistent quality level in its work over time?</p> <p>3.3. In case the entity established a team, did the leader of the entity's team control the determination activity?</p>		
<p><b>General comments and recommendations:</b></p>		
<p><b>Leader of the JI-AT (Signature):</b></p>	<p><b>Date:</b></p>	