



**JOINT IMPLEMENTATION
DETERMINATION AND VERIFICATION MANUAL**

(Version 01)

CONTENTS

A. BACKGROUND	3
B. OBJECTIVES	3
C. DEFINITIONS	4
D. PRINCIPLES OF DETERMINATION AND VERIFICATION	4
E. DETERMINATION	4
1. General	4
2. Publication of project design document	5
3. Project approvals by Parties involved	6
4. Project participants authorization by Parties involved	6
5. Project boundary	6
6. Leakage	7
7. Baseline setting	7
Approved CDM methodology approach	7
Deviation from approved CDM methodology	8
JI specific approach	8
Approved CDM methodology approach	9
Multi-project emission factor	9
8. Additionality	10
9. Crediting period	11
10. Monitoring	11
Approved CDM methodology approach	12
Deviation from approved CDM methodology	12
JI specific approach	12
Approved CDM methodology approach	14
Overlapping monitoring period	15
11. Estimation/calculation of emission reductions or enhancements of removals	15
12. Environmental impacts	17
13. Stakeholder consultation	17
14. Determination regarding small-scale projects (additional/alternative elements for assessment)	17



15. Determination regarding land use, land-use change and forestry projects (additional/alternative elements for assessment)	19
16. Determination regarding projects under programmes of activities	21
17. Determination report	21
F. VERIFICATION	23
1. General	23
2. Publication of monitoring report	23
3. Project implementation	24
4. Compliance with monitoring plan	24
5. Revision of monitoring plan	25
6. Data management	25
7. Verification report	26
G. REFERENCES	27
H. ABBREVIATIONS	28
ANNEX: Determination and verification check list	29



A. Background

1. The verification procedure under the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (JISC) (hereinafter referred to as JI Track 2 procedure) is the determination by an independent entity accredited by the JISC of whether a project and the ensuing reductions of anthropogenic emissions by sources or enhancements of anthropogenic removals by sinks meet the relevant requirements of Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol and the annex to decision 9/CMP.1 (hereinafter referred to as JI guidelines).
2. Paragraphs 30-45 of the JI guidelines describe the steps of the JI Track 2 procedure. These include the steps relating to determination regarding a project design document (PDD) (hereinafter referred to as determination) and the steps relating to determination of emission reductions or enhancements of removals (for the latter determination, hereinafter referred to as verification).
3. Prompted by discussions at the fifth UNFCCC workshop on joint implementation (JI), and taking into account the inputs from the call for public input conducted subsequently, the JISC, at its fourteenth meeting, decided to develop a determination and verification manual (DVM) for accredited independent entities (AIEs) for their performing determinations and verifications in line with relevant provisions of the JI guidelines and other decisions by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP) and the JISC with regard to the requirements for projects under the JI Track 2 procedure and the role of AIEs.
4. The JISC, [after the consultations with stakeholders at the roundtable and the sixth UNFCCC workshop on JI,] [and taking into account the inputs from the further call for public input on this subject] adopted the present document at its [eighteenth] meeting.

B. Objectives

5. The objective of this document is to guide AIEs to undertake determinations and verifications in a systematic manner. This would improve the consistency of determination and verification works within and among AIEs, and as a result, contribute to the improvement of the integrity and transparency of the JI Track 2 procedure as a whole. The document would also be useful for project participants, as it provides information on what will be expected with regard to their projects.
6. This document compiles requirements for projects under the JI Track 2 procedure in existing decisions by the CMP and the JISC as well as indicative modalities, sorted by steps/elements of determination and verification, and presents them in a way for AIEs to follow.¹ This document does not introduce new requirements for projects under the JI Track 2 procedure, nor new requirements for AIEs to conform to.
7. AIEs should clearly recognize the difference between this document and the validation and verification manual (VVM) developed by the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism (CDM), reflecting the different nature of JI and the CDM and the roles of AIEs and designated operational entities in the respective mechanisms.
8. The JISC will review this document ~~periodically~~, and update it as necessary to include new relevant requirements and/or guidance adopted by the CMP and/or the JISC, or to improve the contents based on the experience gained by the JISC, **as appropriate**.

¹ The decisions of the CMP and the JISC that the present document is based on are referred to in the corresponding guidances and listed in the reference section.



C. Definitions

9. Definitions of the terms used in this document are:

[To be developed later, if deemed necessary]

D. Principles of determination and verification

10. An AIE shall apply the following principles when performing a determination or verification:

- (a) Impartiality, independence and safeguarding against conflict of interest, thereby maintaining objective judgments throughout the course of the determination or verification;
- (b) Confidentiality, by not disclosing information obtained from the project participants marked as proprietary or confidential to a third party without the written consent of the provider of the information, except as required by applicable national law of the host Party;²
- (c) Transparency, by providing relevant objective evidence or appropriate justification for all judgments in the determination or verification;
- (d) Consistency, by making the judgements on the same basis for the same requirement.

E. Determination

1. General

11. The purpose of determination is to assess whether a project presented in its project design document (PDD) meets the following requirements as defined in paragraph 33 of the JI guidelines:^[1]

- (a) The project has been approved by the Parties involved;
- (b) The project would result in a reduction of anthropogenic emissions by sources or an enhancement of anthropogenic removals by sinks that is additional to any that would otherwise occur;
- (c) The project has an appropriate baseline and monitoring plan in accordance with the criteria set out in appendix B of the JI guidelines;
- (d) Project participants have submitted to the AIE documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity, including transboundary impacts, in accordance with procedures as determined by the host Party, and, if those impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the host Party, have undertaken an environmental impact assessment in accordance with procedures as required by the host Party.

² In accordance with paragraph 40 of the JI guidelines, information used to determine whether reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources or enhancements of anthropogenic removals by sinks are additional, to describe the baseline methodology and its application, and to support an environmental impact assessment referred to in paragraph 33 (d) of the JI guidelines, shall not be considered as proprietary or confidential.



12. If the AIE, in assessing the PDD and supporting documents, identifies issues that need to be corrected, clarified or improved with regard to JI project requirements, it should raise these issues ~~to~~ **and inform** the project participants **of the issues** for their appropriate actions. The AIE may raise these issues in the form of:

- (a) Corrective action request (CAR), requesting the project participants to correct a mistake **in the published PDD** that is not in line with the (technical) process used for the project or relevant JI project requirement, or that shows any other logical flaw;
- (b) Clarification request (CL), requesting the project participants to provide additional information for the AIE to make a judgment on the conformity with the JI project requirement in question;
- (c) Forward action request (FAR), informing the project participants of an issue, relating to project implementation but not to project design, that needs to be reviewed during the first verification of the project.

~~13. The AIE should inform the project participants of the issues referred to in paragraph 12 above if it identifies them.~~

~~14.13. Once the project participants modified the PDD or provided additional information responding to it for the AIE to make a judgment on all the issues raised,~~ **the AIE should make an objective assessment as to whether the actions, if any, taken by the project participants satisfactorily resolve the issues raised, if any, and** should conclude its findings of the determination.

~~15.14.~~ The AIE should record all the issues it raised and how they were addressed in the report referred to in paragraph 61 below.

2. Publication of project design document

~~16.15.~~ The AIE, when making a PDD publicly available through the secretariat in accordance with paragraph 32 of the JI guidelines, shall ensure that:^[iii]

- (a) The correct PDD form developed by the JISC, in terms of project scale and type and form version is used.³ In this context, it should be noted that:
 - (i) The PDD form developed by the JISC shall not be altered. It shall be completed without modifying/adding headings, logo, format or font. Tables shall not be modified or deleted (unless otherwise indicated). However, rows may be added as needed;
 - (ii) The JISC will not accept documentation using the previous version of the PDD form developed by the JISC six months after the adoption of a new version;
- (b) All documents submitted are correctly referenced;
- (c) All documents and annexes listed in the table of contents of the PDD are submitted;
- (d) All documents are submitted in English, unless an **[official]** translation into English is provided;

³ The JISC has developed four PDD forms, i.e. joint implementation project design document form (JI PDD form), joint implementation project design document form for small-scale projects (JI SSC PDD form), form for submission of bundles joint implementation small-scale projects (F-JI-SSC-BUNDLE) and joint implementation land use, land-use change and forestry project design document form (JI LULUCF PDD form).



- (e) All the information marked as confidential or proprietary is submitted. In this context, it should be noted that information used to determine whether reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources or enhancements of anthropogenic removals by sinks are additional, to describe the baseline methodology and its application, and to support an environmental impact assessment referred to in paragraph 33 (d) of the JI guidelines, shall not be considered as proprietary or confidential.

3. Project approvals by Parties involved

17.16. The AIE shall assess whether the designated focal points (DFPs) of all Parties declared as “Parties involved” in the PDD have provided written project approvals.⁴ In this context, the AIE shall firstly assess, when submitting the determination report to the secretariat for publication in accordance with paragraph 34 of the JI guidelines, at least the host Party is identified as a Party involved in the PDD and the respective written project approval has been issued by the DFP of the host Party.^[iii]

18.17. The AIE shall assess whether the written project approvals referred to in paragraph 16 above are unconditional.^{5 [iii]}

4. Project participants authorization by Parties involved

19.18. The AIE shall assess whether each of the legal entities listed as project participants in the PDD is authorized by a Party involved^[iv], which is also listed in the PDD, through:

- (a) A written project approval by a Party involved, explicitly indicating the name of the legal entity;^[iii] or
- (b) Any other form of project participant authorization in writing, explicitly indicating the name of the legal entity.

5. Project boundary

20.19. The AIE shall assess whether:^[v]

- (a) The project boundary defined in the PDD encompasses all anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases (GHGs) which are:
 - (i) Under the control of the project participants;
 - (ii) Reasonably attributable to the project; and
 - (iii) Significant, i.e., as a rule of thumb, would by each source account on average per year over the crediting period for more than 1 per cent of the annual average anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs, or exceed an amount of 2,000 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent, whichever is lower; and

⁴ In the case of multilateral funds, written approval from each participant’s DFP is not necessarily required. However, if written approval is not provided, rights and privileges in terms of being a Party involved may be given up.

⁵ A written approval by a Party may cover more than one project provided that all projects are clearly listed in the approval.



- (b) The project boundary is defined on the basis of a case-by-case assessment with regard to the criteria referred to in subparagraph (a) above. If an approved clean development mechanism (CDM) baseline and monitoring methodology is used, the AIE ~~should check~~**shall assess** whether the project boundary is defined in line with the approved methodology.

~~21.20.~~ The AIE shall assess whether:^[v]

- (a) The delineation of the project boundary and the gases and sources included are appropriately described and justified in the PDD by using a figure or flow chart as appropriate;
- (b) All gases and sources included are explicitly stated, and the exclusions of any sources related to the baseline or the project are appropriately justified.

6. Leakage

~~22.21.~~ The AIE shall assess whether:^[v]

- (a) The PDD appropriately describes an assessment of the potential leakage of the project and appropriately explains which sources of leakage are to be calculated, and which can be neglected;
- (b) The PDD provides a procedure for an ex ante estimate of leakage.

22. If an approved CDM baseline and monitoring methodology is used, the AIE shall assess, alternatively to paragraph 21 above, whether the leakage is defined in line with the approved methodology.

7. Baseline setting

23. The AIE shall assess whether the PDD explicitly indicates which of the following approaches is used for identifying the baseline:^[v]

- ~~(a) By using an approved CDM baseline and monitoring methodology (hereinafter referred to as approved CDM methodology approach);~~
- ~~(b)(a)~~ **(a)** By identifying and listing plausible future scenarios on the basis of conservative assumptions and identifying the most plausible one (hereinafter referred to as JI specific approach)-;
- (b) By using an approved CDM baseline and monitoring methodology (hereinafter referred to as approved CDM methodology approach).**

Approved CDM methodology approach

~~24. If the PDD indicates that it uses the approved CDM methodology approach, the AIE shall assess whether:~~

- ~~(a) The PDD provides the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used, and the approved CDM methodology exists as referenced;^{[vii] [viii] [viii]}~~
- ~~(b) The PDD provides a complete, clear and transparent description and justification of why the referenced approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project;^{[vii] [vii] [viii]}~~



~~(c) All explanations, descriptions and analyses with regard to the identification of the baseline in the PDD are made in accordance with the referenced approved CDM methodology;^[v]~~

~~(d) The baseline is identified appropriately as a result of the steps in subparagraphs (a)–(c) above.~~

Deviation from approved CDM methodology

~~25. If the PDD indicates that the baseline setting deviates from the approved CDM methodology, the AIE shall assess whether:^{[vi] [vii] [viii]}~~

~~(a) The PDD provides a complete, clear and transparent description and justification of the deviation;~~

~~(b) The PDD provides an appropriate analysis of how the deviation affects the assumptions, formulae, parameters, data sources and key factors used in the methodology, and a clear statement on how uncertainties are taken into account and conservativeness is safeguarded.~~

JI specific approach

26.24. For the JI specific approach with regard to the baseline setting, the AIE shall assess whether the baseline is established:^[v]

- (a) Taking into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances, such as sectoral reform initiatives, local fuel availability, power sector expansion plans, and the economic situation in the project sector. In this context, the AIE shall assess whether key factors that affect a baseline are taken into account, e.g.:
 - (i) Sectoral reform policies and legislation;
 - (ii) Economic situation/growth and socio-demographic factors in the relevant sector as well as resulting predicted demand. Suppressed and/or increasing demand that will be met by the project can be considered in the baseline as appropriate (e.g. by assuming that the same level of service as in the project scenario would be offered in the baseline scenario);
 - (iii) Availability of capital (including investment barriers);
 - (iv) Local availability of technologies/**[techniques]**, skills and know-how and availability of best available technologies/**[techniques]** in the future;
 - (v) Fuel prices and availability;
 - (vi) National and/or subnational expansion plans for the energy sector, as appropriate;
 - (vii) National and/or subnational forestry or agricultural policies, as appropriate.
- (b) In a transparent manner with regard to the choice of approaches, assumptions, methodologies, parameters, data sources and key factors;
- (c) Taking into account of uncertainties and using conservativeness assumptions;
- (d) In such a way that emission reduction units (ERUs) cannot be earned for decreases in activity levels outside the project activity or due to force majeure.



Approved CDM methodology approach

25. If the PDD indicates that it uses the approved CDM methodology approach, the AIE shall assess whether:

- (a) The PDD provides the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used, and the approved CDM methodology exists as referenced;^{[vi] [vii] [viii]}**
- (b) The PDD provides a complete, clear and transparent description and justification of why the referenced approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project;^{[vii] [viii]}**
- (c) All explanations, descriptions and analyses with regard to the identification of the baseline in the PDD are made in accordance with the referenced approved CDM methodology;^[v]**
- (d) The baseline is identified appropriately as a result of the steps in subparagraphs (a)-(c) above.**

26. If the PDD indicates that it uses an approved CDM methodology with a deviation from it [on some aspect(s)] in baseline setting, the AIE shall assess, in addition to those in paragraph 25 above, whether:^{[vi] [vii] [viii]}

- (a) The PDD provides a complete, clear and transparent description and justification of the deviation;**
- (b) The PDD provides an appropriate analysis of how the deviation affects the assumptions, formulae, parameters, data sources and key factors used in the methodology, and a clear statement on how uncertainties are taken into account and conservativeness is safeguarded;**
- (c) The deviation is justifiable so that the baseline setting can be treated under the approved CDM methodology approach as a result of the steps in subparagraphs (a)-(b) above. If the deviation is not justifiable, the AIE shall assess the baseline setting in accordance with paragraph 24 above.**

Multi-project emission factor

27. If the PDD indicates the use of a multi-project emission factor, the AIE shall assess whether the PDD provides an appropriate justification that, unless the approved CDM methodology, if used, does not require such justification.^[v]

- (a) The physical characteristics of the sector justify the application of a standard emission factor across the sector (e.g. in the case of an integrated electricity network with no major transmission constraints, the physical characteristics of the system may imply that the impact of a project on emissions can be assessed irrespective of its location); and/or**
- (b) The emissions intensity does not vary significantly across the sector (e.g. in the case of diesel power generation in off-grid electricity systems, the emission factor for electricity generation may be based on standard factors with a reasonable degree of accuracy).**



8. Additionality

28. In accordance with Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol a JI project has to provide a reduction in emissions by sources, or an enhancement of net removals by sinks, that is additional to any that would otherwise occur.^{[iv] [v]}

~~29. If the PDD indicates that it uses the approved CDM methodology approach for identifying the baseline as referred to in paragraph 23 above, the AIE shall assess whether:~~

- ~~(a) The PDD provides the title, reference number and version of the baseline and monitoring methodology used, and the approved CDM methodology exists as referenced;^{[vi] [vii] [viii]}~~
- ~~(b) The PDD provides a complete, clear and transparent description and justification of why the referenced approved CDM methodology or tool is applicable to the project;^{[vi] [vii] [viii] [ix]}~~
- ~~(c) All explanations, descriptions and analyses with regard to additionality are made in accordance with the selected methodology;^[vi]~~
- ~~(d) The additionality is demonstrated appropriately as a result of the steps in subparagraphs (a)-(c) above.^{[vi] [vii] [viii]}~~

30.29. If the PDD indicates that it uses the JI specific approach for identifying the baseline as referred to in paragraph 23 above, ~~including the use of a methodology deviating from an approved CDM methodology,~~ the AIE shall assess which of the following approaches is used to demonstrate additionality.^{[v] [vi] [vii] [viii]}

- (a) Application of the most recent version of the “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality” approved by the CDM Executive Board;
- (b) Application of any other method for proving additionality approved by the CDM Executive Board;
- (c) Provision of traceable and transparent information showing that the baseline was identified on the basis of conservative assumptions, that the project scenario is not part of the identified baseline scenario and that the project will lead to reductions of anthropogenic emissions by sources or enhancements of net anthropogenic removals by sinks of GHGs;
- (d) Provision of traceable and transparent information that an AIE has already positively determined that a comparable project (to be) implemented under comparable circumstances (same GHG mitigation measure, same country, similar technology, similar scale) would result in a reduction of anthropogenic emissions by sources or an enhancement of net anthropogenic removals by sinks that is additional to any that would otherwise occur and a justification why this determination is relevant for the project at hand.

31.30. For any approach referred to in paragraph 29 above~~30 above~~, the AIE shall assess whether:

- (a) The PDD provides a complete, clear and transparent description and justification for the applicability of the approach;^{[v] [vi] [vii] [viii]}
- (b) The additionality is demonstrated appropriately as a result of the analysis using the approach chosen.^{[vi] [vii] [viii]}



~~32.31.~~ For the approaches referred to in paragraphs 29~~30~~ (a) or 29~~30~~ (b) above, the AIE shall assess whether all explanations, descriptions and analyses are made in accordance with the selected tool or method.

32. If the PDD indicates that it uses the approved CDM methodology approach for identifying the baseline as referred to in paragraph 23 above, the AIE shall assess whether:

- (a) The PDD provides the title, reference number and version of the baseline and monitoring methodology used, and the approved CDM methodology exists as referenced;**^{[vi] [vii] [viii]}
- (b) The PDD provides a complete, clear and transparent description and justification of why the referenced approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project;**^{[vi] [vii] [viii]}
- (c) All explanations, descriptions and analyses with regard to additionality are made in accordance with the selected methodology;**^[vi]
- (d) The additionality is demonstrated appropriately as a result of the steps in subparagraphs (a)-(c) above.**^{[vi] [vii] [viii]}

9. Crediting period

33. The AIE shall assess whether:

- (a) The PDD provides the starting date of the project as the date on which the implementation or construction or real action of the project will begin or began, and the starting date is after the beginning of 2000;^{6 [vi] [vii] [viii]}
- (b) The PDD provides the expected operational lifetime of the project in years and months;^{[vi] [vii] [viii]}
- (c) The PDD provides the length of the crediting period in years and months and its starting date, which is on or after the date the first emission reductions or enhancements of removals are generated by the project;^{[iii] [v] [vi] [vii] [viii]}
- (d) The PDD indicates that the crediting period for the issuance of ERUs starts only after the beginning of 2008 and does not extend beyond the operational lifetime of the project. If the crediting period extends beyond 2012, it is clearly mentioned that the extension is subject to the host Party approval[, and the estimates of emission reductions or enhancements of removals are presented separately for those until 2012 and those after 2012 in all relevant sections of the PDD].^{[iii] [v] [vi] [vii] [viii]}

10. Monitoring

34. The AIE shall assess whether the PDD, **in its monitoring plan section**, explicitly indicates which of the following approaches is used for the monitoring plan:^{[v] [vi] [vii] [viii]}

- ~~(a) Approved CDM methodology approach;~~
- ~~(b)(a) JI specific approach;~~
- (b) Approved CDM methodology approach.**

⁶ Projects starting as of 2000 may be eligible as JI projects if they meet the requirements of the JI guidelines.



Approved CDM methodology approach

35. If the PDD indicates that it uses the approved CDM methodology approach, the AIE shall assess whether:

- (a) The PDD provides the title, reference number and version of the baseline and monitoring methodology, and the approved CDM methodology exists as referenced;^{[vi] [vii] [viii]}
- (b) The PDD provides a complete, clear and transparent description and justification of why the referenced approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project;^{[vi] [vii] [viii]}
- (c) All explanations, descriptions and analyses with regard to monitoring in the PDD are made in accordance with the selected methodology;^[vi]
- (d) The monitoring plan is established appropriately as a result.

Deviation from approved CDM methodology

36. If the PDD indicates that its monitoring plan deviates from the approved CDM methodology, the AIE shall assess whether:^{[vi] [vii] [viii]}

- (a) The PDD provides a complete, clear and transparent description and justification of the deviation;
- (b) The PDD provides an appropriate analysis of how the deviation affects the assumptions, formulae, parameters, data sources and key factors used in the methodology, and a clear statement on how uncertainties are taken into account and conservativeness is safeguarded;
- (c) The monitoring plan is established appropriately as a result.

JI specific approach

37.35. The AIE shall assess whether the monitoring plan:

- (a) Describes all relevant factors and key characteristics that will be monitored, and the period in which they will be monitored, in particular also all decisive factors for the control and reporting of project performance;^[v]
- (b) Specifies the indicators, constants and variables used, which are reliable, valid and provide transparent picture of the emission reductions or enhancements of removals to be monitored. If default values are used, the AIE should assess whether they originate from recognized sources, are supported by statistical analyses providing reasonable confidence levels and are presented in a transparent manner. In this context, the AIE may assess whether:^[v]
 - (i) For those values that are to be provided by the project participants, how the values are to be selected and justified is clearly indicated and justified, for example, by explaining:
 - What types of sources are suitable (official statistics, expert judgment, proprietary data, IPCC, commercial and scientific literature etc.);
 - The vintage of data that is suitable (relative to the project's crediting period);



- What spatial level of data is suitable (local, regional, national, international);
 - How conservativeness of the values is to be ensured;
 - (ii) For other values:
 - The precise references from which these values are taken are clearly indicated (e.g. official statistics, IPCC Guidelines, commercial and scientific literature);
 - The conservativeness of the values provided is justified;
 - (iii) For all data sources, the procedures to be followed if expected data are unavailable are specified. For instance, it could be pointed to a preferred data source (e.g. national statistics for the past 5 years), and indicated a priority order for use of additional data (e.g. using longer time series) and/or fall back data sources to preferred sources (e.g. private, international statistics etc.);
 - (iv) International System Units (SI units) are used;
 - (v) Any parameters, coefficients, variables etc. that are used to calculate baseline emissions or net removals but are obtained through monitoring are noted;
- (c) Draws on the list of standard variables contained in appendix B of “Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring” developed by the JISC, as appropriate,^[v]
- (d) Explicitly and clearly distinguishes.^{[vi] [vii] [viii]}
- (i) Data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period, but are determined only once (and thus remain fixed throughout the crediting period), and that are available already at the stage of determination;
 - (ii) Data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period, but are determined only once (and thus remain fixed throughout the crediting period), but that are not already available at the stage of determination; and
 - (iii) Data and parameters that are monitored throughout the crediting period;
- (e) Describes the methods employed for data monitoring (including its frequency) and recording,^[v]
- (f) Describes all algorithms and formulae for the estimation/calculation of baseline emissions/removals and project emissions/removals or direct monitoring of emission reductions from the project, leakage, as appropriate. In this context, the AIE may assess whether.^{[vi] [vii] [viii]}
- (i) The underlying rationale for the algorithms/formulae (e.g. marginal vs. average etc.) is explained;
 - (ii) Consistent variables, equation formats, subscripts etc. is used;
 - (iii) All equations are numbered;
 - (iv) All variables, with units indicated, are defined;



- (v) The conservativeness of the algorithms/procedures is justified. To the extent possible, methods to quantitatively account for uncertainty in key parameters is included;
- (vi) Consistency between the elaboration of the baseline scenario and the procedure for calculating the emissions or net removals of the baseline is ensured;
- (vii) Any parts of the algorithms or formulae that are not self-evident are explained. It is justified that the procedure is consistent with standard technical procedures in the relevant sector. References are provided as necessary. Implicit and explicit key assumptions are explained in a transparent manner. It is clearly stated which assumptions and procedures have significant uncertainty associated with them, and how such uncertainty is to be addressed. The uncertainty of key parameters is described and, where possible, an uncertainty range at 95% confidence level for key parameters for the calculation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals is provided;⁷
- (g) Identifies national or international monitoring standard if such standard has to be and/or is applied to the certain aspects of the project, and provides a reference as to where a detailed description of the standard can be found;^[v]
- (h) Describes statistical techniques, if they are used for monitoring, and how they are used in a conservative manner;^[v]
- (i) Presents the quality assurance and control procedures for the monitoring process. This includes, as appropriate, information on calibration and on how records on data and/or method validity and accuracy are kept and made available on request;^[v]
- (j) Clearly identifies the responsibilities and the authority regarding the monitoring activities;^[v]
- (k) On the whole, reflects good monitoring practices appropriate to the project type. In the case of JI LULUCF projects, this includes applying the good practice guidance, as developed by the IPCC;^[v]
- (l) Provides, in tabular form, a complete compilation of the data that need to be collected for its application. This includes data that are measured or sampled and data that are collected from other sources (e.g. official statistics, expert judgment, proprietary data, IPCC, commercial and scientific literature etc.). Data that are calculated with equations should not be included in the compilation.^[v]
- (m) Indicates that the data monitored and required for verification are to be kept for two years after the last transfer of ERUs for the project.^[v]

Approved CDM methodology approach

36. If the PDD indicates that it uses the approved CDM methodology approach, the AIE shall assess whether:

- (a) The PDD provides the title, reference number and version of the baseline and monitoring methodology, and the approved CDM methodology exists as referenced;^{[vi] [vii] [viii]}**

⁷ In this regard, project participants are encouraged to refer to chapter 6 of the IPCC Good Practice Guidance and Uncertainty Management in National Greenhouse Gas Inventories for more guidance on analysis of uncertainty.



- (b) The PDD provides a complete, clear and transparent description and justification of why the referenced approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project;^{[vi] [vii] [viii]}
- (c) All explanations, descriptions and analyses with regard to monitoring in the PDD are made in accordance with the selected methodology;^[vi]
- (d) The monitoring plan is established appropriately as a result.

37. If the PDD indicates that it uses an approved CDM methodology with a deviation from it [on some aspect(s)] in establishing the monitoring plan, the AIE shall assess, in addition to those in paragraph 36 above, whether:^{[vi] [vii] [viii]}

- (a) The PDD provides a complete, clear and transparent description and justification of the deviation;
- (b) The PDD provides an appropriate analysis of how the deviation affects the assumptions, formulae, parameters, data sources and key factors used in the methodology, and a clear statement on how uncertainties are taken into account and conservativeness is safeguarded;
- (c) The deviation is justifiable so that the monitoring plan can be treated under the approved CDM methodology approach as a result of the steps in subparagraphs (a)-(b) above. If the deviation is not justifiable, the AIE shall assess the monitoring plan in accordance with paragraph 35 above.

Overlapping monitoring periods

38. If the monitoring plan indicates overlapping monitoring periods during the crediting period, the AIE should assess whether:^[ix]

- (a) The underlying project is composed of clearly identifiable components for which emission reductions or enhancements of removals can be calculated independently; and
- (b) Monitoring can be performed independently for each of these components, i.e. the data/parameters monitored for one component are not dependent on/effect data/parameters (to be) monitored for another component; and
- (c) The monitoring plan ensures that monitoring is performed for all components and that in these cases all the requirements of the JI guidelines and further guidance by the JISC regarding monitoring are met; and
- (d) The monitoring plan explicitly provides for overlapping monitoring periods of clearly defined project components, justifies its need and states how the conditions mentioned in subparagraphs (a)-(c) are met.

11. Estimation/calculation of emission reductions or enhancements of removals

39. The AIE shall **assess whether the PDD identify** indicates which of the following approaches ~~the PDD~~ it chose to estimate/calculate the emission reductions or enhancement of removals generated by the project:^[v]

- (a) Assessment of emissions or net removals in the baseline scenario and in the project scenario; or



- (b) Direct assessment of emission reductions (e.g. in the case of landfill gas projects).

40. If the PDD indicates that it chose the approach referred to in paragraph 39 (a) above, the AIE shall assess whether the PDD provides the ex ante estimates of:^{[v] [vi] [vii] [viii]}

- (a) Emissions or net removals for the project scenario (within the project boundary);
- (b) Leakage, as applicable;
- (c) Emissions or net removals for the baseline scenario (within the project boundary);
- (d) Emission reductions or enhancements of removals adjusted by leakage (based on (a)-(c) above).

41. If the PDD indicates that it chose the approach referred to in paragraph 39 (b) above, the AIE shall assess whether the PDD provides the ex ante estimates of:^{[v] [vi] [vii]}

- (a) Emission reductions from the project (within the project boundary);
- (b) Leakage, as applicable;
- (c) Emission reductions adjusted by leakage (based on (a)-(b) above).

42. Whichever the approach referred to in paragraph 39 above ~~is~~ that the PDD chose, the AIE shall assess whether:

- (a) The estimates referred to in paragraph 40 or 41 above are given.^{[v] [vi] [vii] [viii]}
 - (i) On a periodic basis;
 - (ii) At least from the beginning until the end of the crediting period;
 - (iii) On a source-by-source/sink-by-sink basis;
 - (iv) For each GHG gas;
 - (v) In tonnes of CO₂ equivalent, using global warming potentials defined by decision 2/CP.3 or as subsequently revised in accordance with Article 5 of the Kyoto Protocol;
- (b) The formula used for calculating the estimates referred to in paragraph 40 or 41 above are consistent throughout the PDD;^{[vi] [vii] [viii]}
- (c) For calculating the estimates referred to in paragraph 40 or 41 above, key factors, e.g. those listed in paragraph 24 (a) (i)-(vii) above, influencing the baseline emissions or removals and the activity level of the project and the emissions or removals as well as risk associated with the project were taken into account;^[v]
- (d) Data sources used for calculating the estimates referred to in paragraph 40 or 41 above are clearly identified, reliable and transparent;^[v]
- (e) Emission factors, including default emission factors, if used for calculating the estimates referred to in paragraph 40 or 41 above, were selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice;^[v]



- (f) The estimates referred to in paragraph 40 or 41 above are calculated based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner;^{8[v]}
- (g) The estimates of emission reductions or enhancements of removals are consistent throughout the PDD.^{[vi] [vii] [viii]}

12. Environmental impacts

43. The AIE shall assess whether:^{[vi] [vii] [viii]}
- (a) The PDD lists and attaches documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project, including transboundary impacts, in accordance with procedures as determined by the host Party;
 - (b) The PDD provides conclusion and all references to supporting documentation of an environmental impact assessment undertaken in accordance with the procedures as required by the host Party, if the analysis referred to in subparagraph (a) above indicates that the environmental impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the host Party.

13. Stakeholder consultation

44. The AIE shall assess whether the PDD provides:^{[vi] [vii] [viii]}
- (a) A list of stakeholders from whom comments on the project have been received, if any;
 - (b) The nature of the comments; and
 - (c) A description on whether and how the comments have been addressed.

14. Determination regarding small-scale projects (additional/alternative elements for assessment)

45. If the project is presented as a JI small-scale (SSC) project using the JI SSC PDD form, the AIE shall assess whether the PDD appropriately specifies and justifies that the project falls under:^{[vii] [x]}
- (a) One of the types and thresholds of JI SSC projects as defined in “Provisions for joint implementation small-scale projects” developed by the JISC. In case the project contains more than one JI SSC project type component, the AIE should further assess whether each component meets the relevant threshold criterion;
 - (b) One of the SSC project categories defined in the most recent version of appendix B of annex II to decision 4/CMP.1, or an additional project category approved by the JISC in accordance with the relevant provision in “Provisions for joint implementation small-scale projects”.
46. The AIE shall assess whether the SSC PDD confirms and shows that the proposed JI SSC project is not a debundled component of a large project by explaining that there does not exist a JI (SSC) project with a publicly available determination in accordance with paragraph 34 of the JI guidelines.^{[vii] [x]}
- (a) Which has the same project participants; and
 - (b) Which applies the same technology/measure⁹ and pertains to the same project category⁹; and

⁸ In this context, project participants may draw on appendix A to “Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring” developed by the JISC.



- (c) Whose determination has been made publicly available in accordance with paragraph 34 of the JI guidelines within the previous 2 years; and
 - (d) Whose project boundary is within 1 km of the project boundary of the proposed JI SSC project at the closest point.
47. If more than one JI SSC project are bundled, the AIE shall assess whether:^{[vii] [x]}
- (a) All projects in the bundle:
 - (i) Have the same crediting period; and
 - (ii) Comply with the provisions for JI SSC projects defined in “Provisions for joint implementation small-scale projects”, in particular the thresholds referred to in paragraph 45 (a) above; and
 - (iii) Retain their distinctive characteristics (i.e. location, technology/measure etc.); and
 - (iv) The composition of the bundle does not change over time.
 - (b) The AIE has received:
 - (i) Information on the bundle using the form developed by the JISC (F-JI-SSC-BUNDLE);
 - (ii) A written statement signed by all project participants indicating that they agree that their individual projects are part of the bundle and nominating one project participant to represent all project participants in communicating with the JISC;
 - (iii) Indication by the Parties involved that they are aware of the bundle in their project approvals referred to in paragraph 16 above~~17 above~~.
48. If the project participants prepared a single SSC PDD for the bundled JI SSC projects, the AIE shall assess, in addition to those in paragraph 47 above, whether all the projects:^{[vii] [x]}
- (a) Pertain to the same JI SSC project category;
 - (b) Apply the same technology or measure;
 - (c) Are located in the territory of the same host Party.
49. If the project participants prepared separate SSC PDDs for the bundled JI SSC projects, the AIE shall assess whether:^{[vii] [x]}
- (a) SSC PDDs have been prepared for all JI SSC projects in the bundle;
 - (b) Each SSC PDD contains a single JI SCC project in the bundle.
50. With regard to leakage of the JI SSC project(s), the AIE, when following subsection 6 above, shall assess whether the leakage only within the boundaries of non-Annex I Parties is considered.^[x]
51. With regard to baseline setting for the JI SSC project(s), the AIE, when following subsection 7 above, shall assess whether:

⁹ The second part of this subparagraph applies if the already existing project is a JI SSC project.



- (a) If the SSC PDD uses a simplified baseline and monitoring methodology for SSC project activities approved by the CDM Executive Board,^{[vii] [x]}
 - (i) The methodology is the most recent version;
 - (ii) All explanations, descriptions and analyses are made in accordance with the selected methodology;
- (b) If the JI SSC projects in a bundle use the same baseline, the PDD provides an appropriate justification for the use of the same baseline considering the particular situation of each project in the bundle.^{[vii] [x]}

52. With regard to monitoring concerning bundled JI SSC project(s), the AIE, when following section 10 above, shall assess whether which of the following approaches is used for establishing a monitoring plan.^{[vii] [x]}

- (i) By preparing a separate monitoring plan for each of the constituent projects;
- (ii) By preparing an overall monitoring plan, including a proposal of monitoring of performance of the constituent projects on a sample basis, as appropriate. In this case, the AIE shall further assess whether:
 - All the JI SSC projects are located in the territory of the same host Party;
 - All the JI SSC projects pertain to the same project category;
 - All the JI SSC projects apply the same technology or measure;
 - The overall monitoring plan reflects good monitoring practice appropriate to the bundled JI SSC projects and provides for collection and archiving of the data needed to calculate the emission reductions achieved by the bundled projects.

15. Determination regarding land use, land-use change and forestry projects (additional/alternative elements for assessment)

53. If the project is presented as a JI land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) project using the JI LULUCF PDD form, the AIE shall assess whether the PDD appropriately specifies how the project conforms to:^[viii]

- (a) The definitions of LULUCF activities included in paragraph 1 of the annex to decision 16/CMP.1, applying the good practice guidance for land use, land-use change and forestry as decided by the CMP, as appropriate;
- (b) In the case of afforestation, reforestation and/or forest management projects, the definition of “forest” selected by the host Party, which specifies:
 - (i) A single minimum tree crown cover value between 10 and 30 per cent; and
 - (ii) A single minimum land area value between 0.05 and 1 hectare; and
 - (iii) A single minimum tree height value between 2 and 5 metres.



54. With regard to project boundary of the JI LULUCF project, instead of following subsection 5 above, the AIE shall follow this and the next paragraphs. The AIE shall assess whether the project boundary defined in the PDD:^[v]^[viii]

- (a) Geographically delineates the JI LULUCF project under the control of the project participants. If the JI LULUCF project contains more than one discrete area of land, the AIE shall further assess whether:
 - (i) Each discrete area of land has a unique geographical identification;
 - (ii) The boundary is defined for each discrete area and does not include the areas in between these discrete areas of land;
- (b) Encompasses all anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of GHGs which are:
 - (i) Under the control of the project participants;
 - (ii) Reasonably attributable to the project; and
 - (iii) Significant;
- (c) Accounts for all changes in the following carbon pools: above-ground biomass, below-ground biomass, litter, dead wood, and soil organic carbon. In this context, the AIE shall assess whether the PDD provides:
 - (i) The information of which carbon pools are selected;
 - (ii) If one or more carbon pools are not selected, transparent and verifiable information that indicates, based on conservative assumptions, that the pool is not a source;
- (d) Is defined on the basis of a case-by-case assessment with regard to the criteria referred to in subparagraph (b) above. If an approved CDM baseline and monitoring methodology is used, the AIE shall further assess whether the project boundary is defined in line with the approved methodology.

55. With regard to project boundary of the JI LULUCF project, the AIE shall also assess whether:^[v]

- (a) The delineation of the project boundary and the gases and sources/sinks included are appropriately described and justified in the PDD;
- (b) All gases and sources/sinks included are explicitly stated, and the exclusions of any sources/sinks related to the baseline or the LULUCF project are appropriately justified.

56. With regard to leakage of the JI LULUCF project, when following subsection 6 above, the AIE shall assess whether the PDD takes into account only the increased anthropogenic emissions by sources and/or reduced anthropogenic removals by sinks of GHGs outside the project boundary.^[v]

57. With regard to baseline setting for the JI LULUCF project, when following subsection 7 above, the AIE shall additionally assess whether the PDD provides an explanation how the baseline chosen takes into account the good practice guidance for LULUCF, developed by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and how it ensures conformity with the definitions, accounting rules, modalities and guidelines under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol.^[viii]



58. With regard to monitoring of the JI LULUCF project, when following subsection 10 above, the AIE shall additionally assess whether the PDD provides an appropriate description of the sampling design that will be used for the calculation of the net anthropogenic removals by sinks occurring within the project boundary in the project scenario and, in case the baseline is monitored, in the baseline scenario, including, inter alia, stratification, determination of number of plots and plot distribution etc..^[viii]

16. Determination regarding projects under programmes of activities

[To be developed later]

17. Determination report

59. In accordance with paragraph 34 of the JI guidelines the AIE shall make its determination publicly available through the secretariat, together with an explanation of its reasons, including a summary of comments received and a report of how due account was taken of these.

60. For the purpose of the publication referred to in paragraph 59 above, the AIE shall prepare a determination report using the JI determination report form (F-JI-DRep) developed by the JISC, and attach to it:^[xi]

- (a) The JI PDD of the project;
- (b) Written approvals by all Parties involved in an alphabetical order; and
- (c) Other relevant documents, e.g.:
 - (i) Any determination protocol used in the determination process;
 - (ii) A list of persons interviewed by the AIE's determination team during the determination process.

61. As one of the "other relevant documents" referred to in paragraph 60 (c) above, the AIE should prepare a report that provides comprehensive and detailed information on the determination. **Within the AIE, the team that undertook the detailed assessment of the project should draft the report, and a technical reviewer, who is not a member of the team, should independently review it before finalization.** In this report, the AIE should include, as a minimum:

- (a) Determination process (steps) taken (e.g. desk review, project site visit, interview with project participants, follow-up exchanges);
- (b) Details of personnel involved in the determination (e.g. names and roles of determination team members, name of technical reviewer);
- (c) Summary of assessment for each JI project requirement including:
 - (i) Project approval by Parties involved;
 - (ii) Baseline setting (including additionality);
 - (iii) Monitoring;
 - (iv) Estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of removals;
 - (v) Environmental impacts;
 - (vi) Comments by stakeholders;



- (d) Determination opinion (conclusion), including the reasons;
- (e) References to the documents/information used in the determination;
- (f) A check list that details its judgment on each JI project requirement, using the form in the annex to the present document, including all the issues it raised and how they were addressed during the course of the determination as referred to in paragraphs 12-14 above.

62. When submitting the determination report and any supporting documentation to the secretariat for publication, the AIE shall ensure that:^[ii]

- (a) The correct version of the JI PDD form, the JI LULUCF PDD form, the JI SSC PDD form or the form for submission of bundled JI SSC projects (F-JI-SSC-BUNDLE), as applicable, is used;
- (b) The correct version of the JI determination report form (F-JI-DRep) is used;
- (c) All documents submitted are correctly referenced;
- (d) All documents and annexes listed in the table of contents of the PDD, in the JI determination report form and in the list of documents presented together with the determination report form are submitted;
- (e) All the documents are submitted in English, unless an official translation into English is provided;
- (f) All the information marked as confidential or proprietary is submitted. In this context, it should be noted that information used to determine whether reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources or enhancements of anthropogenic removals by sinks are additional, to describe the baseline methodology and its application, and to support an environmental impact assessment referred to in paragraph 33 (d) of the JI guidelines, shall not be considered as proprietary or confidential;
- (g) The project approvals submitted are unconditional and in writing and clearly identify the project for which the approval is granted. An official translation of an approval into English is provided, in case the original is not issued in English;
- (h) Project participants are identified consistently throughout the whole submission of a determination. An authorisation of a legal entity to participate in a JI project clearly identifies the legal entity listed in the PDD, for which the authorisation is granted. An official translation of an authorisation into English is provided, in case the original is not issued in English. The modalities of communication clearly identifies the project participant(s) nominated as focal point(s) for handling communications with the JISC, provides contact information¹⁰ and is signed by all project participants.

¹⁰ The tabular format for providing contact information on project participants included in the JI project design document forms as an annex should be used in modalities of communication. The contact details shall include an email address.



F. Verification

1. General

63. The purpose of verification is to assess the reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources or enhancements of anthropogenic removals by sinks generated by a JI project and reported by the project participants through the monitoring report in accordance with paragraph 37 of the JI guidelines.

64. If an AIE, in assessing the monitoring report and supporting documents, identifies issues that need to be corrected, clarified or improved with regard to the monitoring requirements, it should raise these issues ~~to~~ **and inform** the project participants **of the issues** for their appropriate actions. The AIE may raise these issues in the form of:

- (a) Corrective action request (CAR), requesting the project participants to correct a mistake that is not in line with the monitoring plan;
- (b) Clarification request (CL), requesting the project participants to provide additional information for the AIE to make a judgment on the conformity with the monitoring plan;
- (c) Forward action request (FAR), informing the project participants of an issue, relating to the monitoring that needs to be reviewed during the next verification period.

65. ~~The AIE should inform the project participants of the issues referred to in paragraph 64 above if it identifies them. Once the project participants modified the monitoring report or provided additional information responding to it for the AIE to make a judgment on all the issues raised,~~ **The AIE should make an objective assessment as to whether the actions, if any, taken by the project participants satisfactorily resolve the issues raised, if any, and** should conclude its findings of the verification.

66. The AIE should record all the issues it raised and how they were addressed in the report referred to in paragraph 82 below.

2. Publication of monitoring report

67. In accordance with paragraph 36 of the JI guidelines project participants shall submit to an AIE a report in accordance with the monitoring plan on reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources or enhancements of anthropogenic removals by sinks that have already occurred. The report shall be made publicly available. In accordance with paragraph 21 of “Procedure for public availability of documents under the verification procedure under the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee”, the AIE shall make the monitoring report publicly available in PDF format on the UNFCCC JI website.

68. The AIE, when submitting the monitoring report to the secretariat for making it publicly available, shall ensure that:

- (a) The project is listed on the UNFCCC JI website with a positive determination pursuant to paragraph 35 of the JI guidelines;
- (b) All documents submitted are correctly referenced;^[ii]
- (c) All documents are submitted in English, unless an official translation into English is provided;^[iii]



- (d) All the information marked as confidential or proprietary is submitted. In this context, it should be noted that information used to determine whether reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources or enhancements of anthropogenic removals by sinks are additional, to describe the baseline methodology and its application, and to support an environmental impact assessment referred to in paragraph 33 (d) of the JI guidelines, shall not be considered as proprietary or confidential.^[iii]

3. Project implementation

69. The AIE should, through the desk-review and[/or] project site visit, assess whether the project has been implemented in accordance with the PDD that was positively determined and is listed so on the UNFCCC JI website.

70. The AIE should, through the desk review and[/or] project site visit, assess the status of operation of the project during the monitoring period.

4. Compliance with monitoring plan

71. The AIE shall assess whether the project participants ensured that the monitoring occurred in accordance with the monitoring plan as a part of the PDD that was positively determined and is listed so on the UNFCCC JI website.^[v]

72. The AIE shall review the monitoring result and assess whether:^[v]

- (a) For calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of removals, key factors, e.g. those listed in paragraph 24 (a) (i)-(vii) above, influencing the baseline emissions or removals and the activity level of the project and the emissions or removals as well as risk associated with the project were taken into account, as appropriate;
- (b) Data sources used for calculating emission reductions or enhancements of removals are clearly identified, reliable and transparent;
- (c) Emission factors, including default emission factors, if used for calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of removals, are selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice;
- (d) The emission reductions or enhancements of removals are calculated based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner.¹¹

73. In the case of monitoring of a JI SSC project, the AIE shall assess whether the relevant threshold to be classified as JI SSC project referred to in paragraph 45 above is exceeded during any monitoring period on an annual average basis, and if so, shall determine the maximum emission reduction level estimated for the JI SSC project for that period in the SSC PDD, or in the case of a bundle, estimated for the bundle for that period in the F-JI-SSC-BUNDLE.^{[vii] [x]}

74. If the monitoring report is on bundled JI SSC projects, the AIE shall additionally check whether:^{[vii] [x]}

- (a) The composition of the bundle has not changed from that is stated in F-JI-SSC-BUNDLE;

¹¹ In this context, project participants may draw on appendix A to “Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring” developed by the JISC.



- (b) The project participants submitted a common monitoring report to the AIE, if the determination regarding the bundled JI SSC projects was conducted on the basis of an overall monitoring plan.

5. Revision of monitoring plan

75. If the project participants revised the monitoring plan, the AIE shall assess whether:^[v]

- (a) The project participants submitted the revised monitoring plan together with the monitoring report to the AIE for verification;
- (b) The project participants provided an appropriate justification for the revision;
- (c) The proposed revision improves the accuracy and/or completeness of information of the original monitoring plan without changing conformity with the relevant rules and regulations for the establishment of monitoring plans.

76. If the AIE concludes positively in the assessment referred to in paragraph 75 above, it shall proceed with the verification based on the revised monitoring plan.^[v]

6. Data management

77. The AIE should assess the quality of the information [using standard auditing techniques] provided in the monitoring report by assessing whether the data and their sources are clearly identified, reliable and transparent. For this purpose, the AIE may include an on-site assessment of the project site for assessing, e.g.:

- (a) The implementation and operation of the project as per the PDD;
- (b) The implementation of data collection procedures as per the monitoring plan, including the quality control and quality assurance procedures;
- (c) The function of the monitoring equipment, including its calibration status.

78. The AIE should check whether the evidence and records used for the monitoring are kept in a traceable manner.

79. The AIE should check whether the data collection and management system for the project is in line with the monitoring plan.

7. Verification report

80. In accordance with paragraph 38 of the JI guidelines the AIE shall make its verification publicly available through the secretariat, together with an explanation of its reasons.

81. For the purpose of the publication referred to in paragraph 80 above, the AIE shall prepare a summary of the verification using the latest version of the JI verification report form (F-JI-VRep) developed by the JISC, and attach to it:^[xiii]

- (a) The verification report;
- (b) Other relevant documents e.g.:
 - (i) A revised monitoring plan, as applicable;



- (ii) A determination by the AIE that the revisions to the monitoring plan improve the accuracy and/or completeness of information of the original monitoring plan without changing conformity with the relevant rules and regulations for the establishment of monitoring plans, as applicable.

82. In the verification report referred to in paragraph 81 above, the AIE should provide comprehensive and detailed information on the verification of the reported emission reductions or enhancements of removals. **Within the AIE, the team that undertook the detailed assessment of the reported emission reductions or enhancements of removals should draft the report, and a technical reviewer, who is not a member of the team, should independently review it before finalization.** In this report, the AIE should include, as a minimum:

- (a) Verification process (steps) taken (e.g. desk review, project site visit, interview with project participants, follow-up exchanges);
- (b) Details of personnel involved in the verification (e.g. names and roles of verification team members, name of technical reviewer);
- (c) Summary of assessment with regard to:
 - (i) Project implementation in accordance with the PDD, including the applicability of the project as a JI SSC project or the composition of the bundled JI SSC projects, as applicable;
 - (ii) Compliance with the monitoring plan, including the revision of the monitoring plan and/or appropriateness of the monitoring with regard to bundled JI SSC projects, as applicable;
 - (iii) Calculation of emission reductions or enhancements of removals;
 - (iv) Quality and management of data;
- (d) Verification opinion (conclusion on the verified amount of emission reductions or enhancements of removals), including the reasons;
- (e) References to the documents/information used in the verification;
- (f) A check list that details its judgment on each element of verification referred to in subsections 3-6 above, using the form in the annex to the present document, including all the issues it raised during the course of the determination as referred to in paragraphs 64-66 above.

83. In the case of monitoring of bundled JI SSC projects, the AIE:^[vii] [x]

- (a) Shall prepare a single verification report if a single SSC PDD and overall monitoring plan were used as referred to in paragraphs 48 and 52 (ii) respectively;
- (b) May prepare a single verification report if it appraises each bundled project separately and covers the same monitoring period.

84. When submitting the verification report to the secretariat for publication, the AIE shall ensure that:^[ii]

- (a) The correct version of the JI verification report form (F-JI-VRep) is used;
- (b) All documents submitted are correctly referenced;



- (c) All documents and annexes listed in the JI verification report form and in the list of documents presented together with the verification report form are submitted;
- (d) All the documents are submitted in English, unless an official translation into English is provided;
- (e) All the information marked as confidential or proprietary is submitted. In this context, it should be noted that information used to determine whether reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources or enhancements of anthropogenic removals by sinks are additional, to describe the baseline methodology and its application, and to support an environmental impact assessment referred to in paragraph 33 (d) of the JI guidelines, shall not be considered as proprietary or confidential.

G. References

- ~~{ii}~~[i] Guidelines for the implementation of Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol (Annex to decision 9/CMP.1)
- ~~{iii}~~[ii] Clarification regarding the public availability of documents under the verification procedure under the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (Version 03)
- ~~{iv}~~[iii] Glossary of joint implementation terms (Version 01)
- ~~{v}~~[iv] Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
- ~~{vi}~~[v] Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring (Version 01)
- ~~{vii}~~[vi] Guidelines for users of the joint implementation project design document form (Version 03)
- ~~{viii}~~[vii] Guidelines for users of the joint implementation project design document form for small - scale projects and the form for submission of bundled joint implementation small-scale projects (Version 03)
- ~~{ix}~~[viii] Guidelines for users of the joint implementation land use, land-use change and forestry project design document form (Version 03)
- ~~{x}~~[ix] Clarification regarding overlapping monitoring periods under the verification procedure under the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (Version 01)
- ~~{xi}~~[x] Provisions for joint implementation small-scale projects (Version 02)
- ~~{xii}~~[xi] JI determination report form (F-JI-DRep) (Version 01)
- ~~{xiii}~~[xii] JI verification report form (F-JI-VRep) (Version 01)



H. Abbreviations

Abbreviation	
AIE	Accredited independent entity
CAR	Corrective action request
CL	Clarification request
CDM	Clean development mechanism
CMP	Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol
DVM	Determination and verification manual
ERU	Emission reduction unit
FAR	Forward action request
GHG	Greenhouse gas
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
JI	Joint implementation
JISC	Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee
LULUCF	Land use, land-use change and forestry
PDD	Project design document
SSC	Small-scale
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change



ANNEX

Determination and verification check list

[To be developed later]