



PARTY/JISC REVIEW FORM

(version 03)

(by submitting this form, a Party involved in a JI activity (through DFP) or a JISC member requests a review)

Party involved (DFP) / JISC member submitting the form:

Reference number and title of the proposed JI activity:

289 - Implementation of energy-efficient lighting system in the Donetsk Region with the use of Kyoto Protocol mechanism: replacement of incandescent lamps with energy-efficient ones at budget financed and social entities in the Artemivsk town (under Track 2)

AIE that performed the determination

TÜV Rheinland Japan Ltd.

Type of JI activity:

large-scale

small-scale

LULUCF

PoA/JPA

Background

- The requirements of Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol, the JI guidelines, and relevant CMP and JISC requirements regarding determinations pursuant to paragraph 33 of the JI guidelines have to be met and appropriately addressed by the accredited independent entity (AIE).
- Project participants shall submit to an AIE a JI PDD/PoA DD that contains all the information needed for the determination of whether the proposed JI activity fulfills the requirements in paragraph 31 of the JI guidelines.
- The AIE shall determine whether the proposed JI activity meets the conditions in paragraph 33 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 (paragraph 34 of JI guidelines).
- Where applicable, the AIE shall take into consideration paragraphs 26–30 of the procedures for programmes of activities under the verification procedure under the JISC (JI PoA procedures, version 1).

Request for review

Please respond to the questions presented below by marking the appropriate check box:

Yes	No	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	➤ Has the AIE determined appropriately that the proposed JI activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ has been approved by the Parties involved listed in the JI PDD/PoA DD?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	▪ 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?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	▪ has an appropriate baseline and monitoring plan in accordance with the criteria set out in appendix B of the JI guidelines?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	➤ Has the AIE confirmed that the project participants have submitted documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the proposed JI 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?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	➤ Has the AIE made its determination publicly available through the secretariat together with an explanation of its reasons, including a summary of the comments received and a report of how due account was taken on these?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	➤ Has the coordinating entity of the JI PoA included only JPA(s) that appear to meet all the eligibility requirements defined in the JI PoA DD? (<i>applicable to JI PoA only</i>)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	➤ Has the AIE confirmed that the eligibility criteria for inclusion of JPAs have been fulfilled and the operational and management arrangements for the implementation of the JI PoA have been established by the coordinating entity? (<i>applicable to JI PoA only</i>)

Please describe in detail the reasons for requesting the review, including the specific JI requirements (e.g. guidelines, guidance, decisions, rules, etc.) that you consider not fulfilled, and attach supporting documentation, if appropriate.

It is claimed by the PP that the state funding for large-scale replacement of ICLs with CFLs in the public sector is not sufficient. However, no documentary evidence of this Investment barrier has been provided and determined by the AIE other than just a statement included in the PDD. Traceable and transparent information showing that the baseline was identified on the basis of conservative assumptions along with documentary evidence to back the claim as well as reasons for non-availability of funding could have been asked for by AIE during determination, in accordance with paragraph 44 (a) of the Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring ver03.