REPORT ON WITNESSING ACTIVITY
(VERIFICATION)

Name and address of applicant or accredited independent entity (IE)	
UNFCCC ref no. of IE	
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	☐ **JI specific approach** ☐ **Approved CDM methodology**, **ref. no. and version:**
Verification witnessed (*verification team member(s), internal reviewer, operational management, dates, duration, etc.*)	
JI-AT leader's name	
JI-AT member(s)'s name (*indicate the expert on baseline setting and monitoring*)	

Has documentary evidence been provided to the JI-AT:	
− Proposal and contract review report − Evidence of the impartiality and competence of the IE's team and internal reviewer involved in the verification − Verification plan − Corresponding monitoring report − Draft verification 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 (Verification work) relate to the detailed tasks that the IE is expected to carry out in a verification, 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 verifications, 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 verification) 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 verification		
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. Verification work		
	2.1 Has all pertinent documentation been identified prior to the assessment?		
	2.2 Does the IE record the name of the entity that carried out the determination regarding the PDD and its date for the project in question?		
	2.3 Does the IE have a proper record keeping of previous determination activities regarding emission reductions or removal enhancements concerning the project under witnessing?		
	2.4 Has the IE recorded any findings in an earlier verification report? If yes, how was the findings accounted for?		
	2.5 Has the IE made the monitoring report publicly available in accordance with paragraph 36 of the JI guidelines and relevant procedures developed by the JISC?		
	2.5.1 Was the monitoring report submitted to the secretariat by the operational management?		
	2.6 Did the IE check whether the project has been approved at least by one Party involved, other than the host Party?		

	2.7 Did the IE effectively check whether the project has been implemented in accordance with the PDD regarding which the determination had been deemed final?		
	2.8 Did the IE effectively check whether the monitoring occurred in accordance with the monitoring plan included in the PDD regarding which the determination had been deemed final?		
	2.9 Did the IE effectively check whether the calculation of emission reductions or removal enhancements was based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner?		
	Only for small-scale (SSC) projects: 2.10 Did the IE effectively check whether the relevant threshold to be classified as a JI SSC project was exceeded during any monitoring period on an annual average basis?		
	Only for bundled SSC projects: 2.11 Did the IE effectively check whether the composition of the bundle has not changed from what is stated in F-JI-SSC-BUNDLE, and the project participants submitted a common monitoring report to the IE if the determination was conducted on the basis of an overall monitoring plan?		
	Only for the monitoring is based on a monitoring plan providing overlapping monitoring periods: 2.12 Did the IE effectively check whether the monitoring periods per component of the project are clearly specified in the monitoring report and do not overlap with those for which verifications were already deemed final in the past?		
	Only if the project participants submitted to the IE a revised monitoring plan: 2.13 Did the IE effectively check whether: – The project participants provided an appropriate justification for the proposed revision?		
	– The proposed revision improves the accuracy and/or applicability of information collected compared to the original monitoring plan without changing conformity with the relevant rules and regulations for the establishment of monitoring plans?		
	2.14 Did the IE effectively check the quality of the information in the monitoring report, using standard auditing techniques?		

	3. Process for performing the verification		
81-82	Did the IE effectively implement its verification procedure for carrying out the verification in accordance with all requirements by: − Preparing and fulfilling a verification plan in accordance with the requirements?		
	− Using tools to systematically and consistently carry out the verification, such as verification protocol or check-list?		
	− Using tools to specifically assess application of the baseline and monitoring methodology by the project participant(s), such as methodology/approach check-list?		
	− Preparing a final verification 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 verification opinion and report and enable to produce a final verification opinion and report that meet all applicable requirements?		
87-88	Did the IE effectively implement its verification approval procedure?		
	Is the verification opinion and report approved by the operational management?		
39	Was the verification 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 verifier(s) and verification team leader have the knowledge and understanding of the JI guidelines, relevant decisions of the CMP and the JISC, including all verification requirements, and the "Determination and verification manual"?		
55	Does the verification team have the required knowledge and understanding?		
57	Does the verification team have the required competence for assessing application of baseline and monitoring methodologies?		
58	Does the verification 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 verification team leader have the additional required competence?		

60	Do technical expert(s) used in the verification , if any, have: − Specialized knowledge and sufficient expertise in technical aspects of the JI project undergoing verification?		
	− Sufficient understanding of the verification?		
61	Does the internal reviewer have the required knowledge?		
62	Does the internal reviewer have the required competence?		
	5. General comments		
	Was the verification work systematically approached and carried out? How is the general presentation and quality of the verification report? Did the IE's verification 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: