

Annex 4

**DRAFT DETERMINATION AND VERIFICATION MANUAL
(FOURTH DRAFT)****Note by the secretariat**

1. The Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (JISC), at its fourteenth meeting, taking into account the public input on the development of a determination and verification manual (DVM), decided to develop a DVM. Taking into account diverse views expressed by JISC members and alternate members on the nature and contents of a DVM, the JISC, at its fifteenth meeting, considered the nature and structure of a DVM, and agreed on them.
2. Based on this, the JISC, also at its fifteenth meeting, requested the secretariat, in consultation with five JISC members/alternate members (Mr. Beck, Mr. Duan, Mr. Geletukha, Mr. Hubenthal and Mr. Trusca), to start preparing a first draft of a DVM immediately after the meeting. The JISC at the same time also requested the secretariat to launch a public call for inputs immediately after the meeting for 20 days, seeking to provide texts of the contents of a DVM, based on the nature and structure of a DVM as agreed by the JISC. The call was conducted from 27 April until 17 May 2009, resulting in six written inputs.
3. The JISC, at its sixteenth meeting, considered the first draft DVM taking into account the written inputs received from the call referred to in paragraph 21 below and the inputs from the participants of the roundtable consultations organized immediately prior to the meeting, and requested the secretariat, in consultation with six JISC members/alternate members (Mr. Beck, Mr. Duan, Mr. Geletukha, Mr. Hubenthal, Mr. Kudo and Mr. Trusca), to prepare a second draft DVM for discussion with stakeholders at the UNFCCC workshop on joint implementation as well as for consideration by the JISC at its seventeenth meeting. The JISC, at same meeting, also requested the secretariat to launch a call for public inputs on the second draft DVM for four weeks. The call was open from 20 August until 16 September 2009, resulting in five written inputs.
4. The JISC, at its seventeenth meeting, considered the second draft taking into account the inputs from participants of the workshop referred to in paragraph 3 above, and agreed on priority areas that the JISC would try to incorporate in the first version of the DVM. At the same meeting, the JISC requested the secretariat to prepare a third draft DVM, in consultation with five JISC members/alternate members (Mr. Beck, Mr. Duan, Mr. Geletukha, Mr. Hubenthal, Mr. Kudo), taking into account the JISC's consideration on the second draft and the inputs from the call referred to in paragraph 3 above as appropriate, and submit it to the JISC for its consideration at its eighteenth meeting.
5. The JISC, at its eighteenth meeting, considered the third draft taking into account the inputs from the call referred to in paragraph 3 above, and provided guidance on necessary changes to the draft. The Chair requested the secretariat to prepare a fourth draft DVM, in consultation with the same five JISC members/alternate members referred to in paragraph 4 above, taking into account the JISC's consideration on the third draft.
6. The present document is prepared by the secretariat in consultation with the five JISC members/alternate members based on the request by the JISC as referred to in paragraph 5 above.



**JOINT IMPLEMENTATION
DETERMINATION AND VERIFICATION MANUAL**

(Version 01)

CONTENTS

A. BACKGROUND	3
B. OBJECTIVES	3
C. PRINCIPLES OF DETERMINATION AND VERIFICATION	3
D. PUBLICATION OF PROJECT DESIGN DOCUMENT	4
E. DETERMINATION	5
1. General	5
2. Project approvals by Parties involved	6
3. Authorization of project participants by Parties involved	6
4. Baseline setting	6
– JI specific approach	7
– Approved CDM methodology approach	8
5. Additionality	8
– JI specific approach	8
– Approved CDM methodology approach	9
6. Project boundary	9
– JI specific approach	9
– Approved CDM methodology approach	10
7. Crediting period	10
8. Monitoring plan	10
– JI specific approach	10
– Approved CDM methodology approach	13
– Overlapping monitoring periods	13
9. Leakage	14
– JI specific approach	14
– Approved CDM methodology approach	14
10. Estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals	14
– JI specific approach	14
– Approved CDM methodology approach	15
11. Environmental impacts	16



12. Stakeholder consultation	16
13. Determination regarding small-scale projects (additional elements for assessment)	16
14. Determination regarding land use, land-use change and forestry projects (additional/alternative elements for assessment)	18
– JI specific approach	18
– Approved CDM methodology approach	19
15. Determination regarding programmes of activities (additional/alternative elements for assessment)	20
16. Determination report	21
F. PUBLICATION OF MONITORING REPORT	24
G. VERIFICATION	24
1. General	24
2. Project approval by Parties involved	25
3. Project implementation	25
4. Compliance with monitoring plan	25
5. Revision of monitoring plan	26
6. Data management	26
7. Verification regarding programmes of activities (additional elements for assessment)	26
8. Verification report	28
H. REFERENCES	30
I. ABBREVIATIONS	31
ANNEX: Determination and verification check list	32



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 all applicable 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 net removals (hereinafter referred to as verification).
3. Prompted by discussions at the fifth UNFCCC workshop on joint implementation (JI), and taking into account inputs received in response to the subsequent call for public input, the JISC, at its fourteenth meeting, decided to develop a determination and verification manual (DVM) to assist accredited independent entities (AIEs) in performing determinations and verifications in accordance with relevant provisions of the JI guidelines and other decisions of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP) and the JISC.
4. The JISC, after the consultations with stakeholders at the roundtable and the sixth UNFCCC workshop on JI, and taking into account inputs from the further call for public input on this subject, adopted the present document at its **nineteenth** meeting.

B. Objectives

5. The objectives of this document are:
 - (a) To assist AIEs in undertaking determinations and verifications in a systematic manner;
 - (b) To improve the consistency of determinations and verifications by and among AIEs;
 - (c) To enhance the integrity and transparency of the JI Track 2 procedure as a result.
6. This document is a compilation of steps for AIEs to take in assessing whether projects under the JI Track 2 procedure satisfy current CMP and JISC requirements.¹ Because this document introduces no new requirements either for projects under the JI Track 2 procedure or for AIEs in carrying out determinations and verifications, a grace period is neither needed nor provided. While this document is based on existing CMP and JISC documents, it does not replace any of these existing documents.
7. AIEs should distinguish the form and content of this document from those of the validation and verification manual (VVM) developed by the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism (CDM).
8. The JISC will review this document and update it periodically, as needed, to reflect new requirements and/or guidance adopted by the CMP and/or the JISC.

C. Principles of determination and verification

9. An AIE should follow the following principles when performing a determination or verification:
 - (a) Impartiality, independence and safeguarding against conflict of interest, thereby maintaining objectivity throughout the course of the determination or verification;

¹ Section "H. References" at the end of this document lists the CMP and JISC decisions on which this document is based.



- (b) Confidentiality, by not disclosing information obtained from 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 and keeping in mind that, 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”;
- (c) Transparency, by providing relevant objective evidence or appropriate justification for all opinions expressed in the determination or verification;
- (d) Consistency, by providing opinions regarding whether a requirement has been met on a uniform basis;
- (e) Timeliness, by making efforts to provide project participants feedback and completing the determination or verification without undue delay.

D. Publication of project design document

10. In accordance with paragraph 32 of the JI guidelines, the AIE shall make the PDD submitted by the project participants pursuant to paragraph 31 of the JI guidelines publicly available through the secretariat, subject to confidentiality provisions set out in paragraph 40 of the JI guidelines, and receive comments from Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC accredited observers on the PDD and any supporting information for 30 days from the date the PDD is made publicly available.

11. The AIE shall make the PDD and any supporting information publicly available in PDF format on the UNFCCC JI website.^[iii]

12. The AIE shall, through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC JI website, provide the following information:^[ii]

- (a) The name of the proposed JI project;
- (b) Bearing in mind paragraph 40 of the JI guidelines, two versions of the PDD and any supporting documentation (if applicable):
 - (i) A marked-up version where all confidential/proprietary parts have been made illegible by the project participants (e.g. by covering those parts with black ink) so that it can be made public;
 - (ii) A version containing all information, i.e. including parts which shall be treated as strictly confidential by all persons handling this documentation (AIEs, JISC members and alternate members, and panel, subcommittee and working group members, external experts requested to consider such documents in support of the work of the JISC, and the secretariat, as applicable).



13. The AIE, when making a PDD publicly available through the secretariat, shall ensure that:^[iii]

- (a) The correct version of the PDD form² is used, taking into account 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. For official documents submitted in other languages, an official translation into English is provided;
- (e) All the information marked as confidential or proprietary is submitted, taking into account 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.

14. If the AIE receives comments on the PDD and any supporting information from Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC accredited observers within a 30-day period, it shall promptly acknowledge the receipt of the comments.

E. Determination

1. General

15. In accordance with paragraph 33 of the JI guidelines, the AIE shall determine whether:^[i]

- (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 “Joint implementation project design document form” (JI PDD form), “Joint implementation land use, land-use change and forestry project design document form” (JI LULUCF PDD form), “Joint implementation project design document form for small-scale projects” (JI SSC PDD form), “Form for submission of bundled joint implementation small-scale projects” (F-JI-SSC-BUNDLE), or “Joint implementation programme of activity design document form (F-JI PoA-DD form), as applicable.



16. 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 and inform the project participants of 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 accordance 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 assess compliance 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 project design, that needs to be reviewed during the first verification of the project.

17. The AIE should make an objective assessment as to whether the actions taken by the project participants, if any, satisfactorily resolve the issues raised, if any, and should conclude its findings of the determination.

18. The AIE should record all the issues it raised and how they were addressed in the report referred to in paragraph 78 below.

2. Project approvals by Parties involved

19. The AIE should assess whether the designated focal points (DFPs) of all Parties listed as “Parties involved” in the PDD have provided written project approvals.³ In this context, the AIE should firstly assess, when submitting the determination report to the secretariat for publication in accordance with paragraph 34 of the JI guidelines, whether 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.^[iv]

20. The AIE should assess whether the written project approvals referred to in paragraph 19 above are unconditional.^{4 [iv]}

3. Authorization of project participants by Parties involved

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

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

4. Baseline setting

22. The AIE should assess whether the PDD explicitly indicates which of the following approaches is selected for identifying the baseline.^[vi]

- (a) By using a methodology for baseline setting and monitoring developed in accordance with appendix B of the JI guidelines (hereinafter referred to as JI specific approach);

³ 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.

⁴ A written approval by a Party may cover more than one project provided that all projects are clearly listed in the approval.



- (b) By using a baseline and monitoring methodology approved by the CDM Executive Board in its totality (hereinafter referred to as approved CDM methodology approach).

JI specific approach

23. If the PDD indicates that it selected the JI specific approach, the AIE should assess whether the PDD provides a detailed theoretical description in a complete and transparent manner, as well as justification, that the baseline is established:^{[vi] [vii] [viii] [ix] [X]}

- (a) By listing and describing plausible future scenarios on the basis of conservative assumptions and selecting the most plausible one;
- (b) 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 should assess whether key factors that affect a baseline are taken into account, e.g.:⁵
 - (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.
- (c) In a transparent manner with regard to the choice of approaches, assumptions, methodologies, parameters, data sources and key factors;
- (d) Taking into account of uncertainties and using conservativeness assumptions;
- (e) 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.
- (f) By drawing on the list of standard variables contained in appendix B to “Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring”, as appropriate;

24. If the PDD indicates that it uses selected elements or combinations of approved CDM methodologies or methodological tools for baseline setting, the AIE should assess whether the selected elements or combinations of approved CDM methodologies or methodological tools, together with the elements supplementary developed by the project participants, if any, for establishing the baseline, are in accordance with paragraph 23 above:^{[vi] [vii] [viii] [ix] [X]}

⁵ Key factors listed in (i)-(vii) are just examples, and it does not mean that the AIE should always assess all these factors regarding any PDD.



25. If the PDD indicates that it uses a multi-project emission factor, the AIE should assess whether the PDD provides an appropriate justification that, e.g.:^[vi]

- (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).

Approved CDM methodology approach

26. If the PDD indicates that it selected the approved CDM methodology approach, the AIE should assess whether:

- (a) The PDD provides the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used, and the approved CDM methodology is the most recent valid version when the PDD is submitted for publication on the UNFCCC JI website, allowing for a grace period of two months;^{[vii] [viii] [ix] [x]}
- (b) The PDD provides a description of why the referenced approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project;^{[vii] [viii] [ix] [x]}
- (c) All explanations, descriptions and analyses pertaining to the baseline in the PDD are made in accordance with the referenced approved CDM methodology;^[vi]
- (d) The baseline is identified appropriately as a result of the steps in subparagraphs (a)-(c) above.

5. Additionality

27. In accordance with Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol a 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” to qualify as a JI project.^{[v] [vi]}

JI specific approach

28. If the PDD indicates that it selected the JI specific approach referred to in paragraph 22 above, the AIE should assess which of the following approaches is used to demonstrate additionality:^{[vi] [vii] [viii] [ix] [x]}

- (a) 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;
- (b) 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;



- (c) Application of the most recent version of the “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality” approved by the CDM Executive Board (allowing for a grace period of two months when the PDD is submitted for publication on the UNFCCC JI website), or any other method for proving additionality approved by the CDM Executive Board;
29. For any approach referred to in paragraph 28 above, the AIE should assess whether:
- (a) The PDD provides a justification of the applicability of the approach with a clear and transparent description;^{[vi] [vii] [viii] [ix] [x]}
 - (b) Additionality proofs are provided;^{[vii] [viii] [ix] [x]}
 - (c) Additionality is demonstrated appropriately as a result of the analysis using the approach chosen.
30. For the approaches referred to in paragraph 28 (c) above, the AIE should assess whether all explanations, descriptions and analyses are made in accordance with the selected tool or method.

Approved CDM methodology approach

31. If the PDD indicates that it selected the approved CDM methodology approach referred to in paragraph 22 above, the AIE should assess whether:
- (a) The PDD provides the title, reference number and version of the baseline and monitoring methodology used;^{[vii] [viii] [ix] [x]}
 - (b) The PDD provides a description of why and how the referenced approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project;^{[vi] [vii] [viii] [ix] [x]}
 - (c) All explanations, descriptions and analyses with regard to additionality are made in accordance with the selected methodology;^[v]
 - (d) Additionality proofs are provided;^{[vii] [viii] [ix] [x]}
 - (e) Additionality is demonstrated appropriately as a result of the steps in subparagraphs (a)-(d) above.

6. Project boundary

JI specific approach

32. If the PDD indicates that it selected the JI specific approach referred to in paragraph 22 above, the AIE should assess whether:^{[i] [vi]}
- (a) The project boundary defined in the PDD encompasses all anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases (GHGs) that 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



- (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;
- (c) 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;
- (d) All gases and sources included are explicitly stated, and the exclusions of any sources related to the baseline or the project are appropriately justified.

Approved CDM methodology approach

33. If the PDD indicates that it selected the approved CDM methodology approach referred to in paragraph 22 above, the AIE should assess whether the project boundary is defined in accordance with the approved CDM methodology.^[vi]

7. Crediting period

34. The AIE should assess whether:

- (a) The PDD states 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 [vii] [viii] [ix]}
- (b) The PDD states the expected operational lifetime of the project in years and months;^{[vii] [viii] [ix] [x]}
- (c) The PDD states 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 net removals are generated by the project;^{[iv] [vi] [vii] [viii] [ix] [x]}
- (d) The PDD states 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, the PDD states that the extension is subject to the host Party approval, and the estimates of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals are presented separately for those until 2012 and those after 2012 in all relevant sections of the PDD.^{[iv] [vi] [vii] [viii] [ix]}

8. Monitoring plan

35. The AIE should assess whether the PDD, in its monitoring plan section, explicitly indicates which of the following approaches referred to in paragraph 22 above it selected:^{[vi] [vii] [viii] [ix] [x]}

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

JI specific approach

36. If the PDD indicates that it selected the JI specific approach, the AIE should assess whether the monitoring plan:

⁶ Projects starting as of 2000 may be eligible as JI projects if they meet the requirements of the JI guidelines. For programmes of activities (PoAs), only activities starting after the beginning of 2006 may be eligible (see also paragraph 71)



- (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;^[vi]
- (b) Specifies the indicators, constants and variables that are reliable (i.e. provide consistent and accurate values), valid (i.e. be clearly connected with the effect to be measured), and that provide a transparent picture of the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals to be monitored. If default values are used, the AIE should assess whether accuracy and reasonableness are carefully balanced in their selection. The AIE should also 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 should assess whether;^[vi]
 - (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, for example, by explaining:
 - What types of sources are suitable (official statistics, expert judgment, proprietary data, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (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. Consistency between the baseline and monitoring plan is ensured;
- (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;^[vi]
- (d) Explicitly and clearly distinguishes;^{[vii] [viii] [ix]}



- (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;^[vi]
- (f) Elaborates all algorithms and formulae used 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 should assess whether:^[vi]
 - (i) The underlying rationale for the algorithms/formulae (e.g. marginal vs. average etc.) is explained;
 - (ii) Consistent variables, equation formats, subscripts etc. are 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 are 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 a national or international monitoring standard if such standard has to be and/or is applied to certain aspects of the project and provides a reference as to where a detailed description of the standard can be found;^[vi]
- (h) Documents statistical techniques, if used for monitoring, and that they are used in a conservative manner;^[vi]

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.



- (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.^[vi]
- (j) Clearly identifies the responsibilities and the authority regarding the monitoring activities;^[vi]
- (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;^[vi]
- (l) Provides, in tabular form, a complete compilation of the data that need to be collected for its application, including 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.) but not including data that are calculated with equations.^[vi]
- (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.^[vi]

37. If the PDD indicates that it uses selected elements or combinations of approved CDM methodologies or methodological tools for establishing a monitoring plan, the AIE should assess whether the selected elements or combinations of approved CDM methodologies or methodological tools, together with the elements supplementary developed by the project participants, if any, for establishing the monitoring plan, are in line with paragraph 36 above:^[vi]

Approved CDM methodology approach

38. If the PDD indicates that it selected the approved CDM methodology approach, the AIE should assess whether:

- (a) The PDD provides the title, reference number and version of the baseline and monitoring methodology, and the approved CDM methodology is the most recent valid version when the PDD is submitted for publication on the UNFCCC JI website, allowing for a grace period of two months;^{[vi] [vii] [viii] [ix] [x]}
- (b) The PDD provides a description of why the referenced approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project;^{[vi] [vii] [viii] [ix] [x]}
- (c) All explanations, descriptions and analyses pertaining to monitoring in the PDD are made in accordance with the selected methodology;^[vi]
- (d) The monitoring plan is established appropriately as a result.

Overlapping monitoring periods

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

- (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.

9. Leakage

JI specific approach

40. If the PDD indicates that it selected the JI specific approach referred to in paragraph 18 above, the AIE should assess whether:^[vi]

- (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.

Approved CDM methodology approach

41. If the PDD indicates that it selected the approved CDM methodology approach referred to in paragraph 22 above, the AIE should assess whether the leakage and the procedure for its estimation are defined in accordance with the approved CDM methodology.^[vi]

10. Estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals

JI specific approach

42. If the PDD indicates that it selected the JI specific approach referred to in paragraph 18 above, the AIE should assess whether the PDD indicates which of the following approaches it chooses to estimate the emission reductions or enhancement of net removals generated by the project:^[vi]

- (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).

43. If the PDD indicates that it chooses the approach referred to in paragraph 42 (a) above, the AIE should assess whether the PDD provides the ex ante estimates of:^{[vi] [vii] [viii] [ix] [x]}

- (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 net removals adjusted by leakage (based on (a)-(c) above).

44. If the PDD indicates that it chooses the approach referred to in paragraph 42 (b) above, the AIE should assess whether the PDD provides the ex ante estimates of:^{[vi] [vii] [viii] [x]}

- (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).

45. For both approaches referred to in paragraph 42 above that the PDD chooses, the AIE should assess whether:

- (a) The estimates referred to in paragraph 43 or 44 above are given:^{[vi] [vii] [viii] [ix] [x]}
- (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 43 or 44 above are consistent throughout the PDD;^{[vii] [viii] [ix] [x]}
- (c) For calculating the estimates referred to in paragraph 43 or 44 above, key factors, e.g. those listed in paragraph 23 (b) (i)-(vii) above, influencing the baseline emissions or removals and the activity level of the project and the emissions or net removals as well as risks associated with the project were taken into account, as appropriate;^[vi]
- (d) Data sources used for calculating the estimates referred to in paragraph 43 or 44 above are clearly identified, reliable and transparent;^[vi]
- (e) Emission factors, including default emission factors, if used for calculating the estimates referred to in paragraph 43 or 44 above, were selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice;^[vi]
- (f) The estimation referred to in paragraph 43 or 44 above is based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner;^{8 [vi]}
- (g) The estimates referred to in paragraph 43 or 44 above are consistent throughout the PDD;^{[vii] [viii] [ix] [x]}
- (h) The annual average of estimated emission reductions or enhancements of net removals over the crediting period is calculated by dividing the total estimated emission reductions or enhancements of net removals over the crediting period by the total months of the crediting period, and multiplying by twelve.

46. If the PDD indicates that the calculation of the baseline emissions or net removals is to be performed ex post, the AIE should assess whether the PDD includes an illustrative ex ante emissions or net removals calculation.

Approved CDM methodology approach

47. If the PDD indicates that it selected the approved CDM methodology approach, the AIE should assess whether the estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals is:

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



- (a) Made in accordance with the approved CDM methodology;^[vi]
- (b) Presented in the PDD in accordance with paragraphs 45 (a), (b), (g) and (h) above.

11. Environmental impacts

48. The AIE should assess whether:^{[vii] [viii] [ix] [x]}

- (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.

12. Stakeholder consultation

49. If stakeholder consultation was undertaken in accordance with procedures as required by the host Party, the AIE should assess whether the PDD provides:^{[vii] [viii] [ix] [x]}

- (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.

13. Determination regarding small-scale projects (additional elements for assessment)

50. If the project is presented as a JI small-scale (SSC) project using the JI SSC PDD form, the AIE should assess whether the PDD appropriately specifies and justifies the SSC project type(s) and category(ies) that fall under:^{[viii] [xii]}

- (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. If 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”.

51. The AIE should 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:^[xii]
^[xi]

- (a) Which has the same project participants; and
- (b) Which applies the same technology/measure and pertains to the same project category⁹; and

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



- (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.
52. If more than one JI SSC project are bundled, the AIE should assess whether:^{[viii] [xii]}
- (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 50 (a) above; and
 - (iii) Retain their distinctive characteristics (i.e. location, technology/measure etc.);
 - (b) The composition of the bundle does not change over time;
 - (c) 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 19 above.
53. If the project participants prepared a single SSC PDD for the bundled JI SSC projects, the AIE should assess, in addition to those in paragraph 52 above, whether all the projects:^{[viii] [xii]}
- (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.
54. If the project participants prepared separate SSC PDDs for the bundled JI SSC projects, the AIE should assess whether:^{[viii] [xii]}
- (a) SSC PDDs have been prepared for all JI SSC projects in the bundle;
 - (b) Each SSC PDD contains a single JI SSC project in the bundle.
55. With regard to baseline setting for the bundled JI SSC projects, if the projects in the bundle use the same baseline, the AIE, when following subsection 4 above, should assess whether the F-JI-SSC-BUNDLE provides an appropriate justification for the use of the same baseline considering the particular situation of each project in the bundle.^{[viii] [xii]}
56. With regard to monitoring plan concerning bundled JI SSC project(s), the AIE, when following subsection 8 above, should assess which of the following approaches is used for establishing a monitoring plan:^{[viii] [xii]}
- (a) By preparing a separate monitoring plan for each of the constituent projects;



- (b) 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 should further assess whether:
 - (i) All the JI SSC projects are located in the territory of the same host Party;
 - (ii) All the JI SSC projects pertain to the same project category;
 - (iii) All the JI SSC projects apply the same technology or measure;
 - (iv) 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.

57. With regard to leakage of the JI SSC project(s), the AIE, when following subsection 9 above, should assess whether the leakage only within the boundaries of non-Annex I Parties is considered.^[xii]

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

58. 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 should assess whether the PDD appropriately specifies how the LULUCF project conforms to:^[ix]

- (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.

JI specific approach

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

60. With regard to project boundary of the JI LULUCF project, instead of following subsection 6 above, the AIE should follow this and the next paragraphs. The AIE should assess whether the project boundary defined in the PDD:^{[vi] [ix]}

- (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 should 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 should 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.

61. With regard to project boundary of the JI LULUCF project, the AIE should also assess whether:^[vi]

- (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.

62. With regard to monitoring plan of the JI LULUCF project, when following subsection 8 above, the AIE should 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..^[ix]

63. With regard to leakage of the JI LULUCF project, when following subsection 9 above, the AIE should 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.^[vi]

Approved CDM methodology approach

64. If the PDD indicates that it selected the approved CDM methodology approach referred to in paragraph 22 above by using a baseline and monitoring methodology for afforestation or reforestation project activities approved by the CDM Executive Board, the AIE should assess, alternatively to paragraphs 59-63 above, whether:^[ix]

- (a) The PDD provides the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology, and the approved CDM methodology is the most recent valid version when the PDD is submitted for publication on the UNFCCC JI website allowing for a grace period of two months;
- (b) The PDD provides a description of why the referenced approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project;



- (c) All explanations, descriptions and analyses are made in accordance with the referenced approved CDM methodology;
- (d) The baseline, additionality, project boundary, monitoring plan, estimation of enhancements of net removals and leakage are established appropriately as a result of the steps in subparagraphs (a)-(c) above.

15. Determination regarding programmes of activities (additional/alternative elements for assessment)

65. With regard to determinations regarding joint implementation programmes of activities (JI PoAs), when following subsections 1-12 above, “JI project” should be read as “JI PoA”.

66. If the PDD is prepared for a JI PoA using the joint implementation programme of activities design document form (F-JI PoA-DD), the AIE should additionally assess whether the PDD includes:^[x]
^[xiii]

- (a) A description of the policy or goal that the JI PoA seeks to promote;
- (b) A geographical boundary for the JI PoA (e.g. municipality, region within a country, country or several countries) within which all JI programme activities (JPAs) included in the JI PoA will be implemented;
- (c) A description of the operational and management arrangements established by the coordinating entity for the implementation of the JI PoA, including the maintenance of records for each JPA, a system/procedure to avoid double counting (e.g. to avoid including a new JPA that has already been determined), provisions to ensure that persons operating JPAs are aware and have agreed to their activity being added to the JI PoA;
- (d) A description of each type of JPAs that will be included in the JI PoA, including the technology or measures to be used;
- (e) The eligibility criteria for inclusion of JPAs to the JI PoA for each type of JPA in the JI PoA.

67. With regard to programme approvals by Parties involved, when following subsection 2 above, the AIE should additionally assess whether all host Parties of the JI PoA are listed as “Parties involved” and indicated as host Parties in the PDD.

68. With regard to authorization of project participants by Parties involved, when following subsection 3 above, the AIE should additionally assess whether the coordinating entity presented in the PDD is authorized by all host Parties to coordinate and manage the JI PoA.^[x]^[xiii]

69. With regard to baseline setting, when following subsection 4 above, the AIE should additionally assess whether the baseline is established for each type of JPA.^[x]^[xiii]

70. With regard to additionality, when following subsection 5 above, the AIE should additionally and firstly assess whether the PDD indicates at which of the following levels that additionality is demonstrated:^[x]^[xiii]

- (a) For the JI PoA;
- (b) For each type of JPA.

71. With regard to crediting period, when following subsection 7 above, the AIE should assess whether the starting date of the JI PoA is after the beginning of 2006, instead of 2000 referred to in paragraph 34 (a) above.^[x]^[xiii]



72. With regard to monitoring plan, when following subsection 8 above, the AIE should additionally assess whether the monitoring plan is established for each technology and/or measure under each type of JPA included in the JI PoA.^{[x] [xiii]}

73. The AIE should additionally assess whether the PDD includes a table listing at least one real JPA for each type of JPA. The AIE further assess whether, for each real JPA listed, the PDD provides the information of:^{[x] [xiii]}

- (a) Name and brief summary of the JPA;
- (b) The type of JPA;
- (c) A geographical reference or other means of identification;
- (d) The name and contact details of the entity/individual responsible for the operation of the JPA;
- (e) The host Party(ies);
- (f) The starting date of the JPA;
- (g) The length of the crediting period of the JPA;
- (h) Confirmation that the JPA meets all the eligibility requirements for its type, including a description of how these requirements are met;
- (i) Confirmation that the JPA has not been determined as a single JI project or determined under a different JI PoA.

16. Determination report

74. 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.

75. The AIE shall make the determination report publicly available in PDF format on the UNFCCC JI website. The AIE shall ensure that the report includes:^[ii]

- (a) The AIE's determination pursuant to paragraph 33 of the JI guidelines;
- (b) An explanation of its reasons for the determination;
- (c) A summary of comments received pursuant to paragraph 32 of the JI guidelines;
- (d) A report of how due account was taken of these comments.

76. The AIE shall, through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC JI website, provide the following information:^[ii]

- (a) The identification of the proposed JI project by selecting from the list of projects, the PDDs of which have already been made publicly available through the secretariat pursuant to paragraph 32 of the JI guidelines;
- (b) The name of the host Party(ies);
- (c) A list of Parties involved in the proposed JI project;
- (d) A list of (authorized) project participants;



- (e) The determination report.

77. The AIE shall prepare the determination report using the JI determination report form (F-JI-DRep or F-JI PoA-DRep, as applicable) developed by the JISC, and attach to it:^[xiv] ^[xv]

- (a) The 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.

78. As one of the "other relevant documents" referred to in paragraph 75 (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) The determination process (steps) taken (e.g. desk review, project site visit if conducted, 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 plan;
 - (iv) Estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net 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 assessment 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 16-18 above.

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

- (a) The correct version of the PDD form¹⁰ is used, taking into account that:

¹⁰ JI PDD form, the JI LULUCF PDD form, the JI SSC PDD form, F-JI-SSC-BUNDLE, or JI PoA DD form, as applicable.



- (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;¹¹
- (b) The correct version of the JI determination report form (F-JI-DRep or F-JI PoA-DRep, as applicable) 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 documents are submitted in English. For official documents submitted in other languages, an official translation into English is provided;
- (f) All the information marked as confidential or proprietary is submitted, taking into account 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 the determination. An authorisation of a legal entity to participate in the 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 information¹² and is signed by all project participants.

80. When submitting the determination report and any supporting documentation to the secretariat for publication, the AIE should assess whether all documents provide consistent information with respect to:

- (a) Project name and UNFCCC reference number;
- (b) Project scale and sectoral scope;
- (c) Estimated amount of emission reductions or enhancements of removals.

¹¹ Revisions of the PDD forms do not affect projects the PDD of which.^{[vii] [viii] [ix]}

- (a) Has already been used as the basis for a determination by an AIE; or
- (b) Has already been submitted to an AIE for determination prior to the adoption of the revised JI PDD form; or
- (c) Is submitted to an AIE within a month following the adoption of the revised JI PDD form.

¹² 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. Publication of monitoring report

81. 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.^[i]

82. The AIE shall make the monitoring report publicly available in PDF format on the UNFCCC JI website.^[ii]

83. The AIE shall, through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC JI website, provide the following information:^[ii]

- (a) The identification of the project which is listed with a positive determination pursuant to paragraph 35 of the JI guidelines;
- (b) The monitoring report;
- (c) The starting and ending dates of the monitoring period covered by the monitoring report.

84. The AIE, when submitting the monitoring report to the secretariat for making it publicly available, shall ensure that:^[iii]

- (a) All documents submitted are correctly referenced;
- (b) All documents are submitted in English. For official documents submitted in other languages, an official translation into English is provided;
- (c) All the information marked as confidential or proprietary is submitted, taking into account 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.

85. With regard to JI PoAs, when following paragraph 82-84 above, the AIE shall make publicly available the monitoring reports for all JPAs identified for verification.^[xiii]

G. Verification

1. General

86. 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.

87. 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 and inform the project participants of these issues in the form of:

- (a) Corrective action request (CAR), requesting the project participants to correct a mistake that is not in accordance with the monitoring plan;
- (b) Clarification request (CL), requesting the project participants to provide additional information for the AIE to assess compliance 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.

88. The AIE should make an objective assessment as to whether the actions taken by the project participants, if any, satisfactorily resolve the issues raised, if any, and should conclude its findings of the verification.

89. The AIE should record all the issues it raised and how they were addressed in the report referred to in paragraph 115 below.

2. Project approval by Parties involved

90. The AIE should assess whether at least one written project approval by a Party involved in the JI project, other than the host Party(ies), has been issued by the DFP of that Party when submitting the first verification report to the secretariat for publication in accordance with paragraph 38 of the JI guidelines, at the latest.^[iv]

91. The AIE should assess whether the written project approvals referred to in paragraph 90 above are unconditional.^[iv]

3. Project implementation

92. The AIE should, through the desk-review and/or project site visit, assess whether the project has been implemented in accordance with the PDD regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website.

93. 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

94. The AIE should assess whether the monitoring occurred in accordance with the monitoring plan included in the PDD regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website.^[vi]

95. The AIE should review the monitoring result and assess whether:^[vi]

- (a) For calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, key factors, e.g. those listed in paragraph 23 (b) (i)-(vii) above, influencing the baseline emissions or net removals and the activity level of the project and the emissions or removals as well as risks associated with the project were taken into account, as appropriate;
- (b) Data sources used for calculating emission reductions or enhancements of net removals are clearly identified, reliable and transparent;
- (c) Emission factors, including default emission factors, if used for calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, are selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice;
- (d) The calculation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals is based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner.¹³

¹³ In this context, project participants may draw on appendix A to “Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring” developed by the JISC.



96. With regard to the monitoring result of a JI SSC project, the AIE shall determine whether the relevant threshold to be classified as JI SSC project referred to in paragraph 50 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.^{[viii] [xii]}

97. If the monitoring report is on bundled JI SSC projects, the AIE should additionally check whether:^{[viii] [xii]}

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

98. If the monitoring is based on a monitoring plan that provides for overlapping monitoring periods, the AIE should assess 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.^[xi]

5. Revision of monitoring plan

99. If the project participants submitted to the AIE a revised monitoring plan, the AIE shall determine whether:^[vi]

- (a) The project participants provided an appropriate justification for the proposed revision;
- (b) 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.

100. If the determination referred to in paragraph 99 above is positive, it shall proceed with the verification based on the revised monitoring plan.^[vi]

6. Data management

101. 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 should assess, with an on-site inspection if necessary, e.g., whether:

- (a) The implementation of data collection procedures is in accordance with the monitoring plan, including the quality control and quality assurance procedures;
- (b) The function of the monitoring equipment, including its calibration status, is in order;
- (c) The evidence and records used for the monitoring are maintained in a traceable manner;
- (d) The data collection and management system for the project is in accordance with the monitoring plan.

7. Verification regarding programmes of activities (additional elements for assessment)

102. The AIE shall not verify any JPA that has not been added to the JI PoA.^[xiii]



103. The AIE's verification shall be based on the monitoring reports of all JPAs to be verified and shall ensure the accuracy and conservativeness of the emission reductions or enhancements of removals generated by each JPA although the AIE may decide to use any common-practice auditing technique, among others risk-based assessments, and/or a sample-based approach as described below, as appropriate.^[xiii]

104. The monitoring period covered in each verification report of a JI PoA shall not overlap with previous monitoring periods.^[xiii]

105. If the AIE learns of an erroneously included JPA, it shall inform the JISC of its findings in writing for the JISC's consideration at its next meeting.^[xiii]

106. If the AIE finds a sample-based approach appropriate, the AIE shall prepare a sampling plan that:^[xiii]

- (a) Describes its sample selection, taking into account that:
 - (i) For each verification that uses a sample-based approach, the sample selection shall be sufficiently representative of the JPAs in the JI PoA such extrapolation to all JPAs identified for that verification is reasonable. In selecting a sample, the AIE shall take into account differences among the characteristics of JPAs such as:
 - The types of JPAs;
 - The complexity of the applicable technologies and/or measures used;
 - The geographical location of each JPA;
 - The amounts of expected emission reductions of the JPAs being verified;
 - The number of JPAs for which emission reductions are being verified;
 - The length of monitoring periods of the JPAs being verified; and
 - The samples selected for prior verifications, if any;
 - (ii) If, in its sample selection, the AIE does not identify and take into account such differences among JPAs, then it shall provide a reasonable explanation and justification for not doing so.
- (b) Provides a list of JPAs selected for site inspections. In doing so, the AIE shall list a statistically sound selection of sites for inspection in accordance with the criteria listed in subparagraph (a) (i) above.

107. The AIE shall make the sampling plan publicly available through the secretariat along with the verification report and supporting documentation.^[xiii]

108. The AIE shall make site inspections of at least the square root of the number of total JPAs, rounded to the upper whole number (for example, 10 site inspections for a JI PoA of 100 JPAs, 11 site inspections for a JI PoA of 101 JPAs). If the AIE makes no site inspections or fewer site inspections than the square root of the number of total JPAs, rounded to the upper whole number, then it shall provide a reasonable explanation and justification.^[xiii]



109. The AIE may submit its sampling plan to the secretariat for the JISC's ex ante assessment.¹⁴ If the JISC rejects the AIE's sampling plan, the AIE may submit a revised sampling plan that is prepared in accordance with paragraph 106 above.^[xiii]

110. If the AIE learns of a fraudulently included JPA, a fraudulently monitored JPA or an inflated number of emission reductions claimed in a JI PoA, the AIE shall inform the JISC of the fraud in writing for the JISC's consideration at its next meeting.^[xiii]

8. Verification report

111. 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.

112. The AIE shall make the verification report publicly available in PDF format on the UNFCCC JI website. The AIE shall ensure that the report includes:^[ii]

- (a) The AIE's verification;
- (b) An explanation of its reasons for the verification.

113. The AIE shall, through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC JI website, provide the following information:^[ii]

- (a) The identification of the project for which the monitoring report has been made publicly available pursuant to paragraph 36 of the JI guidelines;
- (b) The verification report.

114. The AIE shall prepare a summary of the verification using the latest version of the JI verification report form (F-JI-VRep or F-JI PoA-VRep, as applicable) developed by the JISC, and attach to it:^{[xvi] [xvii]}

- (a) A verification report;
- (b) Other relevant documents e.g.:
 - (i) A revised monitoring plan, as applicable;
 - (ii) A determination that the revisions to the monitoring plan improve 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, as applicable.

115. In the verification report referred to in paragraph 112 above, the AIE should provide comprehensive and detailed information on the verification of the reported emission reductions or enhancements of net removals. Within the AIE, the team that undertook the detailed assessment of the reported emission reductions or enhancements of net 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) The verification process (steps) taken (e.g. desk review, project site visit if conducted, interview with project participants, follow-up exchanges);

¹⁴ Within 30 days of the AIE's submission of its sampling plan to the secretariat, the secretariat shall inform the AIE of the JISC's approval or rejection of the sampling plan. If the JISC rejects the AIE's sampling plan, it will inform the AIE of its reasons.



- (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 net removals;
 - (iv) Quality and management of data;
 - (d) Verification opinion (conclusion on the verified amount of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals), including the reasons;
 - (e) References to the documents/information used in the verification;
 - (f) A check list that details its assessment on each element of verification referred to in subsections 2-5 above, using the form in the annex to the present document, including all the issues it raised during the course of the verification as referred to in paragraphs 87-89 above.
116. With regard to the monitoring result of bundled JI SSC projects, the AIE:^[viii] ^[xii]
- (a) Shall prepare a single verification report if a single SSC PDD and overall monitoring plan were used as referred to in paragraphs 53 and 56 (b) respectively;
 - (b) May prepare a single verification report if it appraises each bundled project separately and covers the same monitoring period.
117. With regard to the monitoring result based on a monitoring plan that provides for overlapping monitoring periods, the AIE, in the verification report form and/or the verification report referred to in paragraph 114 (a) above, shall:^[xi]
- (a) Clearly indicate any verifications for the same project covering (part of) the same monitoring period that are already final in accordance with paragraph 39 of the JI guidelines; and
 - (b) Explicitly indicate whether the verified emission reductions or enhancements of removals in question were already covered by any verification mentioned in subparagraph (a) above.
118. When submitting the verification to the secretariat for publication, the AIE shall ensure that:^[iii]
- (a) The correct version of the JI verification report form (F-JI-VRep or F-JI PoA-VRep, as applicable) 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. For official documents submitted in other languages, an official translation into English is provided;
- (e) All the information marked as confidential or proprietary is submitted, taking into account 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.

119. With regard to the monitoring result based on a monitoring plan that provides for overlapping monitoring periods, the AIE shall not submit the verification to the secretariat for publication as long as published verifications for the same project covering (part of) the same monitoring period are not final in accordance with paragraph 39 of the JI guidelines.^[xi]

H. References

- [i] Guidelines for the implementation of Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol (Annex to decision 9/CMP.1)
- [ii] Procedures on public availability of documents under the verification procedure under the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (Version 01)
- [iii] Clarification regarding the public availability of documents under the verification procedure under the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (Version 03)
- [iv] Glossary of joint implementation terms (Version 01)
- [v] Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
- [vi] Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring (Version 02)
- [vii] Guidelines for users of the joint implementation project design document form (Version 04)
- [viii] 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 04)
- [ix] Guidelines for users of the joint implementation land use, land-use change and forestry project design document form (Version 04)
- [x] Guidelines for users of the joint implementation programme of activities design document form (Version 01)
- [xi] Clarification regarding overlapping monitoring periods under the verification procedure under the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (Version 01)
- [xii] Provisions for joint implementation small-scale projects (Version 03)
- [xiii] Procedure for programme of activities under the verification procedure under the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (Version 01)
- [xiv] JI determination report form (F-JI-DRep) (Version 01)
- [xv] JI determination report form for programme of activities (F-JI PoA-DRep) (Version 01)
- [xvi] JI verification report form (F-JI-VRep) (Version 01)



[xvii] JI verification report form for programme of activities (F-JI PoA-VRep) (Version 01)

I. 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
JI PoA	Joint implementation programme of activities
JISC	Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee
JPA	Joint implementation programme activity
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

Table 1. Check list for publication of project design document

Table 2. Check list for determination

Table 3. Check list for preparation of determination report

Table 4. Check list for publication of monitoring report

Table 5. Check list for verification

Table 6. Check list for preparation of verification report

Note:

1. The structure of the check lists in this annex is intended to be indicative. AIEs may modify them for their own use, as appropriate.
2. The structure of the check lists in this annex by no means implies that AIEs' action requests to project participants and review of project participants' action should be only one cycle. AIEs, if they use these check lists, may record in them as many cycles of requests and reviews that took place.



Table 1. Check list for publication of project design document

DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
11	Are the PDD and any supporting information ready in PDF format?				
12	<i>If the PDD or any supporting documentation contains confidential/proprietary information, are the two versions (marked-up version and version containing all information) ready?</i>				
13 (a)	Is the correct PDD form developed by the JISC in terms of project scale and type and form version used?				
13 (a) (i)	Is the PDD form developed by the JISC not altered?				
13 (a) (ii)	Is the PDD form the most recent version developed by the JISC? If not, is the PDD form still within the grace period (was the PDD form revised to a newer version in the past six months)?				
13 (b)	Are all documents for submission correctly referenced?				
13 (c)	Are all documents and annexes listed in the table of contents of the PDD available for submission?				
13 (d)	Are all documents for submission in English?				
	<i>If official documents are in other languages, is an official translation provided?</i>				
13 (e)	Is all the information marked as confidential or proprietary ready for submission?				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
13 (e)	Is the information used for the following not considered as proprietary or confidential?: – To demonstrate additionality; – To describe the baseline methodology and its application; – To support an environmental impact assessment.				
14	<i>If the AIE received comments on the PDD and any supporting information from Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC accredited observers within the 30-day period, did the AIE promptly acknowledge the receipts of the comments?</i>		N.A.	N.A.	

Table 2. Check list for determination

DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
Project approvals by Parties involved					
19	Have the DFPs of all Parties listed as “Parties involved” in the PDD provided written project approvals?				
19	Does the PDD identify at least the host Party as a “Party involved”?				
19	Has the DFP of the host Party issued a written project approval?				
20	Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved unconditional?				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
Authorization of project participants by Parties involved					
21	Is each of the legal entities listed as project participants in the PDD authorized by a Party involved, which is also listed in the PDD, through: – A written project approval by a Party involved, explicitly indicating the name of the legal entity?; or – Any other form of project participant authorization in writing, explicitly indicating the name of the legal entity?				
Baseline setting					
22	Does the PDD explicitly indicate which of the following approaches is used for identifying the baseline? – JI specific approach – Approved CDM methodology approach				
	<i>JI specific approach only</i>				
23	Does the PDD provide a detailed theoretical description in a complete and transparent manner?				
23	Does the PDD provide justification that the baseline is established:				
	(a) By listing and describing plausible future scenarios on the basis of conservative assumptions and selecting the most plausible one?				
	(b) Taking into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies and				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
	circumstance? – Are key factors that affect a baseline taken into account?				
	(c) In a transparent manner with regard to the choice of approaches, assumptions, methodologies, parameters, data sources and key factors?				
	(d) Taking into account of uncertainties and using conservative assumptions?				
	(e) In such a way that ERUs cannot be earned for decreases in activity levels outside the project activity or due to force majeure?				
	(f) By drawing on the list of standard variables contained in appendix B to “Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring”, as appropriate				
24	<i>If selected elements or combinations of approved CDM methodologies or methodological tools for baseline setting are used, are the selected elements or combinations together with the elements supplementary developed by the project participants in line with 23 above?</i>				
25	<i>If a multi-project emission factor is used, does the PDD provide appropriate justification?</i>				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
	<i>Approved CDM methodology approach only</i>				
26 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?				
26 (a)	Is the approved CDM methodology the most recent valid version when the PDD is submitted for publication? If not, is the methodology still within the grace period (was the methodology revised to a newer version in the past two months)?				
26 (c)	Does the PDD provide a description of why the approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?				
26 (c)	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses pertaining to the baseline in the PDD made in accordance with the referenced approved CDM methodology?				
26 (d)	Is the baseline identified appropriately as a result?				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
Additionality					
	<i>JI specific approach only</i>				
28	Does the PDD indicate which of the following approaches for demonstrating additionality is used? (a) Provision of traceable and transparent information showing 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 emission reductions or enhancements of removals; (b) Provision of traceable and transparent information that an AIE has already positively determined that a comparable project (to be) implemented under comparable circumstances has additionality; (c) Application of the most recent version of the “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality” (allowing for a two-month grace period) or any other method for proving additionality approved by the CDM Executive Board.				
29 (a)	Does the PDD provide a justification of the applicability of the approach with a clear and transparent description?				
29 (b)	Are additionality proofs provided?				
29 (c)	Is the additionality demonstrated appropriately as a result?				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
30	<i>If the approach 28 (c) is chosen, are all explanations, descriptions and analyses made in accordance with the selected tool or method?</i>				
	<i>Approved CDM methodology approach only</i>				
31 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?				
31 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why and how the referenced approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?				
31 (c)	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses with regard to additionality made in accordance with the selected methodology?				
31 (d)	Are additionality proofs provided?				
31 (e)	Is the additionality demonstrated appropriately as a result?				
Project boundary (applicable except for JI LULUCF projects)					
	<i>JI specific approach only</i>				
32 (a)	Does the project boundary defined in the PDD encompass all anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs that are:				
	(i) Under the control of the project participants?				
	(ii) Reasonably attributable to the project?				
	(iii) Significant?				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
32 (b)	Is the project boundary defined on the basis of a case-by-case assessment with regard to the criteria referred to in 32 (a) above				
32 (c)	Are the delineation of the project boundary and the gases and sources included appropriately described and justified in the PDD by using a figure or flow chart as appropriate?				
32 (d)	Are all gases and sources included explicitly stated, and the exclusions of any sources related to the baseline or the project are appropriately justified?				
	<i>Approved CDM methodology approach only</i>				
33	Is the project boundary defined in accordance with the approved CDM methodology?				
Crediting period					
34 (a)	Does the PDD state 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?				
34 (a)	Is the starting date after the beginning of 2000?				
34 (b)	Does the PDD state the expected operational lifetime of the project in years and months?				
34 (c)	Does the PDD state the length of the crediting period in years and months?				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
34 (c)	Is the starting date of the crediting period on or after the date of the first emission reductions or enhancements of net removals generated by the project?				
34 (d)	Does the PDD state that the crediting period for issuance of ERUs starts only after the beginning of 2008 and does not extend beyond the operational lifetime of the project?				
34 (d)	<i>If the crediting period extends beyond 2012, does the PDD state that the extension is subject to the host Party approval?</i>				
	Are the estimates of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals presented separately for those until 2012 and those after 2012?				
Monitoring plan					
35	Does the PDD explicitly indicate which of the following approaches is used? – JI specific approach – Approved CDM methodology approach				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
	<i>JI specific approach only</i>				
36 (a)	Does the monitoring plan describe:				
	– All relevant factors and key characteristics that will be monitored?				
	– The period in which they will be monitored? and				
	– All decisive factors for the control and reporting of project performance?				
36 (b)	Does the monitoring plan specify the indicators, constants and variables used that are reliable, valid and provide transparent picture of the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals to be monitored?				
36 (b)	<i>If default values are used,</i>				
	– Are accuracy and reasonableness carefully balanced in their selection?				
	– Do the default values originate from recognized sources?				
	– Are the default values supported by statistical analyses providing reasonable confidence levels?				
	– Are the default values presented in a transparent manner?				
36 (b) (i)	For those values that are to be provided by the project participants, does the monitoring plan clearly indicate how the values are to be selected and justified?				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
36 (b) (ii)	For other values,				
	– Does the monitoring plan clearly indicate the precise references from which these values are taken?				
	– Is the conservativeness of the values provided justified?				
36 (b) (iii)	For all data sources, does the monitoring plan specify the procedures to be followed if expected data are unavailable?				
36 (b) (iv)	Are International System Unit (SI units) used?				
36 (b) (v)	Does the monitoring plan note any parameters, coefficients, variables, etc. that are used to calculate baseline emissions or net removals but are obtained through monitoring?				
36 (b) (v)	Is the use of parameters, coefficients, variables, etc. consistent between the baseline and monitoring plan?				
36 (c)	Does the monitoring plan draw on the list of standard variables contained in appendix B of “Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring”?				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
36 (d)	Does the monitoring plan explicitly and clearly distinguish:				
	(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 <u>not</u> already available at the stage of determination?				
	(iii) Data and parameters that are monitored throughout the crediting period?				
36 (e)	Does the monitoring plan describe the methods employed for data monitoring (including its frequency) and recording?				
36 (f)	Does the monitoring plan elaborate all algorithms and formulae used for the estimation/calculation of baseline emissions/removals and project emissions/removals or direct monitoring of emission reductions from the project, leakage, as appropriate?				
36 (f) (i)	Is the underlying rationale for the algorithms/formulae explained?				
36 (f) (ii)	Are consistent variables, equation formats, subscripts etc. used?				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
36 (f) (iii)	Are all equations numbered?				
36 (f) (iv)	Are all variables, with units indicated defined?				
36 (f) (v)	Is the conservativeness of the algorithms/procedures justified?				
36 (f) (v)	To the extent possible, are methods to quantitatively account for uncertainty in key parameters included?				
36 (f) (vi)	Is consistency between the elaboration of the baseline scenario and the procedure for calculating the emissions or net removals of the baseline ensured?				
36 (f) (vii)	Are any parts of the algorithms or formulae that are not self-evident explained?				
36 (f) (vii)	Is it justified that the procedure is consistent with standard technical procedures in the relevant sector?				
36 (f) (vii)	Are references provided as necessary?				
36 (f) (vii)	Are implicit and explicit key assumptions explained in a transparent manner?				
36 (f) (vii)	Is it clearly stated which assumptions and procedures have significant uncertainty associated with them, and how such uncertainty is to be addressed?				
36 (f) (vii)	Is the uncertainty of key parameters described and, where possible, is an uncertainty range at 95% confidence level for key parameters for the calculation of emission reductions or enhancements of net				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
	removals provided?				
36 (g)	Does the monitoring plan identify a national or international monitoring standard if such standard has to be and/or is applied to certain aspects of the project?				
	Does the monitoring plan provide a reference as to where a detailed description of the standard can be found?				
36 (h)	Does the monitoring plan document statistical techniques, if used for monitoring, and that they are used in a conservative manner?				
36 (i)	Does the monitoring plan present the quality assurance and control procedures for the monitoring process, including, as appropriate, information on calibration and on how records on data and/or method validity and accuracy are kept and made available upon request?				
36 (j)	Does the monitoring plan clearly identify the responsibilities and the authority regarding the monitoring activities?				
36 (k)	Does the monitoring plan, on the whole, reflect good monitoring practices appropriate to the project type?				
	<i>If it is a JI LULUCF project</i> , is the good practice guidance developed by IPCC applied?				



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

Fourth draft

DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
36 (l)	Does the monitoring plan provide, in tabular form, a complete compilation of the data that need to be collected for its application, including data that are measured or sampled and data that are collected from other sources but not including data that are calculated with equations?				
36 (m)	Does the monitoring plan indicate that the data monitored and required for verification are to be kept for two years after the last transfer of ERUs for the project?				
37	<i>If selected elements or combinations of approved CDM methodologies or methodological tools are used for establishing the monitoring plan, are the selected elements or combination, together with elements supplementary developed by the project participants in line with 36 above?</i>				
	<i>Approved CDM methodology approach only</i>				
38 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?				
38 (a)	Is the approved CDM methodology the most recent valid version when the PDD is submitted for publication? If not, is the methodology still within the grace period (was the methodology revised to a newer version in the past two months)?				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
38 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why the approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?				
38 (c)	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses pertaining to monitoring in the PDD made in accordance with the referenced approved CDM methodology?				
38 (d)	Is the monitoring plan established appropriately as a result?				
	<i>Applicable to both JI specific approach and approved CDM methodology approach</i>				
39	<i>If the monitoring plan indicates overlapping monitoring periods during the crediting period,</i>				
	(a) Is the underlying project composed of clearly identifiable components for which emission reductions or enhancements of removals can be calculated independently?				
	(b) Can monitoring 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)?				
	(c) Does the monitoring plan ensure 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				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
	monitoring are met?				
	(d) Does the monitoring plan explicitly provide for overlapping monitoring periods of clearly defined project components, justify its need and state how the conditions mentioned in (a)-(c) are met?				
Leakage					
	<i>JI specific approach only</i>				
40 (a)	Does the PDD appropriately describe an assessment of the potential leakage of the project and appropriately explain which sources of leakage are to be calculated and which can be neglected?				
40 (b)	Does the PDD provide a procedure for an ex ante estimate of leakage?				
	<i>Approved CDM methodology approach only</i>				
41	Are the leakage and the procedure for its estimation defined in accordance with the approved CDM methodology?				
Estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals					
42	Does the PDD indicate which of the following approaches it chooses? (a) Assessment of emissions or net removals in the baseline scenario and in the project scenario (b) Direct assessment of emission reductions				
43	<i>If the approach (a) in 42 is chosen</i> , does the PDD provide ex ante estimates of:				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
	(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 net removals adjusted by leakage?				
44	<i>If the approach (b) in 42 is chosen, does the PDD provide ex ante estimates of:</i>				
	(a) Emission reductions or enhancements of net removals (within the project boundary)?				
	(b) Leakage, as applicable?				
	(c) Emission reductions or enhancements of net removals adjusted by leakage?				
45	<i>For both approaches in 42</i>				
	(a) Are the estimates in 43 or 44 given:				
	(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?				
	(v) In tones of CO ₂ equivalent, using global warming potentials defined by decision 2/CP.3 or as subsequently revised in accordance with Article 5				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
	of the Kyoto Protocol?				
	(b) Are the formula used for calculating the estimates in 43 or 44 consistent throughout the PDD?				
	(c) For calculating estimates in 43 or 44, are key factors influencing the baseline emissions or removals and the activity level of the project and the emissions or net removals as well as risks associated with the project taken into account, as appropriate?				
	(d) Are data sources used for calculating the estimates in 43 or 44 clearly identified, reliable and transparent?				
	(e) Are emission factors (including default emission factors) if used for calculating the estimates in 43 or 44 selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice?				
	(f) Is the estimation in 43 or 44 based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner?				
	(g) Are the estimates in 43 or 44 consistent throughout the PDD?				
	(h) Is the annual average of estimated emission reductions or enhancements of net removals calculated by dividing the total estimated emission reductions or				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
	enhancements of net removals over the crediting period by the total months of the crediting period and multiplying by twelve?				
46	<i>If the calculation of the baseline emissions or net removals is to be performed ex post, does the PDD include an illustrative ex ante emissions or net removals calculation?</i>				
	<i>Approved CDM methodology approach only</i>				
47 (a)	Is the estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals made in accordance with the approved CDM methodology?				
47 (b)	Is the estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals presented in the PDD:				
	– On a periodic basis?				
	– At least from the beginning until the end of the crediting period?				
	– On a source-by-source/sink-by-sink basis?				
	– For each GHG?				
	– In tones of CO ₂ equivalent, using global warming potentials defined by decision 2/CP.3 or as subsequently revised in accordance with Article 5 of the Kyoto Protocol?				
	– Are the formula used for calculating the estimates consistent throughout the PDD?				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
	– Are the estimates consistent throughout the PDD?				
	– Is the annual average of estimated emission reductions or enhancements of net removals calculated by dividing the total estimated emission reductions or enhancements of net removals over the crediting period by the total months of the crediting period and multiplying by twelve?				
Environmental impacts					
48 (a)	Does the PDD list and attaché documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project, including transboundary impacts, in accordance with procedures as determined by the host Party?				
48 (b)	<i>If the analysis in 48 (a) indicates that the environmental impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the host Party, does the PDD provide conclusion and all references to supporting documentation of an environmental impact assessment undertaken in accordance with the procedures as required by the host Party?</i>				
Stakeholder consultations					
49	<i>If stakeholder consultation was undertaken in accordance with the procedure as required by the host Party, does the PDD provide:</i>				
	(a) A list of stakeholders from whom comments on the projects have been				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
	received, if any?				
	(b) The nature of the comments?				
	(c) A description on whether and how the comments have been addressed?				
Determination regarding small-scale projects (additional elements for assessment)					
50	Does the PDD appropriately specify and justify the SSC project type(s) and category(ies) that fall under:				
	(a) One of the types and thresholds of JI SSC projects as defined in “Provisions for joint implementation small-scale projects”? <i>If the project contains more than one JI SSC project type component, does each component meet the relevant threshold criterion?</i>				
	(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”?				
51	Does the PDD confirm and show that the project 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: (a) Which has the same project participants;				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
	and (b) Which applies the same technology/measure and pertains to the same project category; and (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?				
	<i>Applicable to bundled JI SSC projects only</i>				
52 (a)	Do all projects in the bundle:				
	(i) Have the same crediting period?				
	(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 50 (a) above?				
	(iii) Retain their distinctive characteristics (i.e. location, technology/measure etc.)?				
52 (b)	Does the composition of the bundle not change over time?				
52 (c)	Has the AIE received (from the project participants):				
	(i) Information on the bundle using the form developed by the JISC (F-JI-SSC-BUNDLE)?				
	(ii) A written statement signed by all project				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
	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 19 above?				
53	<i>If the project participants prepared a single SSC PDD for the bundled JI SSC projects, do(are) all the projects:</i>				
	(a) Pertain to the same JI SSC project category?				
	(b) Apply the same technology or measure?				
	(c) Located in the territory of the same host Party?				
54	<i>If the project participants prepared separate SSC PDDs for the bundled JI SSC projects, do(are) all the projects:</i>				
	(a) Have SSC PDDs been prepared for all JI SSC projects in the bundle?				
	(b) Does each SSC PDD contain a single JI SCC project in the bundle?				
55	<i>If the projects in the bundle use the same baseline, does the F-JI-SSC-BUNDLE provide an appropriate justification for the use of the same baseline considering the particular situation of each project in the</i>				



Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee

Fourth draft

DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
	bundle?				
56	Does the PDD indicate which of the following approaches is used for establishing a monitoring plan? (a) By preparing a separate monitoring plan for each of the constituent projects; (b) By preparing an overall monitoring plan including a proposal of monitoring of performance of the constituent projects on a sample basis, as appropriate.				
56 (b)	<i>If the approach 57 (b) above is used,</i>				
	(i) Are all the JI SSC projects located in the territory of the same host Party?				
	(ii) Do all the JI SSC projects pertain to the same project category?				
	(iii) Do all the JI SSC projects apply the same technology or measure?				
	(iv) Does the overall monitoring plan reflect good monitoring practice appropriate to the bundled JI SSC projects and provide for collection and archiving of the data needed to calculate the emission reductions achieved by the bundled projects?				
	<i>Applicable to all JI SSC projects</i>				
57	Is the leakage only within the boundaries of non-Annex I Parties considered?				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
Determination regarding land use, land-use change and forestry projects (additional/alternative elements for assessment)					
58	Does the PDD appropriately specify how the LULUCF project conforms to:				
	(a) The definitions of LULUCF activities included in paragraph 1 of the annex to decision 16/CMP.1, applying good practice guidance for LULUCF as decided by the CMP, as appropriate?				
	(b) <i>In the case of afforestation, reforestation and/or forest management projects</i> , 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)?				
	<i>JI specific approach only</i>				
59	<i>Baseline setting - in addition to 22-26 above</i> Does the PDD provide an explanation how the baseline chosen:				
	– Takes into account the good practice guidance for LULUCF, developed by the IPCC?				
	– Ensures conformity with the definitions, accounting rules, modalities and guidelines under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol?				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
60	<i>Project boundary - alternative to 32-33</i> Does/is the project boundary defined in the PDD:				
	(a) Geographically delineate the JI LULUCF project under the control of the project participants?				
	(a) <i>If the JI LULUCF project contains more than one discrete area of land,</i> (i) Does each discrete area of land have a unique geographical identification? (ii) Is the boundary defined for each discrete area? (ii) Does the boundary not include the areas in between these discrete areas of land?				
	(b) Encompass 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) Account for all changes in the following carbon pools: – Above-ground biomass; – Below-ground biomass; – Litter; – Dead wood; and – Soil organic carbon? (c) Provides:				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
	(i) The information of which carbon pools are selected? (ii) <i>If one or more carbon pools are not selected</i> , transparent and verifiable information that indicates, based on conservative assumptions, that the pool is not a source?				
	(d) Defined on the basis of a case-by-case assessment with regard to the criteria in (b) above?				
61 (a)	<i>Project boundary - alternative to 32-33 (cont.)</i> Are the delineation of the project boundary and the gases and sources/sinks included appropriately described and justified in the PDD?				
61 (b)	<i>Project boundary - alternative to 32-33 (cont.)</i> Are all gases and sources/sinks included explicitly stated, and the exclusions of any sources/sinks related to the baseline or the LULUCF project appropriately justified?				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
62	<i>Monitoring plan - in addition to 35-39</i> Does the PDD provide 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.?				
63	<i>Leakage - in addition to 40-41</i> Does the PDD take into account only the increased anthropogenic emissions by sources and/or reduced anthropogenic removals by sinks of GHGs outside the project boundary?				
	<i>Approved CDM methodology approach only</i>				
64 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?				
64 (a)	Is the approved CDM methodology the most recent valid version when the PDD is submitted for publication? If not, is the methodology still within the grace period (was the methodology revised to a newer version in the past two months)?				
64 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why the approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
64 (c)	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses made in accordance with the referenced approved CDM methodology?				
64 (d)	Are the baseline, additionality, project boundary, monitoring plan, estimation of enhancements of net removals and leakage established appropriately as a result?				
Determination regarding programmes of activities (additional/alternative elements for assessment)					
66	Does the PDD include:				
	(a) A description of the policy or goal that the JI PoA seeks to promote?				
	(b) A geographical boundary for the JI PoA (e.g. municipality, region within a country, country or several countries) within which all JPAs included in the JI PoA will be implemented?				
	(c) A description of the operational and management arrangements established by the coordinating entity for the implementation of the JI PoA, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The maintenance of records for each JPA? – A system/procedure to avoid double counting (e.g. to avoid including a new JPA that has already been determined)? – Provisions to ensure that persons operating JPAs are aware and have agreed to their activity being added to the JI PoA? 				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
	(d) A description of each type of JPAs that will be included in the JI PoA, including the technology or measures to be used?				
	(e) The eligibility criteria for inclusion of JPAs to the JI PoA for each type of JPA in the JI PoA?				
67	<i>Project approvals by Parties involved - additional to 19-20</i> Are all Parties partly or entirely within the geographical boundary for the JI PoA listed as "Parties involved" and indicated as host Parties in the PDD?				
68	<i>Authorization of project participants by Parties involved - additional to 21</i> Is the coordinating entity presented in the PDD authorized by all host Parties to coordinate and manage the JI PoA?				
69	<i>Baseline setting - additional to 22-26</i> Is the baseline established for each type of JPA?				
70	<i>Additionality - additional to 27-31</i> Does the PDD indicate at which of the following levels that additionality is demonstrated? – For the JI PoA – For each type of JPA				
71	<i>Crediting period - additional to 34</i> Is the starting date of the JI PoA after the beginning of 2006 (instead of 2000)?				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
72	<i>Monitoring plan - additional to 35-39</i> Is the monitoring plan established for each technology and/or measure under each type of JPA included in the JI PoA?				
73	Does the PDD include a table listing at least one real JPA for each type of JPA?				
73	For each real JPA listed, does the PDD provide the information of:				
	(a) Name and brief summary of the JPA?				
	(b) The type of JPA?				
	(c) A geographical reference or other means of identification?				
	(d) The name and contact details of the entity/individual responsible for the operation of the JPA?				
	(e) The host Party(ies)?				
	(f) The starting date of the JPA?				
	(g) The length of the crediting period of the JPA				
	(h) Confirmation that the JPA meets all the eligibility requirements for its type, including a description of how these requirements are met				
	(i) Confirmation that the JPA has not been determined as a single JI project or determined under a different JI PoA				



Table 3. Check list for preparation of determination report

DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
75	Is the determination report ready for publication in PDD format?		N.A.	N.A.	
75	Does the determination report include:				
	(a) The AIE's determination pursuant to paragraph 33 of the JI guidelines?		N.A.	N.A.	
	(b) An explanation of its reasons for the determination?		N.A.	N.A.	
	(c) A summary of comments received pursuant to paragraph 32 of the JI guidelines?		N.A.	N.A.	
	(d) A report of how due account was taken of these comments?		N.A.	N.A.	
77	Is the determination report prepared using F-JI-DRep or F-JI PoA-DRep?		N.A.	N.A.	
77	Is the determination report attached with:				
	(a) The JI PDD of the project?		N.A.	N.A.	
	(b) Written approvals by all Parties involved in an alphabetical order?		N.A.	N.A.	
	(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.		N.A.	N.A.	



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
78	Is a report providing comprehensive and detailed information on the determination prepared as one of "Other relevant documents"?		N.A.	N.A.	
78	Is the report drafted by the team who undertook the detailed assessment of the project?		N.A.	N.A.	
78	Is the report independently reviewed by a technical reviewer, who is not a member of the team?		N.A.	N.A.	
78	Does the report include:				
	(a) The determination process (steps) taken (e.g. desk review, project site visit if conducted, interview with project participants, follow-up exchanges)?		N.A.	N.A.	
	(b) Details of personnel involved in the determination (e.g. names and roles of determination team members, name of technical reviewer)?		N.A.	N.A.	
	(c) Summary of assessment for each JI project requirement including: (i) Project approval by Parties involved? (ii) Baseline setting (including additionality)? (iii) Monitoring plan? (iv) Estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals? (v) Environmental impacts? (vi) Comments by stakeholders?		N.A.	N.A.	



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
	(d) Determination opinion (conclusion), including the reasons?		N.A.	N.A.	
	(e) References to the documents/information used in the determination?		N.A.	N.A.	
	(f) A check list that details its assessment on each JI project requirement, using the form in the annex to the DVM?		N.A.	N.A.	
79 (a)	Is the correct version of the PDD form used?				
79 (a) (i)	Is the PDD form developed by the JISC not altered?				
79 (a) (ii)	Is the PDD form the most recent version developed by the JISC? If not, is the PDD form still within the grace period (was the PDD form revised to a newer version in the past six months)?				
79 (b)	Is the correct version of the JI determination report form used?		N.A.	N.A.	
79 (c)	Are all documents for submission correctly referenced?				
79 (d)	Are 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 ready for submission?				
79 (e)	Are all documents for submission in English?				
	<i>If official documents are in other languages, is an official translation provided?</i>				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
79 (f)	Is all the information marked as confidential or proprietary ready for submission?				
79 (f)	Is the information used for the following not considered as proprietary or confidential?: <ul style="list-style-type: none">– To demonstrate additionality;– To describe the baseline methodology and its application;– To support an environmental impact assessment.				
79 (g)	Are the project approvals by Parties involved unconditional and in writing and clearly identify the project for which the approval is granted?				
	Is an official translation of an approval into English provided, in case the original is not issued in English?				
79 (h)	Are project participants identified consistently throughout the whole submission of the determination?				
	Does an authorisation of a legal entity to participate in the JI project clearly identify the legal entity listed in the PDD, for which the authorisation is granted?				
	Is an official translation of an authorisation into English provided, in case the original is not issued in English?				
	Does the modalities of communication clearly identify the project participant(s) nominated as focal point(s) for handling communications with the JISC, provide				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
	contact information and is signed by all project participants?				
80	Do all documents provide consistent information with respect to:				
	(a) Project name and UNFCCC reference number				
	(b) Project scale and sectoral scope				
	(c) Estimated amount of emission reductions or enhancements of removals				

Table 4. Check list for publication of monitoring report

DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
82	Is the monitoring report ready in PDF format?				
84 (a)	Are all documents for submission correctly referenced?				
84 (b)	Are all documents for submission in English?				
	<i>If official documents are in other languages, is an official translation provided?</i>				
84 (c)	Is all the information marked as confidential or proprietary ready for submission?				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
84 (c)	Is the information used for the following not considered as proprietary or confidential?: – To demonstrate additionality; – To describe the baseline methodology and its application; – To support an environmental impact assessment.				
	<i>Applicable to JI PoAs only</i>				
85	Are the monitoring reports for all JPAs identified for determination ready for publication?				

Table 5. Check list for verification

DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
Project approvals by Parties involved					
90	Has the DFPs of at least one Party involved, other than the host Party, issued a written project approval when submitting the first verification report to the secretariat for publication in accordance with paragraph 38 of the JI guidelines, at the latest?				
91	Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved unconditional?				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
Project implementation					
92	Has the project been implemented in accordance with the PDD regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website?				
93	What is the status of operation of the project during the monitoring period?				
Compliance with monitoring plan					
94	Did the monitoring occur in accordance with the monitoring plan included in the PDD regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website?				
95 (a)	For calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, were key factors, e.g. those listed in 23 (b) (i)-(vii) above, influencing the baseline emissions or net removals and the activity level of the project and the emissions or removals as well as risks associated with the project taken into account, as appropriate?				
95 (b)	Are data sources used for calculating emission reductions or enhancements of net removals clearly identified, reliable and transparent?				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
95 (c)	Are emission factors, including default emission factors, if used for calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice?				
95 (d)	Is the calculation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals calculated based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner?				
	<i>Applicable to JI SSC projects only</i>				
96	Is the relevant threshold to be classified as JI SSC project not exceeded during the monitoring period on an annual average basis?				
	<i>If the threshold is exceeded, is the maximum emission reduction level estimated in the PDD for the JI SSC project or the bundle for the monitoring period determined?</i>				
	<i>Applicable to bundled JI SSC projects only</i>				
97 (a)	Has the composition of the bundle not changed from that is stated in F-JI-SSC-BUNDLE?				
97 (b)	<i>If the determination was conducted on the basis of an overall monitoring plan, have the project participants submitted a common monitoring report?</i>				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
98	<i>If the monitoring is based on a monitoring plan that provides for overlapping monitoring periods,</i>				
	Are the monitoring periods per component of the project clearly specified in the monitoring report?				
	Do the monitoring periods not overlap with those for which verifications were already deemed final in the past?				
Revision of monitoring plan					
	<i>Applicable only if monitoring plan is revised by project participants</i>				
99 (a)	Did the project participants provide an appropriate justification for the proposed revision?				
99 (b)	Does the proposed revision improve 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?				
Data management					
101 (a)	Is the implementation of data collection procedures in accordance with the monitoring plan, including the quality control and quality assurance procedures?				
101 (b)	Is the function of the monitoring equipment, including its calibration status, in order?				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
101 (c)	Are the evidence and records used for the monitoring maintained in a traceable manner?				
101 (d)	Is the data collection and management system for the project in accordance with the monitoring plan?				
Verification regarding programmes of activities (additional elements for assessment)					
102	Is any JPA that has not been added to the JI PoA not verified?				
103	Is the verification based on the monitoring reports of all JPAs to be verified?				
103	Does the verification ensure the accuracy and conservativeness of the emission reductions or enhancements of removals generated by each JPA?				
104	Does the monitoring period not overlap with pervious monitoring periods?				
105	<i>If the AIE learns of an erroneously included JPA, has the AIE informed the JISC of its findings in writing?</i>				
	<i>Applicable to sample-based approach only</i>				
106	Does the sampling plan prepared by the AIE:		N.A.	N.A.	
	(a) Describe its sample selection, taking into account that:				
	(i) For each verification that uses a sample-based approach, the sample selection shall be sufficiently representative of the JPAs in the JI PoA such extrapolation to all JPAs identified for that verification is		N.A.	N.A.	



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
	<p>reasonable, taking into account differences among the characteristics of JPAs, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">– The types of JPAs;– The complexity of the applicable technologies and/or measures used;– The geographical location of each JPA;– The amounts of expected emission reductions of the JPAs being verified;– The number of JPAs for which emission reductions are being verified;– The length of monitoring periods of the JPAs being verified; and– The samples selected for prior verifications, if any? <p>(ii) If, in its sample selection, the AIE does not identify and take into account such differences among JPAs, then (does the sampling plan) provide a reasonable explanation and justification for not doing so?</p>				
	<p>(b) Provide a list of JPAs selected for site inspections, based on a statistically sound selection of sites for inspection in accordance with the criteria listed in (a) (i) above?</p>		N.A.	N.A.	



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
107	Is the sampling plan ready for publication through the secretariat along with the verification report and supporting documentation?		N.A.	N.A.	
108	Has the AIE made site inspections of at least the square root of the number of total JPAs, rounded to the upper whole number? <i>If the AIE makes no site inspections or fewer site inspections than the square root of the number of total JPAs, rounded to the upper whole number, then does the AIE provide a reasonable explanation and justification?</i>		N.A.	N.A.	
109	Is the sampling plan ready for submission to the secretariat for the JISC's ex ante assessment? (Optional)		N.A.	N.A.	
	<i>Applicable to both sample based and non-sample based approaches</i>				
110	<i>If the AIE learns of a fraudulently included JPA, a fraudulently monitored JPA or an inflated number of emission reductions claimed in a JI PoA, has the AIE informed the JISC of the fraud in writing?</i>		N.A.	N.A.	

Table 6. Check list for preparation of verification report

DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
112	Is the verification report ready for publication in PDD format?		N.A.	N.A.	



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
112	Does the verification report include:				
	(a) The AIE's verification?		N.A.	N.A.	
	(b) An explanation of its reasons for the verification?		N.A.	N.A.	
114	Is the summary of verification prepared using F-JI-VRep or F-JI PoA-VRep?		N.A.	N.A.	
114	Is the determination report attached with:				
	(a) A verification report?		N.A.	N.A.	
	(b) Other relevant documents? e.g.: (i) A revised monitoring plan, as applicable; (ii) A determination that the revisions to the monitoring plan improve 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, as applicable.		N.A.	N.A.	
115	Does the verification report provide comprehensive and detailed information on the verification?		N.A.	N.A.	
	Is the report drafted by the team who undertook the detailed assessment of the reported emission reductions or enhancements of net removals?		N.A.	N.A.	
	Is the report independently reviewed by a technical reviewer, who is not a member of		N.A.	N.A.	



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
	the team?				
115	Does the report include:				
	(a) The verification process (steps) taken (e.g. desk review, project site visit if conducted, interview with project participants, follow-up exchanges)?		N.A.	N.A.	
	(b) Details of personnel involved in the verification (e.g. names and roles of determination team members, name of technical reviewer)?		N.A.	N.A.	
	(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 net removals? (iv) Quality and management of data?		N.A.	N.A.	
	(d) Verification opinion (conclusion), including the reasons?		N.A.	N.A.	
	(e) References to the documents/information used in the verification?		N.A.	N.A.	



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
	(f) A check list that details its assessment on each element of verification?		N.A.	N.A.	
	<i>Applicable to bundled JI SSC projects only</i>				
116 (a)	<i>If a single SSC PDD and overall monitoring plan were used, has the AIE prepared a single verification report?</i>		N.A.	N.A.	
116 (b)	<i>If the AIE appraises each bundled project separately and covers the same monitoring period, has the AIE prepared a single verification report? (Optional)</i>		N.A.	N.A.	
117	<i>If the monitoring plan provides for overlapping monitoring periods, does the verification report form or verification report,:</i>				
	(a) Clearly indicate any verifications for the same project covering (part of) the same monitoring period that are already final in accordance with paragraph 39 of the JI guidelines?		N.A.	N.A.	
	(b) Explicitly indicate whether the verified emission reductions or enhancements of removals in question were already covered by any verification mentioned in (a) above?		N.A.	N.A.	
118 (a)	Is the correct version of the JI verification report form used?		N.A.	N.A.	
118 (b)	Are all documents for submission correctly referenced?				



DVM paragraph	Check item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants (incl. CAR, CL or FAR)	Review of project participants' action	Conclusion
118 (c)	Are all documents and annexes listed in the JI verification report form and in the list of documents presented together with the verification report form ready for submission?				
118 (d)	Are all documents for submission in English? <i>If official documents are in other languages, is an official translation provided?</i>				
118 (e)	Is all the information marked as confidential or proprietary ready for submission?				
118 (e)	Is the information used for the following not considered as proprietary or confidential?: – To demonstrate additionality; – To describe the baseline methodology and its application; – To support an environmental impact assessment.				
119	<i>If the monitoring plan provides for overlapping monitoring periods, are the (already) published verifications for the same project covering (part of) the same monitoring period final in accordance with paragraph 39 of the JI guidelines?</i>		N.A.	N.A.	