

**Registration - Information and reporting checklist
(Version 2.0)**

Version 1.0 of the information and reporting checklist was published in June 2010. The enclosed version 2.0 of this checklist represents an improved and simplified version that reflects requirements of the EB 48, Annex 60 *Guidelines on completeness check of request for registration* and the Validation and Verification Manual version 1.2.

The main changes between version 1.0 and version 2.0 are the following:

1. The requirements are updated to VVM version 1.2 as the previous version of the information and reporting checklist referred to version 1.1 of the VVM.
2. The current structure of the checklist covers two documents; project design document and the validation report. The previous version, 1.0, includes the letter of approval/authorization, modalities of communication and registration request form; the items to check for these three documents are now consolidated in version 2.0 of the completeness check checklist.
3. The questions have been improved and clarified.

Registration -Information and Reporting check			
1. Project Design Document-PDD		Requirement	Compliance check
1.1	General description	EB 48 Annex 60 Para 10(a)	Are all sections of the PDD for the description of the project activity completed, including details of its project participants, technology, location, estimated amount of reductions and public funding information?
1.2	Baseline		
1.2.1	Application of the baseline/monitoring methodology	EB 48 Annex 60 Para 10(a)	Does the PDD contain the reference and the version of the applied methodology?
1.2.2	Sources of GHG	EB 48 Annex 60 Para 10(a)	Does the PDD describe the GHG sources included in the project boundary?
1.2.3	Identification of the baseline scenario	EB 48 Annex 60 Para 10(a)	Does the PDD describe how the baseline scenario(s) is identified?
1.3	Additionality		
1.3.1	Prior consideration	EB 48 Annex 60 Para 10(a)	Does the PDD describe that the incentive from the CDM was seriously considered in the decision to proceed with the project activity?
1.3.2	Continuing and real actions	EB 48 Annex 60 Para 10(a)	Does the PDD include a timeline of events and actions, which have been considered to achieve CDM registration?
1.3.3	Additionality demonstration option	EB 48 Annex 60 Para 10(a)	Does the PDD describe how additionality of the project activity was demonstrated?
1.3.4	Investment analysis	EB 48 Annex 60 Para 10(a)	Does the PDD list all relevant assumptions such as the input values, the benchmark and the results of the investment analysis?
1.3.5	Sensitivity analysis	EB 48 Annex 60 Para 10(a)	Does the PDD present a sensitivity analysis of the investment analysis?
1.3.6	Common practice analysis	EB 48 Annex 60 Para 10(a)	Does the PDD present a common practice analysis?
1.3.7	Barrier analysis	EB 48 Annex 60 Para 10(a)	Does the PDD describe each of the barriers presented?
1.4	Emission reductions		
1.4.1	Methodological choices	EB 48 Annex 60 Para 10(a)	Does the PDD explain the methodological choices for the calculation of the baseline, project emissions and emission reductions?
1.4.2	Data and parameters available at validation	EB 48 Annex 60 Para 10(a)	Does the PDD list data and parameters used to calculate the emission reductions?
1.4.3	Data and parameters available at validation (details)	EB 48 Annex 60 Para 10(a)	Does the PDD include details (units, values, sources, justifications, etc.) of the listed parameters?
1.4.4	<i>Ex-ante</i> calculation of emission reductions	EB 48 Annex 60 Para 10(a) PDD guideline	Does the PDD describe how the emission reductions were calculated <i>ex-ante</i> with the actual data and equations?
1.5	Monitoring methodology	EB 48 Annex 60 Para 10(a)	Does the PDD list all data and parameters to be monitored?

1.5.1	Data and parameters monitored (details)	EB 48 Annex 60 Para 10(a)	Does the PDD include details such as unit, source, measurement methods, QA/QC procedures, etc. for the listed parameters?
1.5.2	Monitoring plan	EB 48 Annex 60 Para 10(a)	Does the PDD describe the monitoring plan?
1.6	Duration of the project activity		
1.6.1	Project starting date	EB 48 Annex 60 Para 10(a)	Does the PDD indicate the project starting date?
1.6.2	Crediting period	EB 48 Annex 60 Para 10(a)	Does the PDD indicate the starting dates of the crediting period?
2. Validation report - VR		Requirement	Compliance check
2.1	Letter of Authorization- LoA		
2.1.1	LoA	VVM v1.2, Para 49 (a)	Is the receipt of the LoA reported in the VR?
2.1.2	LoA source	VVM v1.2, Para 49 (b)	Does the VR indicate whether the LoA was received from the project participants or directly from the DNA?
2.1.3	Authenticity	VVM v1.2, Para 49 (c)	Does the VR describe the means to ensure the LoAs authenticity if in doubt?
2.1.4	Statements	VVM v1.2, Para 49 (d)	Does the VR indicate if the LoA includes clear statements on the ratification of Kyoto Protocol, voluntary participation and the contribution to host party's sustainable development?
2.2	Project design document -PDD		
2.2.1	Template	VVM v1.2, Para 55	Has the DOE validated if the latest PDD template is used?
2.3	Project description		
2.3.1	Validation method	VVM v1.2, Para 64 (a)	Does the VR include description of the process taken to validate the accuracy and completeness of the project description?
2.3.2	Site visit	VVM v1.2, Para 60-62	If no site visit was conducted, has the DOE justified it?
2.3.3	Validation opinion	VVM v1.2, Para 64 (b)	Does the VR contain the DOE's opinion on the accuracy and completeness of the project description?
2.4	Methodology		
2.4.1	Methodology applicability		
2.4.1.1	General requirement	VVM v1.2, Para 67	Has the DOE ensured that the selected methodology applies correctly to the project boundary, baseline identification and algorithms and/or formulae to determine emission reductions?
2.4.1.2	Correctness of the application	VVM v1.2, Para 72-74	Has the DOE determined if the baseline and monitoring methodologies are correctly applied and are not subject to a clarification, revision or deviation?
2.4.1.3	Applicability conditions	VVM v1.2, Para 76	Has the DOE clearly described how each applicability condition of the methodology/ies is fulfilled by the project activity?
2.4.1.4	Non-coverage by the methodology	VVM v1.2, Para 77	Does the VR contain information about the greenhouse gas emissions within the project boundary caused by the implementation of the project activity which contribute to more than 1% of the expected annual emission reductions and which

			are not addressed by the applied methodology?
2.4.2	Boundary	VVM v1.2, Para 80	Has the DOE described how it has validated the project boundary?
2.4.2.1	Applicability	VVM v1.2, Para 80	Has the DOE provided a statement whether the identified boundary, sources and gases are justified for the project activity?
2.4.3	Baseline identification	VVM v1.2, Para 87	Has the DOE described the steps taken to assess the identification of the baseline of the project activity?
2.4.3.1	Assumptions	VVM v1.2, Para 87 (a)	Has the DOE described all assumptions, data, and references listed in the PDD for the identification of the baseline?
2.4.3.2	Relevance of documents	VVM v1.2, Para 87 (b)	Has the DOE listed all relevant documents used?
2.4.3.3	Suitability	VVM v1.2, Para 87 (c)	Has the DOE indicated whether the assumptions and/or data used are justified?
2.4.3.4	Relevant policies	VVM v1.2, Para 87 (d)	Has the DOE indicated if all relevant national, and/or sectoral policies circumstances are listed in the PDD?
2.4.3.5	Application of meth	VVM v1.2, Para 87 (e)	Has the DOE indicated if the methodology is correctly applied to determine the most plausible baseline scenario?
2.4.3.6	Scenario	VVM v1.2, Para 86	Has the DOE indicated if the PDD provides a clear description of the baseline scenario(s) which includes a description of the technology and the activities that would take place in the absence of the project activity?
2.4.3.7	Crosschecks	VVM v1.2, Para 88	Has the DOE described the steps taken to cross-check the information given in the PDD?
2.4.4	Algorithm and formulae	VVM v1.2, Para 92	Has the DOE described the steps taken to assess the equations applied to calculate baseline and project emissions, leakage and emission reductions as per the chosen methodology?
2.4.4.1	Assumptions	VVM v1.2, Para 92 (a)	Has the DOE provided validation opinions on the assumptions, data and references used in the PDD for the calculation of emission reductions?
2.4.4.2	References	VVM v1.2, Para 92 (b)	Does the validation opinion indicate whether the documents and data used in the PDD are correctly quoted and interpreted in the PDD for the calculation of emission reductions?
2.4.4.3	Reasonableness	VVM v1.2, Para 92 (c)	Does the validation opinion indicate whether all values used in the PDD are reasonable for the calculation of emission reductions?
2.4.4.4	Meth application	VVM v1.2, Para 92 (d)	Does the validation opinion indicate whether the baseline methodology is correctly applied to calculate project and baseline emissions, leakage and emission reductions for the calculation of emission reductions ?
2.4.4.5	Reliability	VVM v1.2, Para 92 (e)	Does the validation opinion indicate whether the calculation of the baseline emissions are replicable using data and values listed in the PDD ?
2.4.4.6	Verification of data	VVM v1.2, Para 93	Does the VR describe how the data and parameters used in the equations were verified?
2.4.4.7	Equations applicability	VVM v1.2, Para 90	Has the DOE determined if the methodology provides different options for equations and parameters and if the selection is appropriate?
2.4.4.8	Ex-ante validation	VVM v1.2, Para 91	If data and parameters are fixed <i>ex-ante</i> (not need to monitor) during the project activity crediting period, has the DOE validated it to be conservative and

			appropriate?
2.4.4.9	Monitoring data	VVM v1.2, Para 91	If data and parameters are monitored during implementation (<i>ex-post</i>) and are available after validation, has the DOE validated that the estimates from the PDD are reasonable?
2.5	Additionality		
2.5.1	General	VVM v1.2, Para 97	Does the VR contain a description of all the steps taken to cross-check the given information in the PDD? Does it explain how it has determined the authenticity of the documentation?
2.5.2	Prior consideration		
2.5.2.1	Project starting date	VVM v1.2, Para 104 (a)	Has the DOE described how the project starting date was validated?
2.5.2.2	Continuing and real actions	EB 49 Annex 22 Para 8 (b)	In case the project starting date and the start of the validation is more than 2 years apart, has the DOE described how continuing real and actions to secure the CDM status was validated?
2.5.2.3	Evidences	VVM v1.2, Para 104 (b)	Has the DOE described how the evidence provided for the prior consideration was assessed?
2.5.2.4	Compliance with guidance	VVM v1.2, Para 104 (c)	Has the DOE provided a clear validation opinion on the project activity's compliance with the requirements by EB 49, Annex 22?
2.5.3	Identification of alternatives	VVM v1.2, Para 107	Has the DOE described whether the list of alternatives is completed?
2.5.4	Investment analysis		
2.5.4.1	Accuracy	VVM v1.2, Para 114 (c)	Has the DOE confirmed the accuracy of financial calculations carried out for any investment analysis?
2.5.4.2	Parameter	VVM v1.2, Para 114 (a)	Has the DOE described how it has validated the parameters used in the financial calculations?
2.5.4.3	Sensitivity analyses	VVM v1.2, Para 111 (e)	Has the DOE assessed the sensitivity analysis to determine under what conditions variations in the result would occur and the likelihood of these conditions?
2.5.4.4	Suitability of benchmark	VVM v1.2, Para 114 (b)	Has the DOE described how the suitability of any benchmark applied has been assessed?
2.5.4.5	Feasibility Study Reports (FSRs)	VVM v1.2, Para 113	Are the input values based on FSRs that are approved by national authorities for proposed project activities?
2.5.4.5.1	Decision	VVM v1.2, Para 113 (a)	Has the DOE validated that the FSR has been the basis of the decision to proceed with the investment in the project ?
2.5.4.5.2	Consistency	VVM v1.2, Para 113 (b)	Has the DOE validated that the values used in the PDD and associated annexes are consistent with the FSR ?
2.5.4.5.3	Sectoral expertise	VVM v1.2, Para 113 (c)	Has the DOE provided a confirmation based on specific local and/or sectoral expertise?
2.5.5	Barrier analysis		
2.5.5.1	Assessment of each barrier	VVM v1.2, Para 118 (a), (b)	Has the DOE described each of the barriers presented?
2.5.5.2	Credibility	VVM v1.2, Para 118	Has the DOE described an overall evaluation of the credibility of the barrier analysis presented?
2.5.6	Common practice	VVM v1.2, Para 121	Has the DOE described details regarding the validation of the common practice analysis?
2.5.6.1	Geographical scope	VVM v1.2, Para 121 (a)	Has the DOE described how the geographical scope of the common practice analysis has been validated?
2.5.6.2	Assessment	VVM v1.2, Para 121 (b)	Has the DOE described how the it has assessed of the existence of similar projects?

2.5.6.3	Essential distinction	VVM v1.2, Para 121 (c)	Has the DOE described how the essential distinctions between the proposed CDM project activity and any similar projects are assessed?
2.5.6.4	Validation opinion	VVM v1.2, Para 121 (d)	Has the DOE confirmed that the project activity is not a common practice?
2.6	Monitoring		
2.6.1	Assessment	VVM v1.2, Para 124 (b)	Has the DOE described the steps taken to assess if the monitoring arrangements are feasible to implement within the project design?
2.6.2	Ability to implement the monitoring plan	VVM v1.2, Para 124 (c)	Has the DOE provided validation opinions regarding the project participant(s) ability to implement the monitoring plan?
2.7	Sustainable development		
2.7.1	Host DNA	VVM v1.2, Para 127	Has the DOE validated that the DNA of the host party confirmed the sustainable development contribution of the project activity?
2.8	Local Stakeholders Comments		
2.8.1	Validation method	VVM v1.2, Para 130 (a)	Has the DOE described the steps taken to assess the adequacy of the local stakeholder consultation?
2.8.2	Validation opinion	VVM v1.2, Para 130 (b)	Has the DOE stated its opinion on the adequacy of the local stakeholder consultation?
2.9	Environmental Impact		
2.9.1	Environmental Impact	VVM v1.2, Para 133	Has the DOE indicated whether the project participant(s) have undertaken an environmental impact assessment as per the host party procedures?
2.10	Validation Report -VR		
2.10.1	Summary of validation process	VVM v1.2, Para 174 (a)	Has the DOE provided a summary and conclusions of the validation process?
2.10.2	Validation conclusions	VVM v1.2, Para 174 (b)	Has the DOE provided all approaches taken and the validation findings?
2.10.3	Adjustment to the validation report	VVM v1.2, Para 173 (c)	Has the DOE described the changes made in the project design since the global stakeholder consultation was conducted?
2.10.4	List of documents reviewed	VVM v1.2, Para 174 (d)	Has the DOE provided a list of interviewees and documents reviewed?
2.10.5	Validation team	VVM v1.2, Para 174 (e)	Has the DOE provided details of the validation team?
2.10.6	Team CV	VVM v1.2, Para 174 (g)	Has the DOE provided appointment certificates or CVs of each validation team member?
2.11	Validation opinion		
2.11.1	Validation methodology	VVM v1.2, Para 176	Does the validation opinion include a summary of the validation methodology,–procedures and the validation criteria applied?
2.11.2	Non coverage	VVM v1.2, Para 176	Does the validation opinion include a description of any of the project components or issues that are not covered by the validation?
2.11.3	Conclusion	VVM v1.2, Para 176	Does the validation opinion include a summary of the validation conclusions?
2.11.4	Statement on ER	VVM v1.2, Para 176	Does the validation opinion include a statement on the validation of the expected emission reductions?
2.11.5	Criteria satisfied	VVM v1.2, Para 176	Does the validation opinion include a statement whether the proposed CDM project activity meets the stated validation criteria?
2.12	Global stakeholder consultation		

2.12.1	30 days (45 days A/R)	VVM v1.2, Para 40, 174 (c)	Was the PDD(s) published for global stakeholder consultation (open for comments for 30 days or 45 days for large-scale Afforestation/ Reforestation projects)?
2.12.2	Comments	VVM v1.2, Para 40, 174 (c)	Did the project activity receive any comments?
2.12.3	Comments consideration	VVM v1.2, Para 40, 174 (c)	Does the validation report consider the comments received?
2.13	Validation methods - Standard Auditing Techniques		
2.13.1	Document review	VVM v1.2, Para 33 (a)	Has the DOE applied the standard auditing techniques in reviewing the documents?
2.13.2	Follow-up actions	VVM v1.2, Para 33 (b)	Has the DOE applied the standard auditing techniques for the follow-up actions (interviews, cross-checking, etc.)?
2.13.3	Referencing	VVM v1.2, Para 33 (c)	Has the DOE applied the standard auditing techniques in referring to relevant information?
2.13.4	Review of calculations	VVM v1.2, Para 33 (d)	Has the DOE applied standard auditing techniques to review formulae used and correctness of calculations?
2.14	Requests raised by the DOE		
2.14.1	Closure of CARs and CLs	VVM v1.2, Para 37	Has the DOE justified how it has resolved all CARs and CLs?
2.14.2	FARs on implementation	VVM v1.2, Para 38	Are the FARs, if any, related to monitoring or implementation?
2.14.3	Updating the PDD	VVM v1.2, Para 38	Has the PDD been rectified and updated according to the responses to the CARs, CLs, and/or FARs?

History of the document

Version	Date	Nature of revision
02.0	3 June 2011	Revisions made in line with para 12 & 14 of the "Procedure for requests for registration of proposed CDM project activities." (version 02.0) (EB59, Annex 12). As well as to be in line with para 58 of Decision 3/CMP6.
01.0	10 June 2010* <i>*prepared by the secretariat and published on the CDM website as requested by the Board (EB 54, Paragraph 57, 28 May 2010)</i>	Initial Adoption.
Decision Class: Regulatory Document Type: Information Note Business Function: Registration		