

 PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT REPORT VALIDATION		
Entity name and Address		
UNFCCC ref no.		
Site Visit made by the CDM-AT	Yes / No	
Address of the site(s) visited		
Scope(s) of accreditation of the activity under performance assessment.		
Approved methodology(ies) and Tools used	Version no.	
Project activity assessed (describe in brief the nature of the activity assessed e.g. small/large scale, brief description of the projects, duration of onsite assessment, etc.)		
Team of the DOE that performed the validation activity (Define the role of each member and identify the person nominated by DOE to act as expert for the technical area. Indicate the members who visited the site)	Team Leader: Members :	
CDM-AT leader		
CDM-AT members involved in the performance assessment activity		
Evaluation : (Key : S = Satisfactory, NS = Not satisfactory, NA = Not Applicable/Cannot comment) Each "NS" under the column "Rating" has to be supported by a Non Conformity (NC) report format. One NC report form can be used for one or more than one "NS" in the column "Ratings" as some of the requirements are related to each other.		
Criteria (As applicable to the activity assessed)	Rating	Comments
1. Process requirements		
1(a) Contract review and allocation of resources		
i) Did the DOE carry out a review of request from PPs to carry out validation activity, to ascertain that DOE has adequate and competent resources to carry out the validation and registration before signing the contract?		
ii) Did the DOE perform any analysis of potential conflict of interest before signing the contract? If yes, were any potential risks identified, and how the potential risks so identified were mitigated?		

1(b) Making the PDD public		
i) Did the DOE followed the procedure for public availability of PDD for stakeholder consultation as per latest procedure for processing and reporting on validation of CDM project activities?		
ii) When did the DOE make the PDD publicly available?		
iii) Has the DOE adequately addressed the comments received in the validation report?		
1(c) Assessment of effective planning by the entity		
i) Did the DOE follow their procedures for selecting the competent validation team members for project activity?		
ii) Did the DOE change any team member during the process? If so, did the DOE follow their procedures related to team selection to ensure that the team continues to be competent and impartial?		
iii) Was the team of DOE aware of the latest decisions of the EB relevant to the project activity under validation?		
iv) Did the team of DOE use any checklists? If so were the check lists generic or specific to the type of the project activity, within different sectoral scopes?		
2. Validation		
2(a) Has the team of DOE followed the latest version of VVM while undertaking the validation ?		
2(b) Does the validation report reflect the capability of the DOE system to successfully validate the following:		
i) Requirements for the approval by all parties involved in the project activity have been met <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirements in the letter of approval; • Authenticity of letter of approval. 		
ii) Project participants have been listed in a consistent manner in the PDD and approved by a party to the KP		
iii) A valid Project Design Document has been filled by project participants in accordance with applicable guidance by the Executive Board		
iv) Clarity and accuracy of the project description in the PDD <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement for physical site inspection. 		
v) Applicability of approved baseline and monitoring methodology(ies) selected by the project participant(s) for the selected project in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • applicability conditions; • project boundary; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All sources of GHG required by methodology included; ○ Identification of additional emission sources. • baseline identification; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All scenarios are considered; ○ Most reasonable baseline scenario correctly 		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ applied; ○ Validation of Data, assumptions; ○ calculations & rationale.; ○ Correct quotation & interpretation of sources referred validated; ○ All applicable CDM requirements and national/sectoral policies & circumstances taken to consideration; ○ Verifiable description of baseline scenario. ● all project emissions & leakage; ● algorithm & formulae. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ appropriateness of the equations; ○ Verification of choice of data & parameters, assumptions & calculations. 		
vi) The PDD & evidences provided adequately demonstrate the additionality of the project in accordance with the applicable version of tools and other relevant CDM-EB requirements and the approved CDM methodology. The means of cross checking and authentication of information & correct quotation & interpretation of sources referred validated.		
<p>vii) Among other things, where applicable coverage of the following areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Prior consideration of CDM <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reliable evidence for establishment of starting date ○ Awareness of CDM & CDM was a decisive factor ○ Continuing & real actions ● Identification of alternatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Complete list of credible alternatives ● Investment Analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ verification of assumptions, data values, factors & computations ○ Suitability of benchmark ○ Appropriateness of input values from FSR ● Barrier analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Assessment & validation of each barrier for credibility ● Common Practice Analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Validation of the Geographical scope ○ Assessment of existing projects ○ Distinction of the project activity 		
viii) Provisions of monitoring, QA/QC, verification and reporting are in accordance with the relevant requirements, feasible and is comprehensive		
ix) Confirmation from the Host Party's DNA, that the project activity is contributing to the sustainable development of the host Party		
x) The PPs have invited comments from the local stakeholders prior to publication of the PDD on UNFCCC website, a summary of the comments has been provided to DOE and a report has been provided of how due account was taken of any comments so received		
xi) The PPs have addressed the environmental and social impacts of the project activity successfully, including an EIA where required		

2(c) For small-scale project activity only		
i) The project activity qualifies within the thresholds of the small-scale project activities		
ii) The project activity is not a debundled component of a large-scale project, in accordance with the rules defined in appendix C of the simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale CDM project activities		
3. Skills and technique <i>(Only if onsite visit is made by the CDM-AT)</i>		
3(a)The members of the team of the DOE:		
i) Applies standard auditing techniques to asses the correctness of information provided?		
ii) Based all findings on adequate factual evidence and referenced where necessary?		
iii) Showed ability to make considered decisions and justify them to the project participants and present report in English?		
4. Assessment of the presentation of Validation report		
4(a) Does the validation report cover the following;		
i) A summary of validation process and it's conclusions		
ii) Reference to the data and information material used as evidence for validation and lists of interviewees		
iii) Details of the validation team		
iv) Information on quality control within the team/of the validation process		
v) Appointment certificates or CVs of the team members		
vi) Clearly identify the changes made to project documentation from what was made public and the final version of PDD		
4(b) Did the team of DOE forward its findings of the draft validation to the PP in the form of CARs/ CLs/FARs and draft validation report?		
4(c) Has the team of DOE raised all relevant issues through CARs/CLs/FARs?		
4(d) If CARs/ CLs/FARs were reported, are they clear and unambiguous? Were the CARs/CLs, closed based on verification of the evidence provided by the PPs and adequately justified by the DOE?		
4 (e) Are there any omissions (e.g. errors in formulae, units, quotation & interpretation of sources referred) in the validation report?		
4 (f) Are there any mistakes in the validation report?		
4 (g) Is the language used in the validation report clear and precise?		
4(h) Does the validation opinion include		
i) Summary of validation methodology, process used, and the validation criteria applied?		

ii) Description of project components or issues not covered by the validation process?		
iii) Summary of validation conclusions?		
iv) Statement on the validation of expected emission reductions?		
v) Statement whether the proposed CDM project activity meets the stated criteria?		
4(i) Is a clear and unconditional validation opinion presented in the verification report?		
4(j) Is the validation report approved by the authorised signatory of the DOE?		
General comments		
Overall conclusions and recommendations:		
CDM-AT team member assessing		Date
Leader of the Assessment Team (Signature)		Date

History of the document

Version	Date	Nature of revision
01	01 July 2009	Initial adoption