

 PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT REPORT VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION		
Entity name and address		
Address of site(s) assessed		
UNFCCC ref no.		
Scope(s) of accreditation of the activity under performance monitoring		
Approved methodology(ies) used (reference)	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)		
Team of the DOE that performed the verification activity (Define the role of each member and identify the person nominated by DOE to act as expert for that 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)		
Criteria (fill 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 verification activity to ascertain that the DOE has adequate and competent resources to carry out verification and certification before signing the contract?		
ii) Did the DOE perform any analysis of potential conflict of interest before signing the contract? If yes, what was the outcome and how the potential risks so identified were mitigated?		
1(b) Making the monitoring report public		
i) When did the DOE make the monitoring report public for the project activity under performance assessment?		
ii) Has the DOE referenced, the activity of making the monitoring report public in the verification report? Has the DOE adequately addressed the comments in the verification report?		

1(c) Assessment of effective planning by the entity		
i) Did the DOE follow their procedures for selecting the competent verification team members for project activity?		
ii) Did the DOE change any team member during the verification 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) Did the entity circulate any assessment plan for the onsite assessment? Was the assessment plan circulated to the Project participants in advance?		
iv) Did the team of DOE identify and reviewed the pertinent documents related to the project activity prior to the starting of verification assessment?		
v) Was the work suitably divided between the members of the team of DOE, based on the capability and capacity of the team members?		
vi) Was the team of DOE aware of the latest decisions of the EB relevant to the project verification activity?		
vii) Did the team of DOE use any checklist(s)? If so, were the check list(s) generic or specific to the project activity?		
2 On-site visit		
2(a) Conduct of an opening meeting with project participants (on Project Site) by the team of DOE:		
Has the (lead) assessor of the entity addressed the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction? • Definition of the scope and objectives of the meeting and of the work ahead ? • Communication ability? • Management of resources? • Time and place of closing meeting? • Ask for questions? 		
2(b). Skills and technique		
Whether the members of the team of the DOE:		
i) Remained within the scope of work defined?		
ii) Remained objective, unbiased?		
iii) Used crosschecks, went into depth, showed persistence?		
iv) Showed ability to anticipate problems being aware of the circumstances?		
v) Showed ability to listen?		
vi) Showed ability to generate appropriate atmosphere when interacting with project participants?		
vii) Showed knowledge of the project participants and the project activity?		
viii) Showed ability to identify instances of non-conformance of any project activity and/or submitted monitoring report?		
ix) Based all findings on adequate factual evidence and referenced where necessary?		

x) Showed ability to make considered decisions and justify them to the project participants and the same report in English?		
2(c) Meeting(s) of entity assessment team witnessed		
i) Ability of the Team leader to collect positive comments?		
ii) Ability to consolidate findings?		
iii) Ability to exchange information?		
iv) Ability to ensure that scope of assessment was covered (verification and certification)?		
v) Ability to discuss and conclude on contents and strategy of closing meeting with project participants?		
2(d) Conducting closing meetings with project participants		
i) Have observations been clearly presented and explained?		
ii) Has the significance of observations been explained?		
iii) Have the procedures been complied with?		
2(e) Communication and reporting by the team of DOE		
i) Oral <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English • Other languages (please indicate). 		
ii) Written <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English; • Other languages (please indicate). 		
2(f) Entity's personnel skills		
i) Skills for effective assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open minded; • Ability to understand complex activities; • Coverage and interpretation of the requirements. 		
ii) Skills for relationship <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relationship with project participants; • Relationship with CDM-AT. 		
3. Verification and Certification (Para 62 of M&P)		
3(a) Has the team of DOE followed the latest version of VVM while making their report?		
3(b) Does the verification process of the project assessed, reflect the capability of the DOE system to successfully verify the following:		
i) Project implementation in accordance with the registered PDD <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implementation status; ○ Actual operation; ○ Increase/potential increase of estimated emission reductions. 		
ii) Compliance of the monitoring plan with the		

<p>monitoring methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Revision/deviation to monitoring plan, has been sought as applicable. 		
<p>iii) Compliance of monitoring with the monitoring plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All parameters in monitoring plan, applied methodology monitored and applied as applicable. 		
<p>iv) Assessment of data and calculation of greenhouse gas emission reductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Completeness of data verified; ○ Conservativeness /justification of assumptions; ○ Verification of assumptions, calculations and data. 		
<p>3(c) Has the team of DOE identified and informed the project participants of any concerns related to the conformity of the actual project activity and its operation with the registered project design document? (Indicate the number of CARs, FARs and CLs issued by the team of DOE)</p>		
<p>3(d) Has the team of DOE recommended to the project participants appropriate changes to the monitoring methodology for any future crediting period, if necessary?</p>		
<p>3(e) Did the team of DOE raise pertinent issues, and have not left out any issue that should have been raised?</p>		
<p>3(f) Has the team of DOE reviewed the previous validation, verification and monitoring reports to identify any open issues or FARs in registered PDD or in the previous monitoring report(s), and any potential issues that are not in accordance with the registered PDD and the applicable methodology? If any issue was identified, how it was resolved?</p>		
<p>3(g) Is the draft report, correct representation of the work carried out by the team of DOE?</p>		
<p>3(h) Did the team of DOE covered the scope of assessment adequately?</p>		
<p>4 General observations</p>		
<p>i) Was work systematically approached and implemented?</p>		
<p>ii) Did the entity's team provide the impression that results would be provided with the same quality at all times?</p>		
<p>iii) In case the entity established a team, did the leader of the entity's team control the verification and certification activity?</p>		
<p>iv) Was the entity's assessor or its team leader sidetracked?</p>		
<p>v) Was the body language of the entity's team members</p>		

conducive to the validations or verification and certification activity?		
vi) How did the team perform under pressure?		
vii) Did the entity team show the capacity to adapt to circumstances as necessary?		
General comments		
Overall conclusions and recommendations		
CDM-AT team member witnessing		Date
Leader of the Assessment Team (Signature)		Date

History of the document

Version	Date	Nature of revision
01	01 July 2009	Initial adoption