



CDM PROJECT ACTIVITY REQUEST FOR REGISTRATION: COMPLETENESS CHECK CHECKLIST

PCP : Clean development mechanism project cycle procedure (version 09.0), EB 82, annex 15, 20 February 2015.

PS : Clean development mechanism project standard (version 09.0), EB 82, annex 13, 20 February 2015.

VVS : Clean development mechanism validation and verification standard (version 09.0), EB 82, annex 14, 20 February 2015.

General principle for bundling (version 03.0), EB82, annex 10, 20 February 2015.

Item	Description of the Item	References
1. SUBMISSION COMPLETENESS		
1.1 Document list: following documents are submitted, completed correctly using valid version of forms and instructions therein, if any:		
1.1.1	Is a duly completed CDM project activity registration request form (CDM-REG-FORM) submitted?	PCP para 72
1.1.2	Is a project design document (PDD) submitted and using the valid version of the applicable CDM-PDD form?	PS para 87, PCP para 19
1.1.3	Is a duly completed CDM small-scale project activities bundling form (F-CDM-SSC-BUN) submitted, where applicable?	PS para 101, General principles for bundling 03.0 para 13
1.1.4	Is(are) letter(s) of approval/authorization (LoA) from the DNA of each Party involved in the proposed CDM project activity submitted?	PS para 81, 82, 83, PCP para 72
1.1.5	Is a Modalities of communication (MoC) statement form (CDM-MOC-FORM) submitted?	PS para 86, PCP para 37-48
1.1.6	Is a Validation Report submitted and prepared in accordance with a valid version of the VVS?	VVS para 177, PCP para 72
1.2 Project View Page:		
1.2.1	Are all relevant sections of the Project View Page, including the geo -coordinates of the project site, completed?	PCP para 72
1.2.2	Is the version of applied methodology(ies) and, where applicable, of the applied standardized baseline(s), valid at the time of submission?	PS para 36
1.2.3	Is the PDD published for global stakeholder consultation for the project activity requested for registration accessible?	PCP para 20
1.2.4	For cases where the PDD has been published for global stakeholder consultation when no applicable approved standardized baseline was valid, and an applicable approved standardized baseline whose selection is mandatory has become valid after the publication of the PDD for global stakeholder consultation, is the request for registration submitted within 240 days after the standardized baseline became valid?	PCP para 28



2. DOCUMENT COMPLETENESS		
2.1 Project Design Document (PDD):		
2.1.1	Are the documents for additionality, such as spreadsheets for the investment analysis, provided where applicable?	PS para 91
2.1.2	Are the documents for the calculation of the baseline, such as spreadsheets, provided where applicable?	PS para 91
2.1.3	For information provided on a confidential basis, is it submitted both in a redacted format that can be disclosed to the public and in a format containing all information?	PS para 92
2.1.4	Are data, values and formulae included in electronic spreadsheets accessible and verifiable?	PS para 93
2.1.5	Are English versions of relevant sections in the submitted documents available? (if the original documents are not in English)	PS para 89
2.2 Letter of Approval/Authorization:		
2.2.1	Does the LoA of the each party include the statements on the Kyoto Protocol ratification and voluntary participation?	PS para 81
2.2.2	Does the LoA of the host party(ies) include the statements on the contribution to the sustainable development?	PS para 83
2.3 Modalities of Communication:		
2.3.1	Are the focal point entities' scopes of authority clearly and correctly indicated?	PCP para 39, 40
2.3.2	Is the Statement of Agreement (Section 3) signed by at least one authorized signatory for each project participant and the information is consistent with Annex 1?	PCP para 38, 41, 46
2.4 Validation Report		
2.4.1	Does the Validation Report contain appointment certificates or curricula vitae of the validation team members, technical experts and internal technical reviewers for the project activity?	VVS 176(h)
3. CONSISTENCY OF INFORMATION		
3.1	Are dates, versions and references consistent among the documents? ¹	All documents

¹ Details of the cross referenced documents should be consistent with the submitted documents. For example, the PDD version number and date mentioned in the Validation Report should match the PDD submitted for request for registration.



3.2	Is the project title consistent in the following documents?	Project View Page
		PDD
		Validation Report
		LoA
		MoC
		Registration request form
3.3	Are the parties consistent in the following documents?	Bundling form
		Project View Page
		PDD
		Validation Report
		LoA
		MoC
3.4	Are the project participants consistent in the following documents?	Registration request form
		Bundling form
		Project View Page
		PDD
		Validation Report
		LoA
3.5	Is(are) the sectoral scope(s) consistent in the following documents?	MoC
		Registration request form
		Bundling form
		Project View Page
		PDD
		Validation Report
3.6	Are the title(s) and version(s) of the methodology(ies) and, where applicable, of the standardized baseline(s) consistent in the following documents?	LoA
		MoC
		Registration request form
		Bundling form



3.7	Is the amount of emission reductions consistent in the following documents?	Project View Page
		PDD
		Validation Report
		Bundling form
3.8	Is the project activity starting date consistent in the following documents?	PDD
		Validation Report
3.9	Is(are) the project activity location consistent in the following documents?	Project View Page
		PDD
		Bundling form
		Validation Report
3.10	Is the duration of the crediting period of the project activity consistent in the following documents?	Project View Page
		PDD
		Validation Report
		Bundling form



Appendix 1. Request for Registration: Completeness Check Issues of an Editorial Nature or Consistency*

The table below lists “issues of an editorial nature or consistency” for which the secretariat may request the DOE to submit the missing or revised documents and/or information in accordance with paragraph 79 of the PCP.

Item	Description of the Item
1.	Inconsistencies clearly attributable to typographical errors and/or documents containing blank pages.
2.	Project information is not consistent (i.e. PDD version and date, crediting period, project title, geo-coordinates, name of Parties and project participants, type of involvement of the Parties (directly/indirectly), sectoral scope(s), title and valid version of the methodology and the standardized baseline, starting date of the project activities within the Validation Report).
3.	The MoC is not completely readable or information is missing.
4.	LoAs by multiple Parties have been submitted in one single pdf file.
5.	Separate LoAs have been submitted for different project participants (if multiple project participants are involved with the same Party).
6.	Documents and appendices (including spreadsheets) are not readable or contain part of text not in English.



Item	Description of the Item
7.	Request for registration information is not consistent (i.e. sign-off dates, valid version of the VVS).
8.	Version of forms submitted is not valid at the time of the request for registration.
9.	Lack of signatures on relevant documents.
10.	Inconsistency of CER numbers, only when the amount of CER reported in any submitted documents is lower than that in the Project View Page or the project is exempted from payment of the registration fee.
11.	Confidential documents are not submitted in two versions, one with redacted information for disclosure to the public and one with not-redacted information to be treated as confidential.
12.	The Validation Report does not contain appointment certificates or curricula vitae of the validation team members, technical experts and internal technical reviewers.

* This list is not exhaustive and will be revised as and when required. The secretariat may contact the Designated Operational Entity/Project Participant on any issues of an editorial nature that are not included in the list above.



Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
04.0	9 July 2015	Revision to expand the list of issues in Appendix 1.
03.0	2 April 2015	Revision to incorporate requirement on mandatory standardized baseline.
02.0	27 March 2015	Revision to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Incorporate the new provisions in CDM project standard (CDM-EB65-A05-STAN), CDM validation and verification standard (CDM-EB65-A04-STAN), General principles for bundling (CDM-EB21-A21-STAN) and CDM project cycle procedure (CDM-EB65-A32-PROC) adopted at EB 82;• Editorial improvements.
01.0	3 May 2012	Initial publication.

Decision Class: Regulatory
Document Type: Information note
Business Function: Registration
Keywords: completeness check, project activities, request for registration
