



## PROGRAMME OF ACTIVITIES (PoA) 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.

| Item  | Description of the Item  | References                         |
|---|--|------------------------------------|
| <b>1. SUBMISSION COMPLETENESS</b>   |  |                                    |
| <b>1.1 Document list: Are the following documents submitted, completed correctly using the valid templates, approved by the board and respective guidelines where applicable?</b> |  |                                    |
| 1.1.1   | Is a duly completed CDM programme of activities registration request form (CDM-PoA-REG-FORM) submitted?  | PCP para 72                        |
| 1.1.2   | Is a Programme of activities design document (PoA-DD) including a generic Component Project Activity Design Document(s) (CPA-DD(s)) submitted? | PS para 87                         |
| 1.1.3   | 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, 83, 235                |
| 1.1.4   | Is a Modalities of Communication (MoC) statement form (CDM-MOC-FORM) submitted?  | PS para 86, 238,<br>PCP para 37-48 |
| 1.1.5   | Is a Validation Report submitted and prepared in accordance with a valid version of the VVS?   | VVS para 177,<br>PCP para 72       |
| 1.1.6   | Is (are) Component Project Activity Design Document (CPA-DD) for a specific CPA(s) <sup>1</sup> submitted?                                     | PS para 87,<br>PCP para 130        |
| 1.1.7   | Is a CPA inclusion form (F-CDM-INC) for the specific CPA submitted?  | PCP para 72                        |

<sup>1</sup> If there are more than one host party, CPA-DD for each host party shall be submitted (PS 9.0, para 209 (c)).



| <b>1.2. PoA/CPA view pages</b>              |  |                |
|---|--|----------------|
| 1.2.1                                       | Are all relevant sections of the PoA and CPA view pages 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                                       | Are the PoA-DD and the specific CPA-DD published for global stakeholder consultation requested for registration accessible?  | PCP para 20    |
| 1.2.4                                       | For cases where the PoA-DD 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 PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, is the request for registration submitted within 240 days after the standardized baseline became valid? | PCP para 28    |
| <b>2. DOCUMENT COMPLETENESS</b>             |  |                |
| <b>2.1 PoA-DD/CPA-DD</b>                    |  |                |
| 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 91     |
| 2.1.5                                       | Are English versions of relevant sections in the submitted documents available?  | PS para 89     |
| <b>2.2 Letter of Approval/Authorization</b> |  |                |
| 2.2.1                                       | Does the Letter(s) of Approval of the host party (ies) include the statements on the Kyoto Protocol ratification, voluntary participation, and contribution to the sustainable development?  | PS para 81, 83 |
| 2.2.2                                       | Does the LoA from the other party include statements on the Kyoto Protocol ratification and voluntary participation?   | PS para 81     |



|   |   |                     |
|---|---|---------------------|
| 2.2.3                                   | Is the CME authorized by each host Party?   | VVS para 52         |
| 2.2.4                                   | Is each project participant authorized by at least one Party involved?  | PS para 235         |
| <b>2.3 Modalities of Communications</b> |   |                     |
| 2.3.1                                   | Are the focal point entity scopes clearly and correctly indicated?  | PCP para 39-40      |
| 2.3.2                                   | Is the CME designated as either the sole or a joint focal point for each scope of authority?  | PCP para 44         |
| 2.3.3                                   | Is the Statement of Agreement (Section 3) signed by at least one authorized signatory of the CME and the information is consistent with Annex 1?  | PCP para 38, 41, 46 |
| <b>2.4 Validation Report</b>            |   |                     |
| 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 para 176 (h)    |
| <b>3. CONSISTENCY OF INFORMATION</b>    |   |                     |
| 3.1                                     | Are dates, versions and references consistent among the documents? <sup>2</sup>   | All documents       |

<sup>2</sup> 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 PoA title consistent among following documents?  | PoA view page     |
|     |   | F-CDM-PoA-REG     |
|     |   | PoA-DD            |
|     |   | CPA view page     |
|     |   | CPA inclusion     |
|     |   | CPA-DD            |
|     |   | Validation Report |
|     |   | MoC               |
|     |   | LoA               |
| 3.3 | PoA lifetime consistent among following documents?  | PoA view page     |
|     |   | PoA-DD            |
|     |   | Validation Report |
| 3.4 | Is(are) the sectoral scope(s) consistent in the following document?   | PoA view page     |
|     |   | F-CDM-PoA-REG     |
|     |   | PoA-DD            |
|     |   | CPA inclusion     |
|     |   | Validation Report |
| 3.5 | Are the title(s) and version(s) of the methodology(ies) and, where applicable, of the standardized baseline(s) consistent in the following documents? | PoA view page     |
|     |   | PoA-DD            |
|     |   | CPA-DD            |
|     |   | Validation Report |
| 3.6 | Is (are) Host Party(ies) consistent among following documents?  | PoA view page     |
|     |   | PoA-DD            |
|     |   | CPA view page     |
|     |   | CPA inclusion     |
|     |   | CPA-DD            |
|     |   | Validation Report |
|     |   | MoC               |
| LoA |   |                   |



|      |  |                   |
|------|--|-------------------|
| 3.7  | Is (are) Other Party(ies) consistent among following documents? <sup>3</sup> | PoA view page     |
|      |  | PoA-DD            |
|      |  | CPA-DD            |
|      |  | Validation Report |
|      |  | MoC               |
|      |  | LoA               |
| 3.8  | Is the CME consistent among following documents?                             | PoA view page     |
|      |  | F-CDM-PoA-REG     |
|      |  | PoA-DD            |
|      |  | CPA inclusion     |
|      |  | Validation Report |
|      |  | MoC               |
| 3.9  | Is the CPA title consistent among following documents?                       | LoA               |
|      |  | PoA view page     |
|      |  | CPA view page     |
|      |  | CPA inclusion     |
|      |  | CPA-DD            |
|      |  | Validation Report |
| 3.10 | Are Emission Reductions (Initial CPAs) consistent among following documents? | PoA view page     |
|      |  | CPA view page     |
|      |  | CPA-DD            |
|      |  | Validation Report |
| 3.11 | Is the CPA Crediting Period consistent among following documents?            | CPA view page     |
|      |  | CPA-DD            |
|      |  | Validation Report |

<sup>3</sup> Each CPA shall have only one host Party, which is the Party in which the CPA is located (PS para 89).



## 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. version and date of PoA-DD and specific-case CPA-DDs, crediting period, PoA and CPAs title, geo-coordinates, name of Parties and project participants, type of involvement of the Parties (directly/indirectly), name of CME, lifetime, sectoral scope(s), title and valid version of the methodology and the standardized baseline). |
| 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.  |
| 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 PoA/CPA webpage or the PoA/CPA 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>  |
|----------------|---------------|---|
| 03.0           | 9 July 2015   | Revision to expand the list of issues in Appendix 1.  |
| 02.0           | 27 March 2015 | Revision to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Incorporate the new provisions in CDM project standard (CDM-EB65-A05-STAN), CDM validation and verification standard (CDM-EB65-A04-STAN) and CDM project cycle procedure (CDM-EB65-A32-PROC) adopted at EB 82;</li><li>• Editorial improvements.</li></ul> |
| 01.0           | 3 May 2012    | Initial publication.  |

Decision Class: Regulatory

Document Type: Information note

Business Function: Registration

Keywords: completeness check, programme of activities, request for registration