



CHECKLIST FOR REQUESTS FOR RENEWAL OF CREDITING PERIOD OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES (VERSION 01.0)

PS: Standard: CDM project standard for project activities (version 01.0)
VVS: Standard: CDM validation and verification standard for project activities (version 01.0)
PCP: Procedure: CDM project cycle procedure for project activities (version 01.0)
SS: Standard: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities (version 06.0)

1. Completeness check

Item No.	Description of item	Reference
1.1 Documentation		
1.1.1	Is a duly completed renewal of crediting period request form using the valid version of the form (CDM-REN-FORM) submitted?	PCP para 272
1.1.2	Is an updated project design document (PDD) using the valid version of the applicable PDD form (CDM-PDD-FORM, CDM-AR-PDD-FORM or CDM-CCS-PDD-FORM) submitted?	PS para 283, PCP paras 268, 272
1.1.3	Is a validation report using the valid version of the form (CDM-RCPV-FORM) submitted?	VVS para 414, PCP para 272
1.1.4	Are all documents prepared in English or do they contain a full translation of relevant sections into English?	PS para 26
1.1.5	If a spreadsheet is submitted, is it in an accessible and verifiable (unprotected) format?	
1.2 Project view page		
1.2.1	Are the versions of the applied methodologies and, where applicable, of the applied standardized baselines, valid at the time of submission (considering, in the case of resubmission of the request for renewal of crediting period, that the same versions applied in the initial submission can be applied within 90 days of the initial notification of the negative conclusion of the completeness check)?	PS para 283, PCP paras 85, 274
1.2.2	Does the request for renewal of crediting period select a standardized baseline whose selection is mandatory at the time of submission of the request for renewal of crediting period, where applicable?	PS paras 285(a), (b)
1.3 Project design document		
1.3.1	Is an appendix on the ex ante calculation of emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals, such as spreadsheets, provided where applicable?	PS paras 23, 220
1.3.2	For information provided on a confidential basis, is it submitted both in a redacted version that can be disclosed to the public and in a version containing all information?	PS para 221



1.3.3	Are data, values and formulae included in spreadsheets accessible and verifiable?	PS para 222
1.3.4	Is the format of the updated PDD, including headings, logos and tables, unaltered? Are all sections of the updated PDD filled, or indicated as intentionally left blank (e.g. "Not applicable")?	PS para 26
1.4 Validation report		
1.4.1	Does the validation report indicate that the validation was conducted in accordance with a valid version of the VVS?	VVS para 20
1.4.2	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 272(h)
1.5 Consistency of information		
1.5.1	<p>Are the project activity title and the UNFCCC reference number consistent in the following documents?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project view page • Renewal of crediting period view page • Renewal of crediting period request form (CDM-REN-FORM) • Updated PDD (CDM-PDD-FORM, CDM-AR-PDD-FORM or CDM-CCS-PDD-FORM) • Validation report (CDM-RCPV-FORM) • Post-registration change request form (CDM-PRC-FORM)* • Post-registration change validation report (CDM-PRCV-FORM)* <p><i>* Applicable if a request for post-registration changes to the project activity is submitted together with this request for renewal of crediting period</i></p>	
1.5.2	<p>Are the titles and versions of the applied methodologies and, where applicable, of the applied standardized baselines consistent in the following documents?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewal of crediting period view page • Updated PDD (CDM-PDD-FORM, CDM-AR-PDD-FORM or CDM-CCS-PDD-FORM) • Validation report (CDM-RCPV-FORM) • Post-registration change request form (CDM-PRC-FORM)* • Post-registration change validation report (CDM-PRCV-FORM)* <p><i>* Applicable if a request for post-registration changes to the project activity is submitted together with this request for renewal of crediting period</i></p>	
1.5.3	<p>Is the estimated amount of emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals consistent in the following documents?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewal of crediting period view page • Updated PDD (CDM-PDD-FORM, CDM-AR-PDD-FORM or CDM-CCS-PDD-FORM) • Validation report (CDM-RCPV-FORM) 	



1.5.4	<p>Are the start date and the duration of the renewed crediting period of the project activity consistent in the following documents?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewal of crediting period view page • Updated PDD (CDM-PDD-FORM, CDM-AR-PDD-FORM or CDM-CCS-PDD-FORM) • Validation report (CDM-RCPV-FORM)
1.5.5	<p>Are the date of completion and the version of the updated PDD consistent with the following documents?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validation report (CDM-RCPV-FORM) • Post-registration change validation report (CDM-PRCV-FORM)* <p><i>* Applicable if a request for post-registration changes to the project activity is submitted together with this request for renewal of crediting period</i></p>
1.5.6	<p>Are sign-off dates consistent/logical in the following documents?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewal of crediting period request form (CDM-REN-FORM) • Updated PDD (CDM-PDD-FORM, CDM-AR-PDD-FORM or CDM-CCS-PDD-FORM) • Validation report (CDM-RCPV-FORM) • Post-registration change request form (CDM-PRC-FORM)* • Post-registration change validation report (CDM-PRCV-FORM)* <p><i>* Applicable if a request for post-registration changes to the project activity is submitted together with this request for renewal of crediting period</i></p>

2. Information and reporting check

Item No.	Description of item	Reference
2.1 Project design document		
2.1.1 Qualification as small-scale project activity	If the project activity is a small-scale CDM project activity, does the updated PDD demonstrate that it continues to qualify as a small-scale project type (Type I, II or III)? In case the project activity contains more than one component, does the updated PDD demonstrate that the sum of components for each type does not exceed the limits of that project type?	PS paras 114–116
2.1.2 References to methodologies and standardized baselines	Does the updated PDD contain the reference (number, title and version) of the selected methodologies and the selected standardize baselines, including any tools, standards and/or guidelines as required by the methodologies, valid at the time of submission?	PS para 53
2.1.3 Applicability of methodologies and standardized baselines	Does the updated PDD describe how all applicability conditions of the selected methodologies and the selected standardize baselines are met?	PS para 54
2.1.4 Project boundary, sources and GHGs	Does the updated PDD clearly define the project boundary of the project activity, including the physical delineation of the project activity, and which sources and GHGs are included in the project boundary in accordance with the applied methodologies and, where applicable, the applied standardize baselines?	PS paras 56, 57



2.1.5	Ex-ante calculation of emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals	Does the updated PDD update the section on ex-ante calculation of emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals, including how the selected values are applied in each equation in accordance with the applied methodologies and the applied standardized baselines?	PS para 70
2.1.6	Methodological choices	Does the updated PDD explain the methodological choices for the calculation of the baseline emissions/net removals, project emissions/actual net removals, leakage emissions, and emission reductions/net anthropogenic removals?	PS paras 70, 71
2.1.7	Data and parameters fixed ex ante	Does the updated PDD list data and parameters that are not monitored during the renewed crediting period? Are the details such as the values applied, accompanied by appropriate units, sources of the data, and justifications provided? If original baseline ex ante parameters are no longer valid, are these parameters updated in accordance with the “Methodological tool: Assessment of the validity of the original/current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period”?	PS paras 27–30, 72, 73, 290
2.1.8	National and/or sectoral policies and circumstances	Does the updated PDD incorporate the impact of national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances existing at the time of requesting for renewal of the crediting period on the current baseline emissions, except for the case where the project activity applies the valid version of an applicable standardized baseline that standardizes baseline scenario?	PS paras 288, 289
2.1.9	Data and parameters to be monitored	Does the updated PDD list all data and parameters to be monitored, as required by the applied methodologies and the applied standardized baselines? Are the details such as units, sources of the data, measurement methods and QA/QC procedures provided?	PS para 76
2.1.10	Sampling plan	If data and parameters to be monitored are to be determined by a sampling approach, does the PDD provide a description of the sampling plan?	PS para 74, SS section 4
2.1.11	Other elements of monitoring plan	Does the updated PDD contain other elements of a monitoring plan, including the operational and management structure for monitoring, provisions for data archiving, responsibilities and institutional arrangement for data collection and archiving?	PS para 77, SS section 4
2.1.12	Crediting period	Does the updated PDD indicate that the next crediting period commences on the day immediately after the expiration of the current crediting period?	PCP para 263
2.2 Validation report			
2.2.1	Form	Does the validation report indicate if the updated PDD was completed correctly using the applicable and valid version of PDD form and instructions therein? If the project participants used a later valid version of the PDD form for the updated PDD than the version of the PDD form of the registered PDD, does the validation report indicate if the DOE has determined whether information transferred to the later valid version of the PDD form is materially the same as that in the registered PDD?	VVS paras 406, 415(a)(i)(ii)
2.2.2	Description of project activity	Does the validation report describe the steps taken and the validation opinion on the accuracy and completeness of the project description in the updated PDD?	VVS paras 50, 51, 56



2.2.3 Updated PDD	Does the validation report indicate if the DOE has determined whether the project participants have updated the sections of the PDD relating to the baseline, estimated emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals, the monitoring plan and the crediting period in accordance with the relevant requirements in the PS?	VVS para 403
2.2.4 Project participants	Does the validation report indicate if the DOE has checked that the names of the project participants included in the updated PDD are consistent with the names of the project participants in the latest version of the MoC statement?	VVS para 409
2.2.5 Small-scale project activity	For a small-scale CDM project activity, does the validation report explain how the project activity continue to qualify for a small-scale CDM project activity?	VVS paras 162, 163
2.2.6 Compliance with methodologies	Does the validation report contain an assessment of whether the updated PDD complies with all the requirements in the selected methodologies, methodological tools and standardized baselines except for additionality demonstration?	VVS paras 407(b), 410, 411, 413, 415(a)(iii)
2.2.7 Applicability conditions	Does the validation report contain an assessment of how each applicability condition of the selected methodologies and standardized baselines is fulfilled by the project activity?	VVS paras 62, 67, 68, 415(a)(iii)
2.2.8 Deviation from the selected methodology	Does the validation report indicate if the project participants deviated from the selected approved methodology or methodological tool, hence requires a clarification on the applicability of them, or requested for deviation from them?	VVS paras 58, 59, 411
2.2.9 Project boundary, sources and GHGs	Does the validation report describe how the DOE has validated the project boundary and sources of GHGs, and if it has identified emission sources that are not addressed by the applied methodologies and/or standardized baselines which are expected to contribute more than 1% of the annual emission reductions?	VVS paras 69–74
2.2.10 Impact of national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances	Does the validation report describe how the DOE has assessed the validity of the original baseline or its update through an assessment of the impact of new relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances?	VVS para 407(a)
2.2.11 Validity of original baseline or its update	Does the validation report describe how the DOE has assessed the validity of the original baseline or its update through an assessment of the correctness of the application of the selected methodologies and standardized baselines?	VVS paras 407, 408, 415(a)(iv)
2.2.12 Validity of original estimation of emission reductions or its update	Does the validation report describe how the DOE has assessed the validity of the estimated emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals through an assessment of the correctness of the application of the selected methodologies and standardized baselines?	VVS para 415(a)(iv)
2.2.13 Compliance of monitoring plan with methodologies	Does the validation report contain an assessment of the compliance of the monitoring plan with the applied methodologies, tools and standardized baselines: whether it contains all necessary parameters, how each parameter is monitored and if any proposed sampling plan is in line with the “Standard: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities”?	VVS paras 117, 118(a), (c), 119(a), 415(a)(iv), SS section 6
2.2.14 Implementation of monitoring plan	Does the validation report contain an assessment of whether the monitoring arrangements, including the QA/QC procedures, are feasible within the project design and the project participants have ability to implement it?	VVS paras 118(b), 119(b), (c)



2.2.15 Crediting period	Does the validation report confirm that the renewed crediting period commences on the day immediately after the expiration of the current crediting period?	VVS para 415(a)(v)
2.2.16 Post-registration changes	Does the validation report provide a statement on whether any proposed post-registration changes for the next crediting period will be submitted together with the request for renewal of crediting period of the registered CDM project activity?	VVS para 415(d)
Validation process		
2.2.17 Standard auditing techniques	Does the validation report describe how the DOE has applied the standard auditing techniques as appropriate, including desk review, follow-up actions, referencing, review of the calculations and on-site inspection?	VVS paras 28–32, SS section 6
2.2.18 On-site inspection	If no on-site inspection was conducted, is a justification provided in the validation report?	VVS para 31
2.2.19 Application of sampling to validation work	If the DOE applied a sampling approach to its validation activities, does the validation report provide information on the sampling plan designed in accordance with the VVS, including, if a sampling approach is applied to on-site inspection, a description of how the sample size was determined and how the field check was carried out?	VVS paras 188, 272(e), 415(b)
2.2.20 Summary of validation process	Does the validation report include a summary of the validation process undertaken?	VVS 272(a), 415(b)
2.2.21 Dialogue with project participants	Does the validation report describe the results of the dialogue between the DOE and the project participants?	VVS 272(b), 415(b)
2.2.22 CARs, CLs, FARs	Does the validation report contain information on all CARs, CLs and FARs, the issues raised, the responses by the project participants, how they were resolved, and how they resulted in changes to the PDD or supporting annexes?	VVS paras 38, 272(b), 415(b)
2.2.23 FARs	In case FARs are raised, are they related to the project implementation and not to the registration requirements?	VVS para 36
2.2.24 Approaches to validation conclusions and opinion	Does the validation report describe the approaches taken, findings and conclusions, to reach the final validation opinion?	VVS paras 272(c), (d), 415(b)
2.2.25 List of reference	Does the validation report provide lists of on-site inspections, interviewees and documents reviewed?	VVS paras 272(e), 415(b)
2.2.26 Quality control	Does the validation report provide information on quality control within the team and in the validation process?	VVS paras 272(g), 415(b)
2.2.27 Validation team	Does the validation report include the details of the validation team members, technical experts, internal technical reviewers involved, and their roles in the validation activity?	VVS paras 272(f), (h), 415(b)
2.2.28 Validation methodology	Does the validation opinion include a summary of the validation methodology, procedures and the validation criteria applied and whether the project activity satisfies the criteria?	VVS paras 270(a), 415(c)
2.2.29 Non coverage	Does the validation opinion include a description of any of the project components or issues that are not covered by the validation?	VVS para 270(b), 415(c)



2.2.30 Validation opinion	Does the validation opinion include a summary of the validation conclusions, a statement on the validation of the expected emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals, and a statement on whether the renewal of crediting period meets the applicable CDM rules and requirements?	VVS paras 270(c), (d), (e), 415(c)
---------------------------	---	------------------------------------



Appendix 1. 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 during the completeness check of a request for registration in accordance with paragraph 78 of the PCP.

Issue No.	Description of issue
1.	Inconsistencies are clearly attributable to typographical errors and/or documents containing blank pages.
2.	Documents and appendices (including spreadsheets) are not readable or contain part of text not in English.
3.	Information in the request for renewal of crediting period is not consistent (e.g. sign-off dates, valid version of the VVS).
4.	Information of the project activity (e.g. version and completion date of updated PDD, renewed crediting period, titles and versions of the applied methodologies and the standardized baselines) is not consistent.
5.	The validation report does not contain appointment certificates or curricula vitae of the validation team members, technical experts and internal technical reviewers.
6.	Confidential documents are not submitted in two versions, one with redacted information for disclosure to the public and one with non-redacted information to be treated as confidential.
7.	Versions of the forms submitted are not valid at the time of the submission of the request for renewal of crediting period.
8.	Signatures are missing in the relevant documents.

* This list is not exhaustive and will be revised as and when required. The secretariat may contact the DOE or project participants on any issues of an editorial nature or consistency that are not included in the list above.



Appendix 2. Information and reporting check: issues of an editorial nature or missing basic information

The table below lists “issues of an editorial nature or missing basic information” for which the secretariat may request the DOE to submit the missing or revised documents and/or information during the information and reporting check of a request for registration in accordance with paragraph 81 of the PCP.

Issue No.	Description of the Item
1.	Any issue of an editorial nature or consistency that is not picked at the completeness check stage.
2.	Typographical errors in the updated PDD or validation report.
3.	Hyperlink/weblink in the updated PDD or validation report is missing or not opening.
4.	System diagrams of project boundary, monitoring line, management structure are missing or unclear in the updated PDD.
5.	GHG sources are not discussed in the updated PDD.
6.	The start date of the next crediting period is missing in the updated PDD.
7.	Recording frequency of parameters is not reported in the updated PDD as per the applied methodologies.
8.	In case of resubmission after the incomplete information and reporting check, any missing or unreadable documents or documents containing blank pages, typographical errors, or part of the text not in English.

* This list is not exhaustive and will be revised as and when required. The secretariat may contact the DOE or the project participants on any issues of an editorial nature or missing basic information that are not included in the list above.



UNFCCC/CCNUCC
Document information



<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
01.0	30 August 2017	<p>Initial publication.</p> <p>This document consolidates the “Request for renewal of crediting period and post registration changes: Completeness check checklist” (version 03.0) and the “Request for renewal of crediting period and post registration changes: Information and reporting check checklist” (version 02.0), but removes elements of post-registration changes.</p> <p>This document also reflects the “CDM project standard for project activities” (version 01.0), “CDM validation and verification standard for project activities” (version 01.0), “CDM project cycle procedure for project activities” (version 01.0) and “Standard: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities” (version 06.0).</p>
<p>Decision Class: Regulatory Document Type: Information note Business Function: Renewal of crediting period Keywords: completeness check, project activities</p>		