



CHECKLIST FOR REQUESTS FOR REGISTRATION 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 registration request form using the valid version of the form (CDM-REG-FORM) submitted? | PCP para 70 |
| 1.1.2 | Is a 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 22, PCP para 70 |
| 1.1.3 | Is a duly completed CDM small-scale project activities bundling form (CDM-SSC-BUN-FORM) using the valid version of the form submitted, where applicable? | PS para 122 |
| 1.1.4 | Is a letter of approval (LoA) and, if applicable, a separate letter of authorization of project participants, from the designated national authority (DNA) of each Party involved in the proposed CDM project activity submitted? | PS paras 107, 108 |
| 1.1.5 | Is a duly completed modalities of communication (MoC) statement using the valid version of the form (CDM-MOC-FORM) submitted? | PS para 112, PCP para 41 |
| 1.1.6 | Is a validation report using the valid version of the form (CDM-VAL-FORM) submitted? | VVS para 21, PCP para 70 |
| 1.1.7 | Are all documents prepared in English or do they contain a full translation of relevant sections into English? | PS para 26 |
| 1.1.8 | If a spreadsheet is submitted, is it in an accessible and verifiable (unprotected) format? | PS para 26 |
| 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 70 |
| 1.2.2 | Is the PDD published for global stakeholder consultation accessible? | PCP para 70 |
| 1.2.3 | 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 re-submission of the request for registration, that the same versions applied in the initial | PS paras 46, 48–50 |



| | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------|
| | submission can be applied within 90 days of the initial notification of the negative conclusion of the completeness check)? | PCP para 85 |
| 1.2.4 | Does the request for registration select a standardized baseline whose selection is mandatory at the time of submission of the request for registration, where applicable? | PS paras 49, 51 PCP para 30 |
| 1.3 Project design document | | |
| 1.3.1 | Are the documents for the demonstration of additionality, such as spreadsheets for the investment analysis, provided where applicable? | PS para 23, 220 |
| 1.3.2 | Are the documents for the ex ante calculation of emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals, such as spreadsheets, provided where applicable? | PS para 23, 220 |
| 1.3.3 | Is an appendix on the summary report of comments received from local stakeholders on the proposed CDM project activity provided? | PS para 100, PCP para 19(b) |
| 1.3.4 | 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 |
| 1.3.5 | Are data, values and formulae included in spreadsheets accessible and verifiable? | PS para 222 |
| 1.3.6 | Is the format of the PDD, including headings, logos and tables, unaltered? | PS para 26 |
| 1.3.7 | Are all sections of the PDD filled, or indicated as intentionally left blank (e.g. "Not applicable")? | PS para 26 |
| 1.4 Letter of approval/authorization | | |
| 1.4.1 | Does the LoA of each Party involved include a statement on the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol, voluntary participation, and refer to the precise title of the proposed CDM project activity? | PS para 107 |
| 1.4.2 | Does the LoA of the host Party include a statement that the proposed CDM project activity assists the host Party in achieving sustainable development? | PS para 109 |
| 1.4.3 | Is each project participant authorized, in the LoA or in a separate authorization letter, by at least one Party involved? | PS para 108 |
| 1.5 Modalities of communication | | |
| 1.5.1 | Are the focal point entities' scopes of authority clearly and correctly indicated? | PCP paras 39, 42, 43 |
| 1.5.2 | Is the Statement of Agreement (Section 3) signed by at least one authorized signatory for each project participant and is the information therein consistent with its Annex 1 of the MoC statement? | PCP paras 41, 44, 48 |
| 1.6 Validation report | | |
| 1.6.1 | Does the validation report indicate that the validation was conducted in accordance with a valid version of the VVS? | VVS para 20 |
| 1.6.2 | 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) |

**1.7 Consistency of information**

| | |
|-------|--|
| 1.7.1 | <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• Registration request form (CDM-REG-FORM)• PDD (CDM-PDD-FORM, CDM-AR-PDD-FORM or CDM-CCS-PDD-FORM)• PDD used for global stakeholder consultation• Validation report (CDM-VAL-FORM)• LoA• MoC statement (CDM-MOC-FORM)• CDM small-scale project activities bundling form (CDM-SSC-BUN-FORM), where applicable |
| 1.7.2 | <p>Are the Parties involved consistent in the following documents?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project view page• PDD (CDM-PDD-FORM, CDM-AR-PDD-FORM or CDM-CCS-PDD-FORM)• Validation report (CDM-VAL-FORM)• LoA• MoC statement (CDM-MOC-FORM)• CDM small-scale project activities bundling form (CDM-SSC-BUN-FORM), where applicable |
| 1.7.3 | <p>Are the project participants consistent in the following documents?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project view page• Registration request form (CDM-REG-FORM)• PDD (CDM-PDD-FORM, CDM-AR-PDD-FORM or CDM-CCS-PDD-FORM)• Validation report (CDM-VAL-FORM)• LoA• MoC statement (CDM-MOC-FORM)• CDM small-scale project activities bundling form (CDM-SSC-BUN-FORM), where applicable |
| 1.7.4 | <p>Are the sectoral scopes consistent in the following documents?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project view page• Registration request form (CDM-REG-FORM)• PDD (CDM-PDD-FORM, CDM-AR-PDD-FORM or CDM-CCS-PDD-FORM)• Validation report (CDM-VAL-FORM)• CDM small-scale project activities bundling form (CDM-SSC-BUN-FORM), where applicable |



| | |
|--------|--|
| 1.7.5 | <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">• Project view page• PDD (CDM-PDD-FORM, CDM-AR-PDD-FORM or CDM-CCS-PDD-FORM)• Validation report (CDM-VAL-FORM)• CDM small-scale project activities bundling form (CDM-SSC-BUN-FORM), where applicable |
| 1.7.6 | <p>Is the estimated amount of emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals consistent in the following documents?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project view page• PDD (CDM-PDD-FORM, CDM-AR-PDD-FORM or CDM-CCS-PDD-FORM)• Validation report (CDM-VAL-FORM)• CDM small-scale project activities bundling form (CDM-SSC-BUN-FORM), where applicable |
| 1.7.7 | <p>Is the start date of the project activity consistent in the following documents?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• PDD (CDM-PDD-FORM, CDM-AR-PDD-FORM or CDM-CCS-PDD-FORM)• Validation report (CDM-VAL-FORM) |
| 1.7.8 | <p>Are the project activity locations, including their geo-coordinates, consistent in the following documents?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project view page• PDD (CDM-PDD-FORM, CDM-AR-PDD-FORM or CDM-CCS-PDD-FORM)• Validation report (CDM-VAL-FORM)• CDM small-scale project activities bundling form (CDM-SSC-BUN-FORM), where applicable |
| 1.7.9 | <p>Are the start date and the duration of the crediting period of the project activity consistent in the following documents?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project view page• PDD (CDM-PDD-FORM, CDM-AR-PDD-FORM or CDM-CCS-PDD-FORM)• Validation report (CDM-VAL-FORM)• CDM small-scale project activities bundling form (CDM-SSC-BUN-FORM), where applicable |
| 1.7.10 | <p>Are the date of completion and the version of the PDD consistent in the following documents?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Validation report (CDM-VAL-FORM)• CDM small-scale project activities bundling form (CDM-SSC-BUN-FORM), where applicable |
| 1.7.11 | <p>Are sign-off dates consistent/logical in the following documents?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Registration request form (CDM-REG-FORM)• PDD (CDM-PDD-FORM, CDM-AR-PDD-FORM or CDM-CCS-PDD-FORM)• Validation report (CDM-VAL-FORM)• LoA• CDM small-scale project activities bundling form (CDM-SSC-BUN-FORM), where applicable |



2. Information and reporting check

| Item No. | Description of item | Reference |
|---|---|---------------------|
| 2.1 Project design document | | |
| 2.1.1 Description of project activity | Are all sections of the PDD for the description of the project activity completed, including the purpose and general description of the project activity, location of the project activity, applied technologies/measures, involved Parties and project participants, whether it receives public funding, the history of the project activity, and the demonstration on debundling where applicable? | PS paras 35–45, 125 |
| 2.1.2 Type of small-scale project activity | If the project activity is proposed as a small-scale CDM project activity, does the PDD indicate a small-scale project type, and explain that it is not a de-bundled component of a large-scale project activity, and, if it comprises more than one component, contain separate information on small-scale project type, technology/measure and application of the methodology for each component? | PS paras 113–126 |
| 2.1.3 Qualification as small-scale project activity | If the project activity is proposed as a small-scale CDM project activity, does the PDD demonstrate that it qualifies as a small-scale project type (Type I, II or III)? In case the project activity contains more than one component, does PDD demonstrate that the sum of components for each type does not exceed the limits of that project type? | PS paras 127–132 |
| 2.1.4 A/R project activity - description | For a proposed afforestation or reforestation (A/R) project activity, does the PDD describe present environmental conditions of the area planned for the project activity, presence of rare and endangered species and their habitats, species and varieties selected for the project activity, technologies and know-how that will be transferred to the host Party, if applicable and the legal title(s) to the land, current land tenure and rights enabling determination of the owner of tCERs or ICERs? | PS para 138 |
| 2.1.5 A/R project activity - project boundary | For a proposed A/R project activity, does the PDD define the project boundary under the control of the project participants? | PS paras 139–145 |
| 2.1.6 A/R project activity - eligibility of land | For a proposed A/R project activity, does the PDD explain the eligibility of the land for the project activity? | PS para 146 |
| 2.1.7 A/R project activity - addressing non-permanence | For a proposed A/R project activity, does the PDD specify the approach to addressing non-permanence (tCERs or ICERs)? | PS para 147 |
| 2.1.8 References to methodologies and standardized baselines | Does the 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 |
| 2.1.9 Applicability of methodologies and standardized baselines | Does the PDD describe how all applicability conditions of the selected methodologies and the selected standardize baselines are met? | PS para 54 |



| | | |
|---|--|--------------------------|
| 2.1.10 Project boundary, sources and GHGs | Does the 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 standardized baselines? | PS paras 56, 57 |
| 2.1.11 Establishment and description of baseline scenario | Does the PDD describe the baseline scenario and explain how it was established in accordance with the applied methodologies and the applied standardized baselines? | PS paras 58–65 |
| 2.1.12 Prior consideration | Where the start date of the project activity is before the publication of the PDD for global stakeholder consultation, does the PDD describe how the CDM benefits were considered in the decision to undertake the project as a CDM project activity in accordance with the PS? | PS paras 31–33 |
| 2.1.13 Demonstration of additionality | Does the PDD describe how additionality of the project activity is demonstrated in accordance with the applied methodologies, the applied standardized baselines and the PS? | PS paras 66–69, 133 |
| 2.1.14 Investment analysis | Where investment analysis is used to demonstrate additionality of the project activity, does the PDD list all relevant assumptions and parameters used in the analysis, such as the financial indicator, input values, benchmark, scenarios for cost comparison, and the results of the investment analysis, including sensitivity analysis? | PS para 67(a) |
| 2.1.15 Barrier analysis | Where barrier analysis is used to demonstrate additionality of the project activity, does the PDD describe each of the barriers presented? | PS paras 67(b), 68(a) |
| 2.1.16 Common practice analysis | If the project activity is proposed as a large-scale CDM project activity, does the PDD contain common practice analysis unless such analysis is not required by the applied methodologies? | PS para 68(b) |
| 2.1.17 Ex-ante calculation of emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals | Does the PDD present 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 |
| 2.1.18 Methodological choices | Does the 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 |
| 2.1.19 Data and parameters fixed ex ante | Does the PDD list data and parameters that are not monitored during the crediting period but are determined before the registration and remain fixed throughout the crediting period? Are the details such as the values applied, accompanied by appropriate units, sources of the data, and justifications provided? | PS paras 27–30, 72, 73 |
| 2.1.20 Data and parameters to be monitored | Does the 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 |
| 2.1.21 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 |



| | | | |
|--------|---|---|---------------------------|
| 2.1.22 | Other elements of monitoring plan | Does the 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 paras 77, SS section 4 |
| 2.1.23 | Delayed submission of monitoring plan | If the project participants choose to make a delayed submission of the monitoring plan, does the PDD contain a statement that the submission of the monitoring plan is delayed? | PS para 79 |
| 2.1.24 | Start date and operational lifetime of project activity | Does the PDD indicate the start date of the project activity and how it has been determined, and the expected operational lifetime? | PS paras 80, 81 |
| 2.1.25 | Crediting period | Does the PDD indicate the type, start date and duration of the crediting period? | PS paras 82–86 |
| 2.1.26 | Analysis of environmental impacts | Does the PDD include a summary of an analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity (if required by the host Party for a small-scale project activity)? | PS paras 87, 137, 167 |
| 2.1.27 | Environmental impact assessment | If an environmental impact assessment was carried out, does the PDD include its conclusions and reference to all related documentation? | PS paras 88, 168 |
| 2.1.28 | Analysis of socio-economic impacts | For an A/R project activity, does the PDD provide a summary of an analysis of the socio-economic impacts of the project activity? | PS para 169 |
| 2.1.29 | Socio-economic impact assessment | For an A/R project activity, if a socio-economic impact assessment was carried out for the project activity, does the PDD include its conclusions and references to all related documentation? | PS para 170 |
| 2.1.30 | Comprehensive environmental and socio-economic impact assessments | For a CCS project activity, does the PDD include detailed summary of the comprehensive environmental and socio-economic impact assessments and references to all related documentation? | PS paras 215, 216 |
| 2.1.31 | Modalities for local stakeholder consultation | Does the PDD describe the process of the local stakeholder consultation? If the local stakeholder consultation was carried out under the host Party rules, does the PDD provide a summary of the consultations? | PS paras 89–99, 102, 103 |
| 2.1.32 | Summary of comments | Does the PDD attach a summary report of the comments received during the local stakeholder consultation as a separate annex and provide an executive summary of this report in the PDD? | PS para 100 |
| 2.1.33 | Consideration of comments | Does PDD describe how the comments and complaints have been taken into account? | PS para 101 |
| 2.1.34 | Letter of approval – extended system | In case where the methodology applied to the proposed CDM project activity provides for the application of a system, such as an electricity grid, and that system extends across more than one Party, are LoAs from those other Parties also submitted? | PS para 111 |



| 2.2 Validation report | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|------------------------------|
| 2.2.1 | Global stakeholder consultation | Does the validation report contain information on the global stakeholder consultation, including dates, duration, how comments received have been taken in due account by the DOE, and whether the publication of a revised PDD for global stakeholder consultation is necessary? | VVS paras 254–265 |
| 2.2.2 | Form | Does the validation report indicate if the PDD was completed correctly using the applicable and valid version of PDD form and instructions therein? | VVS paras 48, 49 |
| 2.2.3 | 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 PDD? If the project activity involves the alteration of an existing installation or process, does the validation report contain an assessment whether the PDD states the differences resulting from the project activity compared to the pre-project scenario? | VVS paras 50, 51, 56 |
| 2.2.4 | History of project activity | If a “former project” as defined in the PS exists in the same geographical location of the project activity, or the project activity was a CPA that has been previously excluded from a registered PoA, does the validation report confirm that the project activity meets the relevant requirements to register as a CDM project activity? | VVS paras 52–55 |
| 2.2.5 | Small-scale project activity | For a proposed small-scale CDM project activity, does the validation report explain how the project activity qualifies for a small-scale CDM project activity and confirm that it is not a de-bundled component of a large-scale project activity? | VVS paras 162, 163, 168–172 |
| 2.2.6 | A/R project activity | For a proposed A/R project activity, does the validation report contain an assessment of the eligibility of the land for the project activity and the approach to addressing non-permanence? | VVS para 183 |
| 2.2.7 | Application of methodologies | Does the validation report contain an assessment of whether the selected methodologies and standardized baselines are applied correctly? | VVS paras 63, 64 |
| 2.2.8 | 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 |
| 2.2.9 | 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 |
| 2.2.10 | 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 |
| 2.2.11 | Baseline scenario identification | Does the validation report describe the steps taken to assess the baseline scenario, and provide a validation opinion on the assumptions and data used, the documentation and the relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances, and the method applied to crosscheck the information contained in the PDD? | VVS paras 75, 80, 81, 83, 84 |
| 2.2.12 | Alternative scenarios | Does the validation report indicate if the procedures in the applied methodologies have been correctly applied for the identification of the baseline scenario, and confirm that no alternative scenario has been excluded where the methodologies require several alternative scenarios to be considered? | VVS paras 77–79 |



| | | |
|---|--|---------------------------|
| 2.2.13 Standardized baseline scenario | If an approved standardized baseline that standardises the baseline scenario is applied to the project activity, does the validation report provide an opinion on whether the baseline scenario identified in the PDD is in accordance with the applied standardized baseline? | VVS paras 76, 82, 85 |
| 2.2.14 Project start date | Does the validation report describe how the start date of the project activity was validated to be in line with the "Glossary: CDM terms"? | VVS paras 40, 46(a) |
| 2.2.15 Evidence of prior consideration | For a project activity with a start date before 2 August 2008 and prior to the date of publication of the PDD for global stakeholder consultation, does the validation report describe how the evidence of the prior consideration of the CDM and the real and continuing actions were assessed? | VVS paras 42–45, 46(b) |
| 2.2.16 Compliance with the requirements | Does the validation report include a validation opinion regarding the project activity's compliance with the applicable requirements related to the prior consideration of the CDM status? | VVS para 46(c) |
| 2.2.17 Demonstration of additionality | Does the validation report describe the assessment of the option/approach taken by the project participant to demonstrate additionality and whether it is in accordance with the requirements by the applied methodologies, applicable guidelines and/or additionality criteria in the applied standardized baselines? | VVS paras 86–89, 174–178 |
| 2.2.18 Identification of alternatives | Where the baseline scenario is not prescribed in the applied methodologies, does the validation report indicate whether the list of alternatives presented in the PDD is credible and complete? | VVS paras 92, 93, 95 |
| 2.2.19 Investment analysis - accuracy | Where an investment analysis is used to demonstrate additionality, does the validation report contain a confirmation of the appropriateness of the underlying assumptions and the accuracy of financial calculations carried out for the investment analysis? | VVS paras 99, 102(c) |
| 2.2.20 Investment analysis - parameters used | Where an investment analysis is used to demonstrate additionality, does the validation report describe how the suitability of the parameters used in the financial calculation has been assessed? | VVS paras 99(a), (b), (c) |
| 2.2.21 Investment analysis - sensitivity analysis | Where an investment analysis is used to demonstrate additionality, does the validation report contain an assessment of the sensitivity analysis of the financial calculation to determine under what conditions variations in the result would occur and the likelihood of these conditions? | VVS para 99(e) |
| 2.2.22 Investment analysis - benchmark analysis | Where an investment analysis is used to demonstrate additionality, and where a benchmark analysis is conducted, does the validation report describe how the suitability of the benchmark has been assessed? | VVS paras 100, 102(b) |
| 2.2.23 Investment analysis - feasibility study report | Where an investment analysis is used to demonstrate additionality, and if the financial parameters used in the analysis are taken from a feasibility study report (FSR) that is approved by a national authority, does the validation report provide a clear validation opinion on the project activity's compliance with the applicable requirements related to the reference to the FSR? | VVS para 101 |
| 2.2.24 Barrier analysis | Where a barrier analysis is used to demonstrate additionality, does the validation report describe how the DOE has assessed each barrier identified by the project participants and the credibility of the barrier analysis? | VVS paras 103–106 |
| 2.2.25 Common practice analysis | Where a common practice analysis is used to demonstrate additionality, does the validation report describe validation of the analysis, in particular, the applicable geographical area, existence of similar projects, essential distinctions between the project activity and any similar projects, and confirm that the project activity is not a common practice? | VVS paras 107–109 |



| | | | |
|--------|--|--|--|
| 2.2.26 | Cross-check of information on additionality | Does the validation report provide describe all steps taken and sources of information for the DOE to cross-check the information in the PDD used to demonstrate additionality, and how the DOE has determined the credibility of the evidence, where applicable? | VVS paras 90, 179 |
| 2.2.27 | Application of equations and parameters | If the applied methodologies and/or standardized baselines provide options for equations and/or parameters for estimating emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals, does the validation report contain an assessment of whether the correct equations and parameters have been chosen, and all estimates can be replicated using the data and parameter values provided in the PDD? | VVS paras 111, 112, 113(d), (e) |
| 2.2.28 | Data and parameters fixed ex ante | Does the validation report verify that choices for data and parameters fixed throughout the crediting period are justified, sources of data and assumptions are appropriate, and result in an accurate or conservative estimation of the emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals? | VVS paras 112(a), 113(a), (b), (c), 114 |
| 2.2.29 | Data and parameters to be monitored | Does the validation report verify that estimates for data and parameters that will be monitored on implementation are reasonable? | VVS paras 112(b), 113(a), (b), (c), 114 |
| 2.2.30 | Parameters determined by sampling | If parameters are determined by sampling, does the validation report verify that sampling efforts have been correctly undertaken in accordance with the “Standard: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities”? | VVS paras 112, SS section 6 |
| 2.2.31 | Delayed submission of monitoring plan | Where applicable, does the validation report confirm that the project participants have chosen to delay the submission of the monitoring plan? | VVS paras 120–122 |
| 2.2.32 | 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 118(a), (c), 119(a) SS section 6 |
| 2.2.33 | 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) |
| 2.2.34 | Start date and crediting period | Does the validation report describe the steps taken to assess the compliance of the project activity’s start date, operational life time and crediting period with the relevant requirements in the PS? | VVS paras 123–125 |
| 2.2.35 | Analysis of environmental impacts | Does the validation report confirm that the analysis of environmental impacts of the project activity was carried out and a summary of the analysis and references to all related documentation were provided? | VVS paras 126, 128, 129, 206, 207, 209 |
| 2.2.36 | Environmental impact assessment | Does the validation report indicate whether the project participants or the host Party considered that the environmental impacts of the project activity significant, and if so, whether the project participants have undertaken an environmental impact assessment in accordance with the relevant procedures of the host Party and all conclusions and references to all related documentation were provided? | VVS paras 127–129, 208–210, |
| 2.2.37 | Analysis of socio-economic impacts | For an A/R project activity, does the validation report confirm that a summary of the analysis and references to all related documentation were provided? | VVS paras 211, 212, 214, 215 |



| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| 2.2.38 | Socio-economic impact assessment | For an A/R project activity, does the validation report indicate whether the project participants or the host Party considered any negative socio-economic impact of the project activity significant, and if so, whether the project participants have undertaken a socio-economic impact assessment in accordance with the relevant procedures of the host Party and all conclusions and references to all related documentation were provided? | VVS paras 213–215 |
| 2.2.39 | Comprehensive environmental and socio-economic impact assessments | For a CCS project activity, does the validation report indicate whether the project participants have undertaken a comprehensive environmental and socio-economic impact assessments in accordance with the relevant procedures of the host Party, describe how the DOE has validated the compliance of the planned monitoring and remedial measures to address any environmental and socio-economic impacts, and state whether the results of the assessments confirm the technical and environmental viability of the project activity? | VVS paras 249–252 |
| 2.2.40 | Local stakeholder comments | Does the validation report contain an assessment of the adequacy of the local stakeholder consultation process conducted and whether comments from stakeholders, if any, have been taken in due account? | VVS paras 130–137 |
| 2.2.41 | Sustainable development co-benefits | Does the validation report state whether a document describing how the project participants intend to monitor sustainable development co-benefits of the proposed CDM project activity was developed by the project participants separately from the monitoring plan? | VVS para 138 |
| 2.2.42 | Receipt of LoAs | Is the receipt of the valid LoAs reported in the validation report, including whether the LoAs were received from the project participants or directly from the DNAs? | VVS paras 139, 143, 144, 145(a), (b) |
| 2.2.43 | Content of LoAs | Does the validation report indicate if the LoAs include clear statements on: i) the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol; ii) voluntary participation; and iii) contribution to the sustainable development of the host country in the host Party LoA; and refers to the precise title of the project activity? | VVS paras 140, 141, 145(d) |
| 2.2.44 | Authorization | Does the validation report indicate how it has confirmed that the participation of each project participant has been authorized by a Party involved? | VVS paras 147–151 |
| Validation process | | | |
| 2.2.45 | 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 |
| 2.2.46 | On-site inspection | If no on-site inspection was conducted, is a justification provided in the validation report? | VVS para 31 |
| 2.2.47 | 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) |
| 2.2.48 | Summary of validation process | Does the validation report include a summary of the validation process undertaken? | VVS 272(a) |
| 2.2.49 | Dialogue with project participants | Does the validation report describe the results of the dialogue between the DOE and the project participants, as well as any adjustments made to the project design following the stakeholder consultation? | VVS 272(b) |



| | | |
|---|--|----------------------------|
| 2.2.50 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? In case FARs are raised, are they related to the project implementation and not to the registration requirements? | VVS paras 36, 38, 272(b) |
| 2.2.51 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) |
| 2.2.52 List of reference | Does the validation report provide lists of on-site inspections, interviewees and documents reviewed? | VVS para 272(e) |
| 2.2.53 Quality control | Does the validation report provide information on quality control within the team and in the validation process? | VVS para 272(g) |
| 2.2.54 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) |
| 2.2.55 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), (e) |
| 2.2.56 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) |
| 2.2.57 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 proposed project activity meets the applicable CDM rules and requirements? | VVS paras 270(c), (d), (e) |



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 registration 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 PDD, crediting period, project activity title, geo-coordinates, names of Parties and project participants, type of involvement of Parties (directly/indirectly), sectoral scopes, titles and versions of the applied methodologies and the standardized baselines, start date of the project activity) 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. | The MoC statement is illegible or information is missing. |
| 7. | LoAs by multiple Parties have been submitted in one single pdf file. |
| 8. | More than one LoA has been submitted from the same Party including for the authorization of different project participants. |
| 9. | 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. |
| 10. | Versions of the forms submitted are not valid at the time of the submission of the request for registration. |
| 11. | 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 PDD or validation report. |
| 3. | Hyperlink/weblink in the 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 PDD. |
| 5. | GHG sources are not discussed in the PDD. |
| 6. | The start date of the crediting period is missing in the PDD except for cases where the project participants intend to start the crediting period after the registration of the project activity. |
| 7. | Recording frequency of parameters is not reported in the 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 “CDM project activity request for registration: Completeness check checklist” (version 04.0) and the “CDM project activity request for registration: Information and reporting check checklist” (version 02.0).</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: Registration Keywords: completeness check, project activities</p> | | |