



**Performance assessment report on
verification/certification activity
(Version 04.0)**

SECTION 1: GENERAL INFORMATION

Entity name			
UNFCCC entity ref. no.			
Address of the site visited			
Scope(s) of accreditation of the activity under performance monitoring			
Approved methodology(ies) and Tools used		Version no.:	
UNFCCC project reference number		Scale:	
Project title			
Brief description of the project activity			
Technical area(s) of the project activity		Monitoring period	
DOE team including technical reviewer(s):	Name:	Role/expert:	
CDM-AT names and their roles			
Start date of the performance assessment:	<i>(include date of the site visit)</i>		

SECTION 2: EVALUATION

(Key : S = Satisfactory, NS = Not satisfactory, NA = Not applicable/cannot comment)

Criteria <i>(fill as applicable to the activity assessed)</i>	Draft assessment	
	Rating	Comments
1. Process requirements		
1.(a) Contract review and allocation of resources		
(i) Did the DOE carry out an effective review of the request for application and supplementary information before entering into a contractual agreement with the CDM project participant to ensure;		
a. That there are no impartiality issues that contravene the CDM accreditation requirements;		
b. -That the DOE has necessary human resources with required competence to perform the verification;		

c. That the project falls within the DOE's accredited sectoral scopes;		
d. Other considerations		
(ii) Was the contract with the CDM project participant concluded by the DOE for verification?		
1.(b) Making the monitoring report public		
(i) Did the DOE submit the monitoring report for publication on UNFCCC CDM website as per the Project cycle procedure? When was this made publicly available? Dids the DOE confirm that only the verification activities after the publication were used as basis for concluding the verification?		
1.(c) Assessment of effective planning by the entity		
(i) Did the DOE follow procedure in compliance with the accreditation standard for selecting the team members/technical reviewer for project activity?		
(ii) Did the DOE confirm that the team selected have no conflict of interest with respect to the CDM project activity?		
(iii) Did the DOE change any team member during the process? If so, did the DOE follow procedures to ensure that the team continues to be competent and impartial?		
(iv) Were the tasks given to each member of the validation team clearly defined and communicated to the client with sufficient information to object to appointment?		
(v) Did the entity circulate any assessment plan for the on-site assessment?		
(vi) Did the DOE team identify and review the pertinent documents related to the project activity prior to the starting of verification assessment?		
2. On-site visit		
2.(a) Skills and technique		
(i) Did the team leader show ability to:		
a. Plan and make effective use of human resources during the verification?		
b. Represent the team while communicating to CDM-PP;		

c. Lead the team to reach to conclusion;		
d. Prevent and resolve conflicts (if any)?		
(ii) Did the team members show ability to:		
a. Plan and organise the work effectively;		
b. Collect information through effective interviews, listening, observing and review of documents, records and data;		
c. -Verify accuracy of collected information and confirm the sufficiency and appropriateness of gathered evidence to support verification findings, and conclusion and prepare verification reports;		
d. -Communicate effectively through personal knowledge of language or through the assistance by an interpreter;		
(iii) Whether the verification team:		
a. Acted impartially in their work through contractual or employment conditions and assignment conditions;		
b. Did not provide any advice, consultancy or recommendation to the CDM-PP on how to address identified deficiencies;		
3. Verification		
3.(a) Does the verification process and the report reflect the capability of the DOE system to apply standard auditing techniques to assess the quality of the information, in order to verify and report the following requirements as per applicable version of the VVS, relevant decisions of the CMP and the CDM Executive Board		
(i) Project implementation in accordance with the registered PDD; a. Implementation status; b. Actual operation; c. Increase/potential increase of estimated emission reductions;		
(ii) Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology;		

<p>(iii) Compliance of implementation of monitoring of parameters in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD or any accepted revised monitoring plan;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Monitoring plan has been properly implemented and followed; b. All parameters have been monitored and updated as applicable; c. Monitoring results are consistently recorded as per approved frequency; d. QA/QC procedures have been applied; 		
<p>(iv) Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments;</p>		
<p>(v) Assessment of data and calculation of greenhouse gas emission reductions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Completeness of data verified; b. -Cross-checked with other sources; c. Calculations of emissions in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology d. Justification of assumptions; e. -Correct application of default values; 		
<p>3.(b) Has the DOE adequately verified and reported post registration changes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan and/or monitoring methodology; (ii) Corrections; (iii) Changes to the start date of the crediting period; (iv) Permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan or monitoring methodology; (v) Changes to the project design of a registered project activity; 		
<p>3.(c) Was the applied sampling approach in accordance with the guidelines?</p>		
<p>3.(d) Was the internal quality control process adequate to capture issues missed by the verification team?</p>		
<p>4. Assessment of the presentation of the draft verification report</p>		
<p>4.(a) Was the draft report, correct representation of the work carried out by the DOE team?</p>		

<p>4.(b) Were the raised CARs/CLs/FARs accurately identified, formulated, discussed and concluded adequately by the DOE team?</p>		
<p>4.(c) Did the draft verification report include:</p>		
<p>(i) An overview of the verification process used by the DOE in order to arrive at its verification conclusions, identification of verification findings and justification;</p>		
<p>(ii) The scope of verification;</p>		
<p>(iii) Details of the verification team, technical experts, internal reviewers involved, together with their roles in the verification activity and details of who conducted the on-site visit;</p>		
<p>(iv) Findings of the desk review and site visit;</p>		
<p>(v) All of the DOE's findings and conclusions for each requirement;</p>		
<p>(vi) A list of each parameter specified by the monitoring plan and a statement on how the values in the monitoring report have been verified;</p>		
<p>(vii) A statement that identifies any changes to the registered PDD, and their date of approval by the CDM Executive Board;</p>		
<p>(viii) An assessment and close-out of any CARs, CLs or FARs issued to the project participants;</p>		
<p>(ix) An assessment of remaining issues from the previous verification period, if appropriate;</p>		
<p>(x) A conclusion on the verified amount of emission reductions achieved.</p>		
<p>Did the DOE conduct the verification/certification activity competently?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>	
<p>CDM-AT leader: <i>(Signature)</i></p>		
<p>Date</p>		
<p>SECTION 3: CLARIFICATION ON FINDINGS BY THE DOE</p>		
<p>SECTION 4: ASSESSMENT OF CLARIFICATIONS BY THE CDM-AT AND RAISING NCs</p>		

General comments <i>Was the work systematically approached and implemented by the entity team? Did the team provide the impression that results would be provided with the same quality all the time? Was the assessor or its team leader sidetracked? Was the body language of the team members conducive to the verification and certification activity? How did the team perform under pressure? Did the entity team show capacity to adapt to circumstances as necessary?</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Case to be presented to the CDM-AP since there is evidence that the DOE intentionally provided false information, intentionally omitted to provide information that should have been provided, or deliberately violated accreditation requirement.	
<i>The CDM-AT shall substantiate issues in this section, if the checkbox above is ticked.</i>	
Did the DOE conduct the verification/certification activity competently? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Final conclusions	
CDM-AT-leader: <i>(Signature)</i>	
Date	

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
04.0	5 November 2019	Revision to ensure consistency with version 14.0 of the “CDM accreditation procedure” (CDM-EB05-A02-PROC) for requirement to conclude whether the DOE conducted the verification/certification activity competently.
03.0	27 June 2016	Addition of field to conclude whether the DOE conducted the verification/certification activity competently to align with version 12.0 of the CDM accreditation procedure (CDM-EB05-A02-PROC).
02.1	29 January 2015	Editorial revision to include “Other considerations” in Section 2.
02.0	30 April 2014	Revision to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Align and improve with version 11.0 of the <i>CDM accreditation procedure</i>; • Change the title from <i>Performance assessment report verification and certification (F-CDM-PAver)</i> to <i>Performance assessment report on verification/certification activity (CDM-PAVE-FORM)</i>.
01.1	9 May 2012	Editorial changes to include new logo and other improvements.
01.0	15 July 2009	Initial publication.

Decision Class: Regulatory
Document Type: Form
Business Function: Accreditation
Keywords: performance assessment, verification