



**Performance assessment report on validation activity
(Version 04.0)**

SECTION 1: GENERAL INFORMATION

| | | | |
|---|--------------|--|--|
| Entity name | | | |
| UNFCCC entity ref.no. | | | |
| Site visit made by the CDM-AT (Yes/No) | | On-site assessment dates (if applicable): | |
| Address of the site(s) visited | | | |
| Scope(s) of accreditation of the activity under performance assessment | | | |
| 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 | | | |
| DOE team including technical reviewer/s | Name: | Role/expert: | |
| CDM-AT leader | | CDM-AT members | |
| Start date of the performance assessment | | | |

SECTION 2: EVALUATION

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

Each "NS" under the column "Rating" has to be supported by a finding report for draft assessment or non-conformity (NC) report format for final assessment. One finding/NC report form can be used for one or more than one "NS" in the column "Ratings" as some of the requirements are related to each other.

| Criteria <i>(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 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 validation; | | |
| c. That the project falls within the DOE's accredited sectoral scopes; | | |
| d. Other considerations | | |
| (ii) Has the DOE concluded the contract with a project participant who is listed in the PDD? | | |
| 1.(b) 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 selected team has 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? | | |
| 2. Validation | | |
| 2.(a) Has the DOE made the PDD publicly available through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website for global stakeholder consultation as per the project cycle procedure requirements? | | |
| 2.(b) Does the validation report reflect effectiveness of the DOE system to apply standard auditing techniques and "general validation requirements", in order to validate and report the following as per the applicable version of VVS, relevant decision of CMP and the CDM Executive Board | | |
| (i) The details of actions taken to take due account of comments received during global stakeholder consultation; | | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>(ii) Requirements for the approval by all parties involved in the project activity have been met; a. Requirements in the letter of approval; b. -Authenticity of letter of approval;</p> | | |
| <p>(iii) Whether each project participant has been authorized by at least one Party involved in a letter of approval and means of validation?</p> | | |
| <p>(iv) Confirmation that the DNA has considered whether the proposed CDM project activity assists the host Party in achieving sustainable development;</p> | | |
| <p>(v) Performance of due diligence on the MoC statement in accordance with the requirements;</p> | | |
| <p>(vi) Correct completion and authorization of the MoC statement;</p> | | |
| <p>(vii) Completion of PDD using the latest version of the applicable PDD form;</p> | | |
| <p>(viii) Whether the description of the proposed project activity in the PDD is accurate, complete, and provides an understanding of the proposed CDM project activity? a. -Requirement for physical site inspection;</p> | | |
| <p>(ix) Selected baseline and monitoring methodology is applicable to the project activity;</p> | | |
| <p>(x) Project boundary in accordance with the selected baseline and monitoring methodology; a. All sources of GHG required by methodology included; b. Identification of additional emission sources;</p> | | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>(xi) Baseline scenario identification in accordance with the selected monitoring and baseline methodology;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. All scenarios are considered and most reasonable baseline scenario correctly applied; b. Verifiable description of baseline scenario; c. Validation of data, assumptions; d. Calculations & rationale; e. Correct quotation & interpretation of sources referred; f. -All applicable CDM requirements and national/sectoral policies & circumstances taken to consideration; | | |
| <p>(xii) Algorithm & formulae in accordance with the selected baseline and monitoring methodology;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Consideration of all project emissions & leakage; b. -Appropriateness of the equations; c. -Validation of choice of data & parameters, assumptions & calculations; | | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>(xiii) Additionality;</p> <p>a. Prior consideration of CDM (105-112 of VVS):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reliable evidence for establishment of starting date; • Awareness of CDM & CDM was a decisive factor; • Continuing & real actions; <p>b. Identification of alternatives;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete list of credible alternatives <p>c. Investment analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accuracy of financial calculations; • Validation of assumptions, data values, factors & computations; • Suitability of any benchmark applied; • Appropriateness of input values from FSR; <p>d. Barrier analysis;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment & validation of each barrier for credibility; <p>e. Common practice analysis;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validation of the geographical scope; • Assessment of existing similar and operational projects; • Distinction of the project activity with the similar and operational projects; | | |
| <p>(xiv) Monitoring plan describes all necessary parameters and is in accordance with the selected baseline and monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s);</p> | | |
| <p>(xv) The CDM project participants have addressed the environmental impacts of the project activity successfully, including an environmental impact assessment (EIA) where required;</p> | | |
| <p>(xvi) The CDM project participants have invited comments from the local stakeholders, and due account was taken of any comments so received;</p> | | |
| <p>2.(c) Whether the applied sampling approach is in accordance with the guidelines? if applicable</p> | | |
| <p>2.(d) For small-scale project activity only</p> | | |
| <p>(i) The project activity qualifies within the thresholds of the small-scale project activities;</p> | | |
| <p>(ii) The project activity is not a debundled component of a large-scale project;</p> | | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| 2.(e) Was the internal quality control process adequate to capture issues missed by the validation team? | | |
| 3. Skills and technique <i>(only if on-site visit is made by the CDM-AT)</i> | | |
| 3.(a) The members of the team of the DOE: | | |
| (i) Applied standard auditing techniques to assess the correctness of information provided? | | |
| (ii) Based all findings on adequate factual evidence and referenced where necessary? | | |
| (iii) Showed ability to make considered decisions and justify them to the project participants? | | |
| 4. Assessment of the presentation of the validation report | | |
| 4.(a) Has the team of DOE raised all relevant issues through corrective actions requests (CARs), clarification requests (CLs) or forward actions requests (FARs)? | | |
| (i) Are the raised CARs/CLs/FARs accurately identified, formulated, discussed and closed adequately by the DOE? | | |
| (ii) Did the team provide any advice, consultancy or recommendation to CDM project participants on how to address any deficiencies? | | |
| 4.(b) Does the validation opinion include: | | |
| (i) Summary of validation methodology, process used, and the validation criteria applied? | | |
| (ii) Description of project components or issues not covered by the validation process? | | |
| (iii) Summary of validation conclusions? | | |
| (iv) Statement on the validation of expected emission reductions? | | |
| (v) Statement whether the proposed CDM project activity meets the stated criteria? | | |
| (vi) Is the validation opinion clear and unconditional? | | |
| 4.(c) Does the validation report cover the following: | | |
| (i) A summary of validation process to arrive at conclusions and its conclusions for conformity with applicable requirements; | | |
| (ii) Identification of the changes made to project documentation from what was made public and the final version of PDD; | | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| (iii) Reference to the data and information material used as evidence for validation and lists of interviewees; | | |
| (iv) Details of the validation team, technical experts, internal technical reviewers; their roles and details of who conducted the site visit; | | |
| (v) Information on quality control within the team and in the validation process; | | |
| (vi) Appointment certificates or CVs of the team members, validation team members, technical experts and internal technical reviewers; | | |
| 4.(d) Final decisions on validation is given by top management of the DOE? | | |
| Did the DOE conduct the verification/certification activity competently? | <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO | |
| CDM-AT leader signature | | |
| Date | | |
| SECTION 3: CLARIFICATION ON FINDINGS BY THE DOE | | |
| | | |
| SECTION 4: ASSESSMENT OF CLARIFICATION BY THE CDM-AT AND RAISING NCs | | |
| | | |
| General comments | | |
| <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 validation activity competently? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO | | |
| Final conclusions | | |
| | | |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| CDM-AT leader signature | |
| 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 validation 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 according to version 11.0 of the <i>CDM accreditation procedure</i>; • Change the title from <i>Performance assessment report validation (F-CDM-PAval)</i> to <i>Performance assessment report on validation activity (CDM-PAVA-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, validation