Performance assessment report on validation of a Programme of activities (PoA) (Version 03.0)

This form is to be used by CDM-AT members for carrying out a performance assessment of a designated operational entity (DOE) on its validation activity for a programme of activities (PoA).

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 tool(s) used			Version no.:
Standards applied (e.g. CDM validation and verification standard (VVS), CDM project standard (PS), PoA standard, etc.)			Version no.:
UNFCCC PoA reference number		Scale at CPA level:	Small/Large:
PoA title			
Brief description of the PoA			
Brief description of the specific CPA(s)			
Technical area(s) of the PoA			
DOE validation team including technical reviewers	Name:	Role:	
CDM-AT leader		CDM-AT member	
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 non-conformity (NC) report. One NC report form can be used for one or more "NS"s if they relate to the same CDM accreditation requirement.**		
Criteria *(as applicable to the activity assessed)*	**Draft assessment**	
	Rating	**Comments**
1. Process requirements		
(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 CME and/or project participants 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 PoA falls within the DOE's accredited sectoral scopes;		
d. Other considerations		
(ii) Has the DOE concluded the contract with the CME and/or project participants who are listed in the PoA-DD?		
(b) Planning of validation by the DOE		
(i) Did the DOE follow a procedure that is in compliance with the accreditation standard for selecting the validation team members/technical reviewer for the PoA?		
(ii) Did the DOE confirm that the selected validation team has no conflict of interest with respect to the PoA?		
(iii) Did the DOE change any validation team member during the process? If so, did the DOE follow a procedure to ensure that the team continues to be competent and impartial?		
(iv) Were the tasks given to each validation team member clearly defined and communicated to the client with sufficient information to object to the appointment of the team		

member?		
2. Validation		
(a) Has the DOE made the PoA-DD and specific CPA-DD(s) publicly available through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website for global stakeholder consultation as per the CDM project cycle procedure (PCP)?		
(b) Does the validation report on PoA-DD Part – I reflect the 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 the VVS, relevant decisions of the CMP and the CDM Executive Board?		
(i) Actions taken to take due account of comments received during the global stakeholder consultation;		
(ii) Approval of voluntary participation by all Parties involved in the programme of activity have been met;		
(iii) Authorization of the CME by all Parties involved in the letters of approval and means of validation;		
(iv) Authorization of each project participant by at least one Party involved in a letter of approval and means of validation;		
(v) Confirmation by the DNA of the host Party that the proposed PoA assists the host Party in achieving sustainable development;		
(vi) Performance of due diligence on the Modalities of Communication (MoC) statement in accordance with the PCP;		
(vii) Completion and authorization of the MoC statement;		
(viii) Completion of PoA-DD and CPA-DD(s) using the applicable version of the forms;		
(ix) Description of the PoA whether it is accurate, complete, and provides an understanding of the PoA?		
(x) Correctness of the starting date of the PoA and duration of the PoA (not exceeding 28 years);		
(xi) Whether the following mandatory eligibility criteria are sufficiently objective and comprehensive to permit assessment of inclusion of		

CPAs in the PoA:		
a. Identification of the geographical boundary;		
b. Conditions that avoid double counting of emission reductions;		
c. Technology/measure specifications including the level and type of service, performance specifications including compliance with testing/certifications;		
d. Documentary evidence to be used to confirm the start date of a CPA;		
e. Conditions to ensure the CPAs' compliance with requirements of a single or multiple methodologies;		
f. Conditions for local stakeholder consultations;		
g. Conditions for environmental impact analysis;		
h. Conditions to provide affirmation that the funding from Annex I Parties, if any, does not result in a diversion of official development assistance;		
i. Where applicable, identification of the target group (e.g. domestic/commercial/industrial, rural/urban, grid-connected/off-grid) and distribution mechanisms (e.g. direct installation);		
j. Where applicable, conditions for application of the sampling approach and plan in accordance with the "Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities";		
k. Where applicable, condition to verify that every CPA (in aggregate if it comprises of independent sub units) meets the small-scale or microscale threshold and remains within those thresholds throughout the crediting period of the CPA;		
l. Where applicable, requirements for the debundling check, in case the CPAs belongs to small-scale or microscale project categories;		

m. Conditions to ensure that relevant additionality related guidelines, tools or any requirements embedded in the methodologies are met: • Approach according to the scale of CPA (large-scale/small-scale/microscale);		
• Investment analysis at CPA level: o List of input parameters; o Source of input parameters; o Accuracy of financial calculations; o Suitability of any benchmark applied; o Input parameters that will be used in the investment analysis;		
• Investment analysis at PoA level: o Range of values for each input parameters; o Source of input parameters; o Accuracy of financial calculations; o Assumptions, data values, factors and computations; o Suitability of any benchmark applied;		
• Barrier analysis; o Each barrier for credibility;		
n. Is the Common Practice Analysis in line with the relevant guideline?		
o. Are any other relevant eligibility criteria identified and included by the CME?		
(xii) Are the eligibility criteria verifiable?		
(xiii) Where applicable, whether distinct eligibility is established of criteria for the PoA including combination of technologies/measures and/or methodologies;		
(xiv) Where applicable, “cross effects”, as defined in the PS, if the		

PoA applies multiple methodologies;		
(xv) Management system to ensure that each specific CPA meets all requirements and eligibility criteria;		
(c) Does the validation report on PoA-DD (Part II - generic CPA) reflect the 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 the VVS, relevant decisions of the CMP and the CDM Executive Board?		
(i) Is the description of generic CPA(s) accurate and complete?		
(ii) Is the section related to the application of a baseline methodology complete and does it provide a reference to the approved methodology(ies), sources and GHGs, data and parameters used to calculate the emission reductions (incl. values of ex ante parameters) and methodological choices?		
(iii) Does the generic CPA-DD provide a description of baseline scenario in line with the applicable methodology and relevant guidance?		
(iv) Does the generic CPA-DD demonstrate that it conforms to the eligibility criteria for inclusion of CPAs established at the PoA, including that on additionality?		
(v) Is the monitoring plan correct and complete in line with the monitoring methodology(ies)?		
(d) Does the validation report on specific CPA(s) reflect the 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 the VVS, relevant decisions of CMP and the CDM Executive Board?		
(i) Is the description of specific CPA(s) in the CPA-DD(s) is accurate, complete, and does it provides an understanding of the CPA? Does it include: a. Requirement for physical site inspection? b. Entity/individual responsible for CPA?		
(ii) Start date of the CPA(s) in accordance with the PS;		

(iii) Whether the expected operational lifetime of the CPA(s) is clearly reported and is line with the duration of the PoA;		
(iv) Crediting period in terms of the start date and length for the CPA(s);		
(v) Information of public funding for the CPA(s);		
(vi) Where applicable, whether an environmental impact analysis was conducted at the CPA level;		
(vii) Where applicable, whether a local stakeholder consultation was conducted at the CPA level;		
(viii) Compliance of the CPA(s) with the eligibility criteria for inclusion established at the PoA;		
(ix) Estimation of emission reductions and explanation of methodological choices: a. The baseline scenario identification in accordance with the selected methodology: • All reasonable scenarios; • Verifiable description of baseline scenario; • Validation of data, assumptions; • Calculations and rationale; • Correct quotation and interpretation of sources referred; • All applicable CDM requirements and national/sectoral policies and circumstances taken to consideration; b. Algorithm and formulae in accordance with the selected methodology; • Consideration of all project emissions and leakage; • Appropriateness of the equations; • Validation of choice of data and parameters, assumptions and calculations; **c.** Ex ante estimates of emission reductions by the CPA(s)		
(x) Where applicable, application of the sampling approach and plan in accordance with the PoA-DD;		
(xi) Application of the monitoring		

methodology and description of the monitoring plan: a. Whether the monitoring plan describes all necessary parameters and is in accordance with the selected methodology including applicable tool(s); b. Whether the monitoring plan includes a description of: • QA/QC procedures; • Uncertainty and accuracy levels; • Calibration frequency;		
(e) Was the internal quality control process adequate to capture issues missed by the validation team?		
3. Skills and technique *(only if site visit is made by the CDM-AT)*		
(a) Have the members of the validation 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 justified them to the CME and/or project participants?		
4. Presentation of validation report		
(a) Has the DOE raised corrective action requests (CARs), clarification requests (CLs) or forward action requests (FARs)? (i) Are all the relevant issues identified? (ii) Are the raised CARs/CLs/FARs accurately identified, formulated, discussed and closed adequately by the DOE? (iii) Did the validation team provide any advice, consultancy or recommendation to the CME and/or project participants on how to address any deficiencies?		
(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 PoA and CPA(s) meet(s) the stated criteria?		
(vi) Is the validation opinion clear and unconditional?		
(c) Does the validation report cover the following?		
(i) Summary of the 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 the PoA-DD and specific CPA-DD(s);		
(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, 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 validation team members, technical experts and internal technical reviewers;		
(d) Is the final decision on the validation given by the top management of the DOE?		
Did the DOE conduct the verification/certification activity competently?	☐ YES ☐ 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 ☐ **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.** *The CDM-AT shall substantiate issues in this section, if the checkbox above is ticked.*	
Did the DOE conduct the validation activity competently? ☐ **YES** ☐ **NO**	
Final conclusions	
Signature by CDM-AT leader:	
Date	

- - - - -

Document information

Version	*Date*	*Description*
03.0	5 November 2019	Addition of field to conclude whether the DOE conducted the validation activity competently to align with version 14.0 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 align and improve according to version 11.0 of the *CDM accreditation procedure*.
01.0	25 October 2013	Initial publication.

Decision Class: Regulatory
Document Type: Form
Business Function: Accreditation
Keywords: AT, performance assessment, programme of activities