



## CHECKLIST FOR REQUESTS FOR POST-REGISTRATION CHANGES TO PROJECT ACTIVITIES (VERSION 03.0)

**PS:** Standard: CDM project standard for project activities (version 03.0)  
**VVS:** Standard: CDM validation and verification standard for project activities (version 03.0)  
**PCP:** Procedure: CDM project cycle procedure for project activities (version 03.0)

### 1. Completeness check

Item No.	Description of item	Reference
<b>1.1 Documentation</b>		
.1	Is a duly completed “Post-registration changes request form” (CDM-PRC-FORM) using the valid version submitted?	PCP para 137(a)
.2	Is a validation report for post-registration changes using the valid version of the form (CDM-PRCV-FORM) submitted?	PCP para 137(b), VVS para 21
.3	Is a revised PDD (in both clean and track-change versions) using the valid version of the applicable PDD form (CDM-PDD-FORM, CDM-AR-PDD-FORM or CDM-CCS-PDD-FORM) submitted, except in case of temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents?	PS para230, PCP paras129, 137(c)
.4	Is supplemental documentation (e.g. emission reduction or net anthropogenic removal worksheet, financial calculations, etc.) submitted as appropriate?	PS para 23, PCP para 136(d)
.5	Are all documents prepared in English or do they contain a full translation of relevant sections into English?	PS para 26
.6	Is the spreadsheet, if submitted, in an accessible and verifiable (unprotected) format?	PS para 26
<b>1.2 Post-registration change request view page</b>		
1	If the post-registration change request is submitted, are all relevant sections of the post-registration change request view page completed?	PCP para 137
<b>1.3 Project design document</b>		
1	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 220
2	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	Does the validation report indicate that the validation was conducted in accordance with a valid version of the VVS?	VVS para 20
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 paras 272(h), 280(b)
1.5 Consistency of information		
.1	Are the project activity title and the UNFCCC reference number consistent in the following documents? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project view page</li> <li>• Post-registration change request form (CDM-PRC-FORM)</li> <li>• Post-registration change validation report (CDM-PRCV-FORM)</li> <li>• Revised PDD</li> <li>• Supplemental documentation</li> </ul>	
.2	Are the titles, versions and UNFCCC reference numbers of the applied methodologies and, where applicable, of the applied standardized baselines consistent in the following documents? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project view page</li> <li>• Post-registration change request form (CDM-PRC-FORM)</li> <li>• Post-registration change validation report (CDM-PRCV-FORM)</li> <li>• Revised PDD</li> <li>• Supplemental documentation</li> </ul>	
.3	Is the estimated amount of emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals consistent among the documents? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Post-registration change validation report (CDM-PRCV-FORM)</li> <li>• Revised PDD</li> <li>• Supplemental documentation</li> </ul>	
.4	Is the reference to the type of post-registration changes consistent in the following documents? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project view page</li> <li>• Post-registration change request form (CDM-PRC-FORM)</li> <li>• Post-registration change validation report (CDM-PRCV-FORM)</li> <li>• Revised PDD</li> <li>• Supplemental documentation</li> </ul>	
.5	Are sign-off dates consistent/logical in the following documents? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Post-registration change request form (CDM-PRC-FORM)</li> <li>• Post-registration change validation report (CDM-PRCV-FORM)</li> </ul>	

**2. Information and reporting check\***

*\*Applicable only if a request for post-registration changes is submitted together with a request for issuance of CERs (post-registration change – issuance track) or with a request for renewal of crediting period of the project activity.*

Item No.	Description of item	Reference
<b>2.1 Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents</b>		
2.1.1 Description of deviation	Does the monitoring report provide a description of the nature, extent and duration of the non-conforming monitoring period, and propose alternative monitoring arrangements or apply the most conservative values approach?	PS para 231
2.1.2 Validation – alternative monitoring arrangements or most conservative values approach	Does the validation report determine whether the project participants proposed alternative monitoring arrangements or applied the most conservative values approach referred to in the PS for the non-conforming monitoring period? If alternative monitoring arrangements are proposed, does the validation report determine whether the arrangements apply conservative assumptions or discount factors to the calculations of emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals?	VVS paras 282, 283
2.1.3 Validation – deviation period	If the temporary deviation may be applicable to the monitoring period under verification and part of the subsequent monitoring period, does the verification report determine the exact period to which the deviation applies?	VVS para 285
2.1.4 Validation - compliance with requirements	Does the validation report state the DOE's opinion on whether the temporary deviation complies with the relevant requirements in the PS?	VVS paras 281, 286
<b>2.2 Corrections</b>		
2.2.1 Detail of corrections	Does the revised PDD clearly indicate the corrections to project information and/or parameters fixed at registration of the CDM project activity? Are these corrections to parameters genuinely corrections and not the updates?	PS para 232
2.2.2 Validation	Does the validation report state how the DOE has assessed that the corrected information is accurate reflection of actual project information and/or the corrected parameters reflect application of the applied methodologies, the registered monitoring plan, the applied standardized baselines and the other applied methodological regulatory documents?	VVS paras 288, 289
<b>2.3 Changes to the start date of the crediting period</b>		
2.3.1 Indication of change	Does the revised PDD clearly indicate the change to the start of the crediting period?	PS paras 233, 234
2.3.2 Impact of change	Does the revised PDD demonstrate the impact of the change on the baseline and, where applicable, additionality, and that the substantive progress to start the project activity has been made?	PS paras 235, 236



2.3.3	Validation	Does the validation report state the DOE's opinion whether the proposed change to the start date complies with the relevant requirements in the PS?	VVS paras 290, 291
<b>2.4 Inclusion of monitoring plan</b>			
2.4.1	Data and parameters monitored	Does the revised PDD list all data and parameters to be monitored, as required by the applied methodologies, the applied standardized baselines and the other applied methodological regulatory documents? Are the details such as units, sources of data, measurement methods and QA/QC procedures provided?	PS paras 79–81
2.4.2	Sampling plan	If data and parameters to be monitored are to be determined by a sampling approach, does the revised PDD provide a description of the sampling plan?	PS para 77
2.4.3	Other elements of monitoring plan	Does the revised 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 82
2.4.4	Validation - compliance with requirements	Does the validation report describe how the DOE has assessed the compliance of the monitoring plan with the applied methodologies, the applied standardized baselines, the other applied methodological regulatory documents: whether it contains all necessary parameters; how each parameter is monitored; and whether 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)
2.4.5	Validation - feasibility	Does the validation report describe how the DOE has assessed 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)
<b>2.5 Permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan, or permanent deviation of monitoring from the applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents</b>			
2.5.1	Description of change	Does the revised PDD provide a description of the nature and extent of the non-conforming monitoring and the proposed alternative monitoring?	PS para 238
2.5.2	Conservativeness	Does the revised PDD demonstrate that assumptions or discount factors used for the calculations of emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals do not lead to their over-estimation?	PS para 239
2.5.3	Validation - description	Does the validation report describe how the DOE has assessed whether the permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan described in the revised PDD are in compliance with the applied methodologies, the applied standardized baselines or the other applied methodological regulatory documents? If the registered project activity applies ex post parameter values where there was no applicable standardized baseline and the PPs switch to the ex ante values determined by applying an applicable standardized baseline, whether the PRC has been submitted for such changes?	VVS para 297 PS para 263



2.5.4 Validation - adverse impact	Does the validation report describe how the DOE has assessed whether the permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan or the permanent deviation of the monitoring from the applied methodologies, the applied standardized baselines, or the other applied methodological regulatory documents are likely to lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals? If the DOE considered that the permanent changes or the permanent deviation would lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation, did the project participants, upon the request from the DOE, apply conservative assumptions or discount factors to the calculations to the extent required to ensure that emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals will not be overestimated as a result of the permanent change or the permanent deviation?	VVS para 298
2.5.5 Validation opinion	Does the DOE state its opinion on whether the permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan, or permanent deviation from the applied methodologies, the applied standardized baselines or the other applied methodological regulatory documents comply with the relevant requirements in the PS?	VVS para 299
<b>2.6 Changes to the project design</b>		
2.6.1 Description of changes	Does the revised PDD contain a description of the nature and extent of the proposed or actual changes to the project design of the project activity?	PS para 240
2.6.2 Impacts of changes	Does the revised PDD provide a summary of impacts of the proposed or actual changes to the project activity on: (a) The applicability and application of the applied methodologies, the applied standardized baselines and the other applied methodological regulatory documents with which the project activity has been registered; (b) The project boundary and any implications on the inclusion or exclusion of emissions sources and leakage emissions; (c) The compliance of the monitoring plan with the applied methodologies, the applied standardized baselines and the other applied methodological regulatory documents; (d) The level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring compared with the requirements in the registered monitoring plan; (e) The additionality of the project activity; and (f) The scale of the project activity?	PS para 242
2.6.3 Impact on additionality	Does the revised PDD provide details on the impacts of the changes on the additionality of the project activity or the additionality criteria identified in the applied standardized baselines?	PS paras 243, 244
2.6.4 Validation - description of changes	Does the validation report determine whether the description of the nature and extent of actual changes in the revised PDD accurately reflects the implementation, operation and monitoring of the modified project activity?	VVS paras 301, 309(a)
2.6.5 Validation - reasons for changes	Does the validation report contain an assessment on when the changes occurred, reasons for the changes taking place, whether the changes would have been known prior to the registration of the project activity, how the changes would impact the overall operation/ability of the project activity to deliver emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals as stated in the PDD and whether the revised estimation of emission reductions due to the change takes into account the applicable limits in accordance with the PS?	VVS para 309(b)



2.6.6 Validation – adverse impacts	<p>Does the validation report contain an assessment regarding whether the changes would adversely affect the conclusion of the validation report in respect of:</p> <p>(a) the applicability and application of the applied methodologies, the applied standardized baselines and the other applied methodological regulatory documents with which the project activity has been registered;</p> <p>(b) the project boundary and any associated leakages due to the changes;</p> <p>(c) the compliance of the monitoring plan with the applied methodologies, the applied standardized baselines and the other applied methodological regulatory documents;</p> <p>(d) the level of accuracy and completeness of the monitoring compared with the requirements contained in the registered monitoring plan;</p> <p>(e) the additionality of the project activity; and</p> <p>(f) the scale of the project activity?</p>	VVS paras 302, 303, 309(c); PS 242(c)
<b>2.7 Validation Process</b>		
2.7.1 Summary of validation process	Does the validation report provide a summary of the validation process and its conclusions?	VVS paras 272(a), 280
2.7.2 Dialogue with project participants	Does the validation report provide the results of the dialogue between the DOE and the project participants, as well as any adjustments made to the project design?	VVS paras 272(b), 280
2.7.3 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 272(b), 280
2.7.4 Sampling approach to validation	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 272(e), 280
2.7.5 List of reference	Does the validation report provide lists of interviewees and documents reviewed, and if conducted, outline of on-site inspections?	VVS paras 272(e), 280
2.7.6 Validation team	Does the validation report provide the details of the validation team members, technical experts and internal technical reviewers involved, and their roles in the validation activity? If an on-site inspection is conducted, does the validation report provide details of who conducted the on-site inspection?	VVS paras 272(f), (h), 280
2.7.7 Quality control	Does the validation report provide information on quality control within the team and in the validation process?	VVS paras 272(g), 280
2.7.8 Validation Opinion	Does the validation report provide the DOE's validation opinion?	VVS paras 272(d), 280



## 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 post-registration change in accordance with paragraph 139 or, if the request is submitted together with a request for issuance, in accordance with paragraph 140, of the PCP.

Issue No.	Description of issue
1.	Inconsistencies are clearly attributable to typographical errors (with the exception of the number of CERs) and/or documents containing blank pages.
2.	Documents and appendices (including spreadsheets) are not readable or contain part of text not in English. A spreadsheet containing the calculations of emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals is missing.
3.	Information of the project activity (e.g. version and completion date of the PDD, registration date, crediting period, project activity title and reference number) is not consistent.
4.	Versions of the forms submitted are not valid at the time of the submission of the request for post-registration change.
5.	Information on the post-registration changes is not consistent (e.g. type of post-registration changes, sign-off dates, valid version of the VVS).
6.	The revised PDD is submitted only in clean or tracked change version.
7.	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 post-registration change if it is submitted together with a request for issuance, in accordance with paragraph 212 of the PCP.

Issue No.	Description of issue
1.	Any issue of an editorial nature that is not picked at the completeness check stage.

\* 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 missing basic information that are not included in the list above.

-----

### Document information

Version	Date	Description
03.0	7 October 2021	Revision to align with the provisions of the “CDM project standard for project activities” (version 03.0), the “CDM validation and verification standard for project activities” (version 03.0) and the “CDM project cycle procedure for project activities” (version 03.0).
02.0	23 August 2019	Revision to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjust the text in the “Description of item” column and the paragraph numbers of the PS, VVS, PCP and the sampling standard in the “Reference” column to their latest versions;</li> <li>• Make editorial improvement.</li> </ul>





01.0

30 August 2017

UNFCCC/CCNUCC



Initial publication.

This document consolidates the “Post Registration Changes: Completeness check checklist” (version 02.0), “Request for issuance and post registration changes: Completeness check checklist” (version 03.0), and the “Request for issuance and post registration changes: Information and reporting check checklist” (version 02.0), but removes elements of requests for issuance.

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) and “CDM project cycle procedure for project activities” (version 01.0) adopted in EB93.

---

Decision Class: Regulatory

Document Type: Information note

Business Function: Registration

Keywords: completeness check, post-registration change, project activities

---