Validation report form for post-registration changes for component project activities

(Version 01.0)

Complete this form in accordance with the instructions attached at the end of this form.

BASIC INFORMATION	
Title and UNFCCC reference number of the component project activity (CPA)	Domestic cookstoves in Maputo (Mozambique), phase II (CPA002)
Version number of the validation report on CPA PRCs	03 31/01/2019
Completion date of the validation report on CPA PRCs	31/01/2019
Version number of PoA-DD and CPA-DD applicable to this validation report	PoA-DD, version 05, dated 10/10/2014, Registered CPA-DD, version 2.1, dated 11/06/2016 and Validated CPA-DD, version 07, dated 24/09/2018
Title and UNFCCC ref. no. of the registered PoA into which the CPA is included	"Domestic Cooking Stoves substitution programme in Mozambique" (PoA ID: 9981)
Type(s) of CPA PRCs	☒ Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies or applied standardized baselines ☐ Corrections ☐ Changes to the start date of the crediting period ☐ Inclusion of monitoring plan ☐ Permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan, or permanent deviation of monitoring from the applied methodologies, standardized baselines, or other applied standards or tools ☐ Changes to the project design ☐ Changes specific to afforestation and reforestation activities
Coordinating/managing entity	Fondazione AVSI
Host Parties	The Republic of Mozambique
Applied methodologies and standardized baselines	AMS-II.G. Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass. Version 05.0
Mandatory sectoral scopes linked to the applied methodologies	Sectoral Scope 03: Energy Demand
Conditional sectoral scopes linked to the applied methodologies, if applicable	NA
Name and UNFCCC reference number of the DOE	EPIC Sustainability Services Private Limited (E-0062)
Name, position and signature of the approver of the validation report on CPA PRCs	K. Sudheendra, Director and Head Operations

	

SECTION A. Executive summary

>>

EPIC Sustainability Services Private Limited (EPIC) has been contracted by Fondazione AVSI to undertake the independent verification of the registered CDM PoA titled "Domestic Cooking Stoves substitution programme in Mozambique" (PoA ID: 9981) covering CPA 002 titled "Domestic cookstoves in Maputo (Mozambique), phase II". The scope of the verification was to verify and certify emission reductions reported for project activity for the monitoring period of 01/12/2016−31/12/2017 (first and last day included); and to verify that the data reported are complete and transparent. However, the verification team has found that the CME is temporarily unable to monitor the included CPAs in accordance with the monitoring plans in the included CPA-DDs. The objective of this report is to validate actual post-registration changes to the registered CDM PoA PDD and the included CPA PDD.

This report summarizes the findings of the verification of the project, performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for CDM as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria refer to the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM rules and modalities as agreed in the Bonn Agreement, the Marrakech Accords and the CDM Executive Board's decisions.

The verification team has, based on the recommendations in the Validation and Verification Standard for PoA, version 01.0[/1/], focusing on the identification of significant risks and reliability of project monitoring and generations of VERs. The verification is not meant to provide any consulting towards the client. However, stated request for clarifications and/or corrective actions may provide input for improvement of the project design.

The scope of the verification is the independent and objective review and ex-post determination of the monitored reductions in GHG emission by the project activity. The verification is based on the validated Project Design Document[1], version 05, dated 10/10/2014, Registered Component Project Design Document, version 2.1, dated 11/06/2016 and Validated Component Project Design Document, version 07, dated 24/09/2018 (hereinafter referred to as PoA-DD[/2/] and CPA-DD[/3/&/4/]), corresponding Validation Report[/5/] and Monitoring Report[/6/] (hereinafter referred as final MR). These documents were reviewed against the requirements of the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM Modalities and Procedures and related rules and guidance.

The objective of this CPA " is to improve energy efficiency by substituting inefficient traditional cookstoves with more effective ones and at the same improving the conditions of the local population living in the poor settlements of Malanga, Minkadjuine, Munhuana, Unidade 7, Chamanculo A, Chamanculo B, Chamanculo D, Aeroporto A, Aeroporto B, Mafalala and Urbanizacao in the district of Nhlamankulu, in Maputo city, Mozambique and reducing the greenhouse gas emissions.

The verification team determines the conformity of the actual project activity and its operation with the CPA-DD and MR. EPIC has, by means of a desk review and an on-site visit, assessed that all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the PoA-DD are in place, and that the project participants have operated the project activity as per the PoA-DD[/2/]. Thus the verification team has concluded that the project activity was implemented and operated as per CPA-DD[/3/&/4/] in line with PoA-DD, and that all physical features of the project are in place.

The verification team, based on the site visit and document review, was able to conclude that the project activity has been commissioned and implemented as per the PoA-DD. The start date of this monitoring period is 01/12/2016.

The monitoring report for this monitoring period is in compliance with the monitoring plan of the PoA-DD. The project activity was registered by applying the small scale methodology "AMS-II.G. Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass (Version 05.0)"[/7/] and the verification was carried out in accordance with the applied methodology. It was confirmed during the site visit that the project activity during the current verification is in accordance with the applicability criteria of the methodology.

It is the responsibility of EPIC to express an independent GHG verification opinion on the GHG emissions reductions and on the calculation of GHG emission reductions from the project for this monitoring period based on the reported emission reduction in the monitoring Report.

[1] Post registration corrections are presented in PRC ref. PRC-9981-002 with effective approval from 25/10/2018

EPIC's verification approach was based on the requirements as defined under the Kyoto Protocol, Marrakech accord, as well as those defined by the CDM Executive board. EPIC's approach was risk-based, drawing on an understanding of the risks associated with reported GHG emissions data and the controls in place to mitigate these. The examination includes assessment of evidence relevant to the amounts and disclosures in relation to the project's GHG emission reductions for this monitoring period.

The verification team has planned and performed the work to obtain the information and explanations that is considered necessary to provide sufficient evidence for it to give reasonable assurance that the amount of calculated GHG emission reductions for this monitoring period were fairly stated.

SECTION B. Validation team, technical reviewer and approver

>>

B.1. Validation team member

No.	Role	Type of resource	Last name	First name	Affiliation (e.g. name of central or other office of DOE or outsourced entity)	Involvement in			
						Document review	On-site inspection	Interviews	Validation findings
1.	Team Leader	IR	D	Siddaramu	EPIC	√	√	√	√
2.	Auditor	IR	Govindarao	Vishnu	EPIC	√	x	x	√
3.	Host Country Expert	ER	Muzima	Adelio	EPIC	√	√	√	√

B.2. Technical reviewer and approver of the validation report on CPA PRCs

No.	Role	Type of resource	Last name	First name	Affiliation (e.g. name of central or other office of DOE or outsourced entity)
1.	Technical reviewer	IR	Radhamadhavan	Vijayaraghavan	EPIC
2.	Approver	IR	Sudheendra	Krishnachar	EPIC

SECTION C. Means of validation

C.1. Document review

>>

The verification was performed primarily based on the review of the monitoring report and the supporting documentation. This process included review of data and information presented to verify their completeness and review of the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology, paying particular attention to the frequency of measurements and the QA/QC procedures, and an evaluation of data management and the QA/QC system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of emission reduction.

The first MR/14/ version 1.0 submitted by the project participant and additional background documents related to the emission reductions are reviewed as an initial step of the verification process. The subsequent step involved the identification of corrective action requests and clarification requests (CAR and CL) which are presented in Appendix 4 of this report. As a result of these findings, the MR is revised to MR version 6.0/6/. A complete list of all documents and records reviewed is as attached in Appendix 3 of this report.

C.2. On-site inspection

Duration of on-site inspection: 01/05/2018 to 05/05/2018				
No.	**Activity performed on-site**	**Site location**	**Date**	**Team member**
1.	The verification team conducted visits to the project site to confirm the information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. An on-site assessment was conducted as a part of verification activity and involved: 1) an assessment of the implementation and operation of the project activity as per the validated PoA-DD/CPA-DD 2) a review of information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting of the monitoring parameters 3) interviews with relevant personnel to confirm that the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the Monitoring Plan 4) a cross-check between information provided in the MR and data from other sources 5) a check of the monitoring equipment including calibration performance, and observations of monitoring practices against the requirements of the PDD and the applied methodology 6) a review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and ERs, and 7) an identification of QA/QC procedures in place to prevent, or identify and correct, any errors or omissions in the reported monitoring parameters 8) Review of the implementation status of the project activity 9) Review of the Monitoring plan. Visit to households and Interview with stakeholders. Verification of baseline. Operation and maintenance Procedures. Technical details of project. Review of the implementation status of the project activity	Project site	01/05/2018 to 05/05/2018	Dr.D.Siddaramu and Mr.Adelio Muzima

C.3. Interviews

No.	**Interviewee**			**Date**	**Subject**	**Team member**
	Last name	**First name**	**Affiliation**			
1.	Galimberti	Alessandro	AVSI	01/05/2018 to 05/05/2018	KPT and Usage Survey, Project design, Distribution system of cookstoves, Baseline fuel usage, Type	Validation team

					of cookstoves used.	
2.	Cumbi	Cristina	AVSI	05/05/2018 to 01/05/2018		Validation team
3.	Guiso	Antonio	Carbon Sink	01/05/2018 to 05/05/2018		Validation team
4.	27 households (and 03) in following localities were visited in the district of Nhlamankulu, Maputo Malanga, Minkadjuine, Munhuana, Unidade 7, Chamanculo A, Chamanculo B, Chamanculo D Aeroporto A Aeroporto B Mafalala Urbanizacao	Households	02/05/2018 to 05/05/2018	Usage Survey, Distribution system of cookstoves, Baseline fuel usage, Type of cookstoves used.	Validation team	

C.4. Clarification requests, corrective action requests and forward action requests raised

Areas of validation findings	No. of CL	No. of CAR	No. of FAR
Compliance with CPA-DD form	-	-	-
Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies or applied standardized baselines	-	-	-
Corrections	-	-	-
Changes to the start date of the crediting period	-	-	-
Inclusion of monitoring plan	-	-	-
Permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan, or permanent deviation of monitoring from the applied methodologies, standardized baselines, or other applied standards or tools	-	-	-
Changes to the project design	-	-	-
Changes specific to afforestation and reforestation project activities	-	-	-
Others (please specify)	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-

SECTION D. Validation findings

D.1. Compliance with CPA-DD form

Means of validation	Not Applicable
Findings	Not Applicable
Conclusion	Not Applicable

D.2. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies or applied standardized baselines

Means of validation	The validation team checked for how the temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies or applied standardized

	baselines in accordance with the applicable validation requirements in the VVS PoA. And found that KPT surveys in the project area, the starting date of the KPT of the year 2017 is postponed and, in fact, the PP was able to start the survey only on 20/11/2017. There is, thus, a gap between the consecutive surveys made in year 2016 and 2017 which is longer than 12 months.
Findings	No CARs/CLs were raised in this section
Conclusion	In line with the registered Monitoring Plan included in the CPA-DD the quantity of woody biomass consumed in project scenario (i.e. parameter $B_{y,new,KPT}$) is to be monitored annually or biennially through the Kitchen Performance Test. However, according the applied methodology (Footnote 12) the biennial monitoring (i.e. monitoring once every two years) may be chosen only if the project proponents are able to demonstrate that the efficiency of the cookstove does not drop significantly as compared to the initial efficiency of the new device, over a time period of two years of typical usage. As the PP is not able to fullfill the requirement of demonstrating that the efficiency of the cookstoves doesn't drop significantly over a time period of two years, the KPT surveys are to be made annually for this project. In other words, the annual KPT surveys should be made in a way that the gap between the start date of the two consecutive KPT surveys is not more than 12 months[2]. In the year 2016 the KPT was made starting 17/10/2016. To respect the annual rhythm of the monitoring, the consecutive KPT survey should have been started latest on 17/10/2017. However, due the practical reasons regarding the availability of the field team performing the KPT surveys in the project area, the starting date of the KPT of the year 2017 was needed to be postponed and, in fact, the PP was able to start the survey only on 20/11/2017. There is, thus, a gap between the consecutive surveys made in year 2016 and 2017 which is longer than 12 months. As PP has been temporarily unable to monitor the CPA in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, a temporary deviation from the registered monitoring plan is sought in line with the CDM Project Standard for Programmes of Activities (version 02.0). Below is demonstrated the compliance with the para 228 of the CDM Project Standard for Programmes of Activities (version 02.0): **The nature of the deviation -** The registered monitoring plan requires that the monitoring of parameter $B_{y,new,KPT}$ ("Annual quantity of woody biomass used in year y in tonnes per device, measured as per the Kitchen Performance Test (KPT) protocol") is made through the annual KPT surveys. In other words, the gap between two consecutive KPT surveys shall not longer than 12 months. However, for the start of the annual KPT survey of the year 2017 was delayed and thus started later than 12 months from the start of the previous KPT survey. The nature of this deviation is temporary and thus similar delay in the start of the KPT Survey is not foreseen to repeat in the later project years. **The extent of the deviation -** The deviation of the registered monitoring plan is regarding the monitoring of the parameter $B_{y,new,KPT}$ during the year 2017. **The duration the non-confirm period -** The gap between the start date of the KPT survey made in 2016 (started on 17/10/2016) and the start date of the KPT survey made in 2017 (started on 22/11/2017), is 33 days more than the 12 months.

[2] As per the reply confirmed by the MP77 the Clarification Request SSC_743 (available at: https://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/SSCmethodologies/clarifications/43111)

Proposed alternative monitoring arrangements for the non-confirming period - In line with para 228 (a) of the CDM Project Standard for Programmes of Activities (version 02.0) the approval of the following alternative monitoring arrangement for the non-confirming period is proposed:

- It is proposed that a temporary deviation for the requirement of making the KPT Survey every 12 months is accepted for the year 2017. In other words, a 33 days delay in the KPT Survey starting date is proposed to be accepted for the year 2017.
- In consequence, it is proposed that the results of KPT Survey made starting 20/11/2017 can be considered applicable for the whole year of the 2017. In fact, the validation team accepted that that the delay of 33 days in the survey start date would not impact significantly to the results of the KPT Survey. From the other hand, as the KPT survey (which results are being highly impacted on the conditions of the project stove) was made later than foreseen in the registered monitoring plan, there is no risk that applying these results for the whole year of 2017 would lead to over-estimate the GHG emission reductions.

Moreover, line with para 228 (a) of the CDM Project Standard for Programmes of Activities (version 02.0) the following conservative assumption for the value of $B_{y,new,KPT}$ is proposed to be applied:

To be conservative in the emission reduction calculations, PP proposes that the results of the KPT survey made in 2017 are, moreover, used for the period 01/12/2016-31/12/2016 instead of the results of the KPT survey made in 2016, which the validation team has accepted. This way it can be ensured that conservative assumptions regarding the values of parameter $B_{y,new,KPT}$ are used and that there is no risk that the proposed temporary deviation would lead to over-estimate the emission reductions during this monitoring period of 01/12/2016 - 31/12/2017.

KPT 2016	Started on 17/10/2016	0.79 kg of charcoal per day per household Note: The KPT made in 2016 resulted as 0.79 kg of charcoal/day/hh for all the population (all stoves were considered to be part of the same age vintage. Stoves were distributed during June 2015 – June 2016)
KPT 2017	From 20/11/2017 to 7/12/2017	Vintage 1: 1.03 kg of charcoal per day per household Vintage 2: 0.848 kg of charcoal per day per household Note: vintage 1: stoves distributed between June 2015 to June 2016 Vintage 2: stoves distributed between July 2016 to July 2017.

Hence KPT 2017 values was used for the vintage cook stoves during the monitoring period.The validation team based on the above infers that prior approval for this temporary change to the current monitoring period is not required via this notification as per the CDM project cycle procedure for programmes of activities, version 2.0, to the CPA002 under the PoA Domestic Cooking Stoves substitution programme in Mozambique 9981 as the CME has used conservative approach. This is as per Appendix 2 of PS-PoA version 2.0

D.3. Corrections

Means of validation	Not Applicable
Findings	Not Applicable

Conclusion	Not Applicable

D.4. Changes to the start date of the crediting period

Means of validation	Not Applicable
Findings	Not Applicable
Conclusion	Not Applicable

D.5. Inclusion of monitoring plan

Means of validation	Not Applicable
Findings	Not Applicable
Conclusion	Not Applicable

D.6. Permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan, or permanent deviation of monitoring from the applied methodologies, standardized baselines, or other applied standards or tools

Means of validation	Not Applicable
Findings	Not Applicable
Conclusion	Not Applicable

D.7. Changes to the project design

Means of validation	Not Applicable
Findings	Not Applicable
Conclusion	Not Applicable

D.8. Changes specific to afforestation and reforestation project activities

Means of validation	Not Applicable
Findings	Not Applicable
Conclusion	Not Applicable

SECTION E. Internal quality control

>>

After the completion of assessment by the verification team all the relevant documentation is submitted to a qualified, Independent Technical reviewer as part of EPIC' internal quality control system. A Technical reviewer team is appointed to review the draft final verification report (Draft FVR). The comments made by the Technical reviewer team are taken into consideration and incorporated in the final FVR. The technical reviewer team assesses whether all the reporting requirements have been fulfilled and whether all the issues raised were closed satisfactorily by the verification team with justification. The technical review process can also raise issues in this regard which is resolved further by the verification team to the satisfaction of the technical reviewer. The technical reviewer team either accepts or rejects the report made by the verification team. The final report (after resolutions of all findings) is then submitted to the Head-operations for review and approval.

SECTION F. Validation opinion

>>

EPIC has performed a validation of the Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan of the CPA002 "CPA No. 02: Domestic Cookstoves in Maputo (Mozambique), phase II", which is located in Mozambique. The validation was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the CDM, and host country criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

The validation consisted of the following three phases: i) desk review of the programme design document and additional background documents; ii) site visit and follow-up interviews with CME and project stakeholders; iii) resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final validation report and opinion.

... The review of the CPA-DD and documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided the validation team with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of stated criteria. Hence the validation team has issued a positive opinion on the proposed PRC.

Appendix 1. Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Full texts
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emission Reduction(s)
CL	Clarification request
CME	Coordinating and Managing Entity
CO2	Carbon dioxide
CO2e	Carbon dioxide equivalent
CPA-DD	Component Project Design Document
DNA	Designated National Authority
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
GWP	Global Warming Potential
KPT	Kitchen Performance Test
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
MP	Monitoring Plan
MR	Monitoring Report
PDD	Project Design Document
PoA-DD	Programme Design Document
PS	Project Standard
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VVS	Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Standard

Appendix 2. Competence of team members and technical reviewers

The following validation team has been assigned to carry out the verification of the project.

Name	Dr.D.Siddaramu	Dr.Vishnu	Mr Muzima Adelio	Mr. R. Vijaya raghavan
Role	Lead Auditor	Auditor	Host country expert	Technical Reviewer
Competence in relevant sectors	Sector 1	Sector 1	Sector 03	Sector 1 and 13
Responsibility	Document review, onsite, DVeR preparation, DVeR resolution, FVeR preparation	Document review, DVeR preparation, FVeR preparation	Document review, onsite	Technical review

Dr. D. Siddaramu holds a M.Sc., Ph.D in Environmental Science, with over 16 years of experience. A qualified Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Lead Auditor, successfully registered more than 30 projects with United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and Verified Carbon Standard registry (VCS) registry; well versed with both National and International legal regime. Has hands on experience in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) studies pertaining to different Ecosystem; monitoring, collection & analyzing environmental samples and conducting socio-economic surveys; data analysis. Conducting CDM/VCS audits, preparation of validation protocols and reports. He is qualified for Sector 1 based on CDM accreditation requirements and qualified lead auditor as per GS4GG EPIC accreditation.

Mr Adelio Muzuma holds a Degree in Applied Physics. From 2016 onwards has been working as freelancer for data collection and Surveys for household and community level projects implemented in multiple locations in Mozambique. He has performed several verification, validation, satisfaction surveys, CES, KPT based on random visits to beneficiaries of the systems and reported to the implementing partners. He has working knowledge of the sector and is qualified as Technical and Host Country Expert for TA 3.1 Energy demand in accordance with the procedures of EPIC.

Mr. R. Vijayaraghavan holds BE in Mechanical Engineering, M.Tech in Energy Conservation and Management and MBA in Technology Management. He is certified as Energy Auditor by Bureau of Energy Efficiency (BEE), Government of India. He has 10 years of working experience in energy sector including validation / verification of fifty CDM and VCS/GS projects and has undergone extensive training on CDM validation and verification and has been qualified as technical reviewer for several sectoral scopes. He is also an ISO 26000 lead auditor certified by Professional Evaluation and Certification Board (PECB).

Dr. G. Vishnu holds a Masters and Doctorate in Environmental Science. He has around 8 years of experience in the field of research and consultancy related to water, wastewater, solid waste management systems, implementation of new, Cleaner Production technologies and biomass assessment studies. He has more than four years" experience in validation verification of more than thirty CDM, projects and has undergone extensive training on GHG validation and verification. He is a Lead Auditor for various technical areas. He is also an ISO 26000 lead auditor and ISO 50001 auditor certified by Professional Evaluation and Certification Board (PECB). He is a Certified Sustainability Assurance Practitioner (CSAP) from Accountability, UK. He is qualified as Lead Auditor based on EPICs CDM accreditation procedures.

Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced

No.	Author	Title	References to the document	Provider
1	UNFCCC	Validation and Verification Standard for PoA, version 2.0	http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/index.html	UNFCCC
2	PP	Project Design Document (POA-DD), version 05, dated 10/10/2014	http://cdm.unfccc.int/ProgrammeOfActivities/poa_db/6E3TWBSAG8IVRFDZNJK12L4X0CYHOM/view	UNFCCC
3	PP	Registered Component Project Design Document (CPA-DD), version 2.1 , dated 11/06/2016	https://cdm.unfccc.int/UserManagement/FileStorage/ZMVESR4KHIN36ALPF7T9X5QWDO1JCG	UNFCCC
4	PP	Validated Component Project Design Document (CPA-DD), version 07, dated 24/09/2018	https://cdm.unfccc.int/UserManagement/FileStorage/ZMVESR4KHIN36ALPF7T9X5QWDO1JCG	UNFCCC
5	Validation DoE	Validation Reports of POA-DD and CPA-DD	http://cdm.unfccc.int/ProgrammeOfActivities/poa_db/6E3TWBSAG8IVRFDZNJK12L4X0CYHOM/view	UNFCCC
6	PP	Monitoring Report, version 06 , dated 17/01/2019	-	PP
7	UNFCCC	AMS-II.G. Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass, version 05.0	http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/DB/HLXIKEIBAXBE4EHO24H5IAB824MBD8	UNFCCC
8	PP	9981-0002_Stove Selling Database 2015-2016 & 2017	-	PP
9	PP (Third party)	Kitchen Performance Test (KPT)	-	Third party (GIZ)
10	PP	9981-0002_Usage Survey Database 2016		PP
11	PP	User Agreements		PP
12	UNFCCC	Guidelines for Application of materiality in verifications	http://cdm.unfccc.int/	UNFCCC
13	PP	Emission reduction calculation sheet	-	PP
14	PP	First MR, version 01	-	PP

Appendix 4. Clarification requests, corrective action requests and forward action requests

Table 1. CLs from this validation

CL ID	Nil	Section no.		Date: 11/12/2018
Description of CL				
CME's response				**Date:** DD/MM/YYYY
Documentation provided by CME				
DOE assessment				**Date:** DD/MM/YYYY

Table 2. CARs from this validation

CAR ID	Nil	Section no.		Date: 11/12/2018
Description of CAR				
CME's response				**Date:** DD/MM/YYYY
Documentation provided by CME				
DOE assessment				**Date:** DD/MM/YYYY

Table 3. FARs from this validation

FAR ID	Nil	Section no.		Date: 11/12/2018
Description of FAR				
CME's response				**Date:** DD/MM/YYYY
Documentation provided by CME				
DOE assessment				**Date:** DD/MM/YYYY

- - - - -

Document information

Version	*Date*	*Description*
01.0	29 December 2017	Initial publication.

Decision Class: Regulatory
Document Type: Form
Business Function: Registration
Keywords: post-registration change, component project activity, validation report