

CDM-EB81-AA-A09

Revision of CDM project standard, validation and verification standard, and project cycle procedure

Version 04.0



United Nations
Framework Convention on
Climate Change

COVER NOTE

1. Procedural background

1. The Executive Board of the clean development mechanism (CDM) (hereinafter referred to as the Board), at its sixty-fifth meeting, adopted the “Clean development mechanism project standard” (PS), “Clean development mechanism validation and verification standard” (VVS) and “Clean development mechanism project cycle procedure” (PCP), consolidating, and modifying as appropriate, the existing regulatory documents. The development of these documents helped significantly improve the consistency and transparency of regulations, as well as their user-friendliness.
2. The PS specifies minimum requirements with regard to the features of project design and required level of attainment in the monitoring of greenhouse gas emission reductions or removal enhancements for project participants and coordinating/managing entities wishing to design and implement a CDM project activity or programme of activities (PoA), and seek issuance of certified emission reductions (CERs).
3. The VVS specifies minimum requirements for designated operational entities (DOEs) for preparing, executing and reporting of their validation and verification activities regarding (proposed) CDM project activities or PoAs.
4. The PCP describes administrative steps for processing requests for registration of CDM project activities and PoAs, requests for issuance of CERs and related actions to be followed by project participants, coordinating/managing entities, DOEs, the Board and the secretariat.
5. To date, the Board has revised each of these documents several times, mainly reflecting the evolving rules for PoAs and introducing the rules for carbon dioxide capture and storage (CCS) project activities and project activities and PoAs applying standardized baselines. In the meantime, project participants, coordinating/managing entities, DOEs and other stakeholders, as well as the Board and the secretariat have gained experience in the implementation of these documents over the past two years, recognizing the need to develop or revise the relevant provisions in various other areas. Consequently, the Board included the project of revision and improvement of the PS, VVS and PCP as part of the CDM two-year business plan and management plan 2013–2014. As a preparation, the secretariat had launched a call for public input from 24 September to 23 October 2012 where stakeholders commented in the areas of the three documents that, in their view, should be revised or clarified.
6. Based on the inputs received from the call, as well as the in-person interaction with stakeholders at CDM round tables and other events and the secretariat’s experience, a concept note on the revision of the PS, VVS and PCP was prepared by the secretariat and presented to the Board at its seventy-fifth meeting. The concept note highlighted key areas where guidance was sought from the Board. It also listed all other possible changes in its appendix.

7. The Board provided guidance in all key areas and requested the secretariat to prepare a draft revised PS, VVS and PCP, taking into account the Board's feedback on the concept note and to launch a call for public input on the drafts. Based on this, the secretariat prepared working drafts and launched a call for public input on them from 2 to 22 April 2014.
8. The Board considered the draft revised PS, VVS and PCP at its seventy-ninth and eightieth meetings, focusing on the key issues, provided feedback and requested the secretariat to prepare a new version of the draft revised PS, VVS and PCP.
9. The drafts that are hereby presented to the Board reflect the process described above.

2. Purpose

10. The purpose of the revision of the PS, VVS and PCP covered by the attached drafts is to generally improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the CDM regulatory framework within the overall framework provided by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP).¹

3. Key issues and proposed solutions²

3.1. Changes to published project design document before registration

11. With regard to changes to the project design of a project activity after publication of the project design document (PDD) but before its registration, the Board, at its eightieth meeting, agreed not to introduce a process and criteria for new publication of a revised PDD, but agreed to introduce a process through which the DOE performing the validation of the project activity may request the Board to clarify whether the changes would require new publication of a revised PDD for global stakeholder consultation.
12. Based on this, the previously proposed new process and criteria have been removed and a new process for clarification on the necessity of new publication of a revised PDD has been introduced in the draft (**VVS, paragraphs 37_{ter}(b) and 37_{quater}; PCP, paragraphs 23_{quinquies}, 23_{sexies}, and 28(a)_{bis}**).

3.2. Withdrawal of monitoring report

13. The Board, by its seventy-ninth meeting, had agreed to introduce a process for allowing project participants to withdraw a published monitoring report. The Board, at its eightieth meeting, requested the secretariat to editorially improve the process in the draft

¹ The draft revised PS, VVS and PCP presented to the Board at its seventy-ninth and eightieth meeting were based on their version 05.0, indicating changes to them in yellow highlights. In the meantime these documents have been revised a few times and the latest version is 07.0. Therefore, the attached drafts indicate substantive changes to version 07.0 of the PS, VVS and PCP in yellow highlights (editorial changes are not highlighted). The additional changes made after the eightieth meeting of the Board are highlighted in green.

² This section lists only the remaining key issues that the Board has not completed its consideration, as well other key issues that have been identified by the secretariat after the Board's eightieth meeting. In this section, most statements referring to "project activities" also apply to PoAs. However, for readability reason, only the term "project activities" is used.

regarding the submission of the evidence that the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity agreed on the withdrawal.

14. Based on this, the draft has been modified accordingly (**PS, paragraph 263_{bis}; VVS, paragraph 258_{bis}; PCP, paragraph 184_{bis}**).

3.3. Renewal of crediting period

15. The Board, by its seventy-ninth meeting, had agreed to clarify the consecutiveness of crediting periods, the consequence of delaying a notification of the intention of renewing the crediting period by the deadline on claiming CERs in the renewed crediting period, and the publication of the notifications. By the same meeting, the Board also had agreed to introduce a process allowing combining a request for renewal of crediting period with a request for approval of post-registration changes. The Board, at its eightieth meeting, requested the secretariat to improve the structure of the relevant sections of the PCP.
16. Based on this, the structure of the section on renewal of crediting period in the draft has been modified so that the contents reflect better the subsections therein. Also, the temporal sequence of crediting periods and the consequence of failing to notify the intention of renewing the crediting period have been made clearer (**PS, paragraph 292_{bis} and 292_{ter}; VVS, paragraphs 290(h), 291(f), 361_{quater}, 363(a)(v) and 363(d); PCP, section 9**).

3.4. Deregistering/terminating project activity

17. The Board, by its seventy-ninth meeting, had agreed to introduce a process allowing deregistering project activities from the CDM. The Board, at its eightieth meeting, requested the secretariat to remove the Board's review process and introduce a re-registration process in which the Board considers requests for re-registration on a case-by-case basis.
18. Based on this, the Board's review process has been removed and a re-registration process has been introduced with elaborated steps and conditions in the draft. The key elements for the proposed re-registration process are the following (**PS, section 13.12 and 13.13; VVS, section 13; PCP, sections 10–11**):
 - (a) Eligible cases for re-registration: All cases as long as the original crediting period (maximum 10 or 21 years) has not expired;
 - (b) Documentation:
 - (i) Option 1: No new documentation is required if the effective date of re-registration is within the same crediting period when the de-registration became effective, otherwise updating PDD, applying the latest version of the approved methodology with updated baseline is required;
 - (ii) Option 2: Updating PDD, applying the latest version of the approved methodology with updated baseline, is always required.
 - (c) Parties' approval: Always requires written no-objection to re-registration by DNAs of all Parties involved;
 - (d) Crediting period:

- (i) The original total length of crediting period applies (i.e. the clock will not stop; no extension in the case of re-registration; only the remainder of the original crediting period is valid);
 - (ii) No change of crediting period type is allowed;
 - (iii) Under Option 1 above, the provisions for renewal of crediting period applies at the originally fixed timing of expiry of the crediting period. If the timing of the request for re-registration is within e.g. 180 days of the expiry of the crediting period, allow combining the request for re-registration and the request for renewal of crediting period;
 - (iv) Under Option 2 above, unless the project activity had chosen a 10-year fixed crediting period option, the new crediting period with full seven years will start at the re-registration. This would mean that the original timing of the expiry of the crediting period will be replaced by the new date;
 - (e) Effective date: The effective re-registration date is determined following the same principles as for requests for registration.
 - (f) Fee:
 - (i) At the time of de-registration, the registration fee (even if there is any positive balance left after deduction of the issuance fee) will not be reimbursed;
 - (ii) At the time of re-registration, a fee equivalent to the registration fee minus any positive balance at the time of de-registration will be charged (Option 3), or no additional fee will be charged (Option 4);
 - (g) Application to PoAs:
 - (i) De-registration of a PoA is not allowed, but the exclusion of a specific case CPA from a PoA and its re-inclusion in the PoA may be allowed, in a new process similar to the inclusion of specific case CPAs;
 - (ii) An excluded specific CPA may be registered as a single project activity but it has to go through all the steps for registration, starting from the publication of the PDD for global stakeholder consultation.
19. It should be noted that deregistration and re-registration of project activities under the CDM is an entirely new concept that has no root in the annex to decision 3/CMP.1 (CDM modalities and procedures) or any other CMP decisions. Therefore, the introduction of deregistration and re-registration process in the revised PCP would require a decision by the CMP first.

3.5. Local stakeholder consultation

20. The Board, at its eightieth meeting, supported the direction of changes proposed by the secretariat, but requested the secretariat to modify the draft provision so that the local stakeholder consultation is completed before the “start date” of the project activity, PoA or component project activity, as defined in the “Glossary: CDM terms”, that relevant stakeholders are invited to the consultation including the cases where significant changes to the project design have occurred after the local stakeholder consultation, and

that the consultation is conducted in accordance with applicable national regulations, as applicable.

21. Based on this, the relevant provisions on the local stakeholder consultation have been modified accordingly in the draft (**PS, paragraph 74, 77, 77^{bis} and 77^{ter}; VVS, paragraphs 146(d), 146^{quater} and 147(d); PCP, paragraphs 19(h) and 27^{bis}**)

3.6. Description of project activity in PDD

22. The Board, at its eightieth meeting, supported the approach proposed by the secretariat to review all instructions in the PDD guidelines for all types of project activities during the on-going merger of the PDD guidelines with the PDD forms, identify critical information that needs to be in the PDD, and reflect that in the revised PS.
23. Based on this, the secretariat reviewed the instructions in the PDD form, and identified that the description of the technologies and measures employed and/or implemented containing specific information was critical information. Consequently, providing that information has been included in the draft as a requirement (**PS, paragraphs 37(e), 37(e)^{bis}, 37(e)^{ter} and 85^{bis}**).

3.7. Effective registration date

24. The Board, at its eightieth meeting, supported the direction of Option 2 of the proposed changes, under which the effective registration date is the date when: i) the deposit of the registration fee is received by the secretariat; or ii) the missing information is submitted from the DOE during the completeness check, as applicable.
25. When reflecting the direction in the draft, it was recognized that the language in the chosen option referred to in paragraph 24 above did not correctly reflect the Board's intention, nor cover or clarify the cases where a request for registration was submitted as a new submission after the submission had been concluded as incomplete at the completeness check stage, or revised documentation was submitted at the information and reporting check stage or after the request was placed under review. Based on this, the language has been modified to clarify the effective registration dates for all cases as follows (**PCP, paragraphs 71–72, 74, 83 and 104**):
- (a) Once a request for registration has successfully passed the completeness check stage, the request will stay in the process and the effective registration date will not be affected by possible iteration (i.e. submission of revised documentation) at the information and reporting check stage;
 - (b) If a request for registration is concluded as incomplete at the completeness check stage, the request will be removed from the process and the submission of revised documentation of the request will become a new submission of a request for registration, hence the effective registration date will be affected;
 - (c) If the project activity or PoA is registered without having being placed under review, the effective registration date is the date when the request documentation was submitted to the secretariat, or the registration fee was received by the secretariat, if applicable (referred to as the date when a "complete request for registration" was submitted). If the request documentation was submitted as a new submission as per subparagraph (b) above, the effective registration date is

the date when the new submission was made or additional registration fee was received, if applicable;

- (d) If the project activity or PoA is registered after having being placed under review, and if the response to the review request did not lead to a revision of the PDD, PoA-DD or validation report, the effective registration date is the same date as in subparagraph (c) above;
 - (e) If the project activity or PoA is registered after having being placed under review, and if the response to the review request resulted in a revision of the PDD, PoA-DD or validation report, the effective registration date is the date when the revised PDD, PoA-DD or validation report was submitted.
26. In addition, as the consequence of unsuccessful outcome of the information and reporting check has been changed in relation to the rule on the effective registration date, the provisions regarding the validity of the baseline and monitoring methodology and/or standardized baseline applied in the original submission for the purpose of resubmission of request for registration has been modified and added (**PCP, paragraphs 75 and 75_{bis}**).
27. Furthermore, the same rules regarding the concept of “incompleteness” of submission and the consequence of unsuccessful outcome of information and reporting check have been applied to the process for handling requests for issuance (**PCP, paragraphs 202, 203 and 205**).

3.8. Voluntary monitoring of contribution to sustainable development

28. The Board, at its eightieth meeting, considered a proposal to introduce provisions on voluntary monitoring of the contribution to sustainable development and requested the secretariat to prepare a concept note in this regard for consideration by the Board at a future meeting.
29. Based on this, provisions on the verification of sustainable development co-benefits of a CDM project activity or PoA have been introduced, which apply only if the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity reported the monitoring results of the sustainable development co-benefits. However, any opinion on the verification of the sustainable development co-benefits does not have any impact on the verification opinion (**PS, paragraph 248(d); VVS paragraphs 273(e) and footnote 41_{bis}**).

3.9. Timing of validation of monitoring plan

30. In response to the request from the CMP in decision 3/CMP 9, paragraph 10, to analyse allowing the validation of monitoring plans for small-scale and microscale project activities and PoAs before their first verifications, the Board, at its seventy-ninth meeting, considered a concept note prepared by the secretariat and agreed to allow the flexibility in the timing of validation of monitoring plan for all scales (microscale, small-scale and large-scale) of project activities and PoAs. This allows validation of complete monitoring plan by a DOE and approval by the Board: (a) at registration; (b) at any time prior to the first request for issuance; or (c) at the first request for issuance. The Board requested the secretariat to revise all the relevant regulatory documents to reflect this flexibility for consideration of the Board at a future meeting. The Board agreed that it would determine the effective date of this flexibility when it adopts the revised regulatory documents. The

Board agreed to report to the CMP in its annual report the results of its analysis in relation to decision 3/CMP.9, paragraph 10, and its decision to implement the above flexibility for all scales of project activities and PoAs.

31. Based on this, the inclusion of a monitoring plan in a registered PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD has been listed as one of the types of changes to a registered CDM project activity or PoA that may be requested post-registration, and making such request has been consequentially added as an option under both the “prior-approval track” and the “issuance track” (**PS, paragraphs 62_{bis} and 62_{ter}, 276_{bis}–276_{quater}; VVS, paragraphs 137_{bis} and 137_{ter}, section 8_{bis}.5 and paragraph 15 of section 8_{ter}; PCP, paragraphs 136(b)(ii)_{bis}, 140, and 142**).

3.10. Issues relating to PoAs

32. In recent meetings, the Board had revised the PS, VVS and PCP several times to modify existing rules or introduce new rules on PoAs to accommodate the needs on the ground. The latest being the amendments to version 07.0 of the PS, VVS and PCP adopted by the Board at its eightieth meeting to make post-registration changes to PoAs and the definition of types of generic CPA more flexible. There are several other remaining issues relating to the rules for PoAs that the secretariat prepared a separate concept note for consideration by the Board at its eighty-first meeting.
33. The amendments to version 07.0 of the PS, VVS and PCP adopted by the Board at its eightieth meeting have been incorporated in the attached drafts with some editorial improvement.
34. In addition, a process for exclusion and re-inclusion of CPAs under a PoA referred to in paragraph 18(g) above has been newly introduced in the draft. The process is designed similar to the process for inclusion in terms of the roles of the coordinating/managing entity, a DOE, the Parties involved, the Board and the secretariat (**PS, section 12; VVS, section 13; PCP, section 6.1_{bis}**).
35. For other remaining issues, upon agreement by the Board, they will be reflected in the revised PS, VVS and PCP.³

4. Impacts

36. Revised PS, VVS and PCP would benefit all stakeholders, as well as the Board and the secretariat, due to improved effectiveness and integrity of the CDM regulatory framework through improved consistency, clarity and comprehensiveness.

5. Proposed work and timeline

37. Upon the adoption by the Board of revised PS, VVS and PCP, the secretariat will prepare for the implementation of the revised framework including:
 - (a) Modification to the IT workflow for handling submissions of requests for registration, issuance, post-registration changes, renewal of crediting period, etc;

³ The attached drafts contain the same proposed draft provisions as found in the separate concept note on issues relating to PoAs, which is also published for consideration by the Board at its eighty-first meeting.

- (b) Development/revision of affected standards, guidelines, the forms (e.g. materiality guidelines, PDD and monitoring report forms) and checklists referred to in the revised PS, VVS and PCP;
 - (c) Dissemination of information to stakeholders.
- 38. The proposed transitional measures regarding the validity of the current version (version 07.0) and revised version (version 08.0) of the PS, VVS and PCP is:
 - (a) On [1 April 2015], version 08.0 will become effective. From this date, all new publication of PDD, PoA-DD and monitoring report have to follow version 08.0; [Requests for de-registration and re-registration may also be submitted from this date];
 - (b) Between [1 April 2015] and [26 November 2015] (i.e. 240 days after the effective date of version 08.0), requests for registration, issuance, post-registration changes, renewal of crediting period, etc. may choose version 07.0 or version 08.0 (grace period for these requests); if a PDD, PoA-DD or monitoring report has been submitted following version 08.0 as per subparagraph (a) above, the corresponding request for registration or issuance also have to follow version 08.0;
 - (c) From [27 November 2015], version 08.0 will become mandatory for all requests for registration, issuance, post-registration changes, renewal of crediting period, etc

6. Recommendations to the Board

- 39. The Board may wish to adopt revised PS, VVS and PCP taking into account the key issues presented in section 3 above, as well as other issues listed in appendix 1, agree on the implantation plan and transitional measures, and request the secretariat to prepare for the implementation of the revised framework.

TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page
APPENDIX 1. OTHER ISSUES FOR POSSIBLE CHANGES TO THE “CDM PROJECT STANDARD”, “CDM VALIDATION AND VERIFICATION STANDARD” AND “CDM PROJECT CYCLE PROCEDURE”	11
APPENDIX 2. DRAFT STANDARD. CDM PROJECT STANDARD (VERSION 07.008.0)	36
APPENDIX 3. DRAFT STANDARD. CDM VALIDATION AND VERIFICATION STANDARD (VERSION 07.008.0)	119
APPENDIX 4. DRAFT PROCEDURE. CDM PROJECT CYCLE PROCEDURE (VERSION 07.008.0).....	242

Appendix 1. Other issues for possible changes to the “CDM project standard”, “CDM validation and verification standard” and “CDM project cycle procedure”

1. The tables below list other issues and proposed changes that will be taken into account in the revision of the “Clean development mechanism project cycle procedure” (PS), “Clean development mechanism validation and verification standard” (VVS) and “Clean development mechanism project cycle procedure” (PCP).

Table 1. Incorporating the clarifications and guidance adopted by the Board

#	Doc.	Para no.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/section
1	VVS	152(b)	Incorporate the “Clarification: Validation of informing about the progress of a project activity after notification of prior consideration of the CDM” (CDM-EB73-A15-CLAR) issued by the Board at EB 73.	VVS paras 152(b), footnote 16 _{ter}
2	VVS	New	Incorporate the “Clarification: Verification of reporting of the status of registered project activity or programme of activities” (CDM-EB77-A13-CLAR) issued by the Board at EB 77.	VVS para 330(i), footnote 41 _{bis}
3	PCP	165–166	Incorporate the provisions for addressing disputes relating to modalities of communication and emission reduction purchase agreements, as agreed by the Board at EB 74.	PCP paras 165–166, 173 _{bis} –173 _{quinquies}
4	PCP	Appendix 1	Incorporate the “Further guidance related to the registration fee for proposed A/R clean development mechanism project activities” (EB 36 report, annex 21) adopted by the Board at EB 36.	Appendix 1
5	PS	New	Incorporate the “Standard for application of the global warming potentials to CDM project activities and PoAs for the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol” (EB 69 report, annex 3) adopted by the Board at its sixty-ninth meeting (EB 69).	PS paras 61 _{bis} –61 _{quinq.} Also reflected in para 256 _{bis} (a)
	VVS	New		VVS paras 4 and 5(c) of section 7.12.8 _{bis} and 290(e)
6	PS	New	Incorporate the general guidance on the requirements for the cases where the monitoring period straddles two crediting periods, as provided by the Board at EB 62.	PS para 256 _{bis}
	VVS	New		VVS paras 290(g) and 291(e)

#	Doc.	Para no.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/section
7	PS	New	Incorporate the relevant provisions of the “General principles for bundling” (EB 66 report, annex 21) adopted by the Board at EB 66.	Not incorporated into the PS as it would make the section disproportionately long. Also para 95 was removed as it was only one of many provisions in the “General principles”, which is already referred in para 94.
	VVS	New		VVS section 8.1.1 _{bis} and para 333 _{quater}
8	PS	33	Incorporate the “Clarification: Implementation of the prior consideration of the CDM requirement in the absence of the host Party DNA” (CDM-EB72-A05-CLAR) issued by the Board at EB 72.	PS para 33
	VVS	113		VVS para 113
	PCP	8		PCP para 8
9	PS	New	Incorporate the “Clarification: Host Party for project activities and bundled project activities” (CDM-EB70-A38-CLAR) issued by the Board at EB 70.	PS paras 79 _{bis} –79 _{ter} , 232 _{bis} , footnote 11 _{bis} .
	VVS	40		VVS para 41 _{bis}
	PCP	19(b)		Not necessary
10	VVS	New	Incorporate the “Clarification: Validation of post-registration changes and verification by the same DOE for the same project activity or programme of activities” (CDM-EB77-A12-CLAR) issued by the Board at EB 77.	VVS para 251 _{bis}
	PCP	New		PCP para 140 _{bis}
11	VVS	New	Incorporate the guidance provided in paragraph 90 of EB 70 report for improvement of global stakeholder consultation process.	VVS paras 35 _{quater} , 36 and 38(b)
	PCP	New		PCP paras 19(h), 19(i), 28 _{bis} and 64 _{bis}
12	VVS	New	Incorporate the guidance provided in paragraph 33 of EB 78 report for provision of specific-case component project activity design document (CPA-DD) for each host Party during the registration of PoA or during expansion of the boundary of the PoA to add additional host Parties.	PS paras 144(c) and 225 _{bis}
	PCP	New		PCP para 19(j)(iii).

#	Doc.	Para no.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/section
13	PS	197, 225, 242, Appendix 1	Incorporate the “Amendment to version 07.0 of the CDM project standard” (CDM-EB-A06), “Amendment to version 07.0 of the CDM validation and verification standard” (CDM-EB-07) and “Amendment to version 07.0 of the CDM project cycle procedure” (CDM-EB-08).	PS paras 197, 198 _{bis} , 225, 242, Appendix 1
	VVS	234, 235, 344, 346, 349		VVS paras 229 _{bis} (b) and (c), 229 _{quinquies} , 229 _{sexies} , 230 _{bis} (d), paras 6(b), 9 and 13(b)(ii) of section 8 _{ter} .
	PCP	19(h)(i), 118, 123, 137(b), 137(e), 138(b), 139		PCP paras 19(h)(i), 118, 123, 137(b), 137(e), 138(b), 139
14	PS	Section 7.5	The Board provided its guidance at its seventieth meeting that, if significant changes have occurred to the project design after the initial local stakeholder consultation (LSC), the DOE, as part of its validation process, shall assess whether the LSC is still adequate. The Board requested the secretariat to amend the relevant CDM documents accordingly for its consideration. At its seventieth meeting the Board also agreed to include, in the relevant CDM documents, rules and requirements to process complaints from local stakeholders submitted to the DNA of the host Party on the outcome of the LSC as well as the timing to start the LSC. Based on this, a new validation requirement has been included that the DOE shall provide an opinion on the validity of the comments received through the LSC in the cases where there are changes to the project design after the LSC. Also, it has been clarified that the timing of the LSC needs to be at the design stage of the project activity. Furthermore, rules and requirements for processing complaints from local stakeholders submitted to the DNA of the host Party after the completion of the LSC have been added.	PS para 73, 74 77 _{bis} 78 _{ter}
	VVS	146–147		VVS paras 146 _{ter} and 147(c)
	PCP	New		PCP para 27 _{bis}

#	Doc.	Para no.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/section
15	PS	New	<p>The Board provided guidance at its seventy-fifth meeting that: the change of all project participants under contractual relationship with the DOE necessitates the new publication of the project design document (PDD) is to be clarified; and the need to introduce a requirement for a new publication of the PDD for changes of DOE or project design (e.g. location, technologies) requires further consideration by assessing the potential impacts of the changes in the project activity.</p> <p>Based on this, it has been clarified that if all project participants (or the coordinating/managing entity in the case of a PoA) with a contractual relationship with the DOE for validation at the time of the publication of the PDD for global stakeholder consultation have changed, a new publication of the PDD is needed. It has also been clarified that if the project participants wish to change the DOE after the publication of the PDD, they need to notify the secretariat of the change before the submission of the request for registration, but a new publication of the PDD by the newly appointed DOE is not needed.</p>	PS paras 87 _{bis}
	VVS	New		VVS para 37 _{bis} , 37 _{ter} and 38 _{bis}
	PCP	20–21		PCP paras 23 _{ter} –23 _{quater}
16	PS	New	<p>The Board provided guidance at its seventy-fifth meeting that a simple process to allow project participants or DOEs to withdraw a published monitoring report was to be introduced. Based on this, rules and requirements for withdrawing published monitoring reports have been introduced.</p> <p>The Board, at its seventy-ninth meeting, supported the direction of the proposed changes, but considered that withdrawn monitoring reports need to be kept on the UNFCCC CDM website and marked as “withdrawn” as in the cases of withdrawn requests for registration and issuance and that the time frame for the secretariat to process requests for withdrawal needs to be shortened.</p> <p>Based on this, it has been clarified that a withdrawn monitoring report will be kept on the UNFCCC CDM website marked as “withdrawn”, and the time frame for processing the request by the secretariat has been shortened to five days. The use of the form for requesting the withdrawal has also been referred to.</p>	PS para 263 _{bis}
	PCP	New		PCP para 28 _{ter}

#	Doc.	Para no.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/section
17	PS	New	For Type II or Type III small-scale project activities, if the maximum output or the emission reductions has exceeded the threshold of each small-scale project activity type in a monitoring period, currently the amount of CERs that can be claimed is capped at the maximum emission reductions estimated in the registered PDD. The cap has been changed from the maximum emission reductions estimated in the registered PDD for that year to the limit of the respective small-scale project activity type.	PS para 296 _{ter}
	VVS	New		VVS para 333 _{ter}
18	PS	Appendix 1	The Board provided guidance at its seventy-fifth meeting that the secretariat should analyse the types of changes that require prior approval by the Board (the prior-approval track) and that may be combined with requests for issuance (the issuance track), and if deemed appropriate, propose the changes, including the revision of appendix 1 of the PS, with justification. Based on this, the secretariat conducted the requested analysis and has added four other types of changes to the monitoring of a registered project activity that do not require prior approval, as these types of changes do not pose any risk to applicability conditions, additionality and the scale of the project activity. The Board, at its seventy-ninth meeting, supported the direction of the proposed changes.	PS appendix 1 para 5(d)(e)(f)(g)
19	VVS	113	The Board provided guidance at its seventy-fifth meeting that: the information that project participants are to include in the notification of prior consideration needs further clarification; and the current exemption for the notification of prior consideration regarding cases for which a new baseline and monitoring methodology, or a revision of an approved methodology, is proposed, is to be removed. Based on this, the information to be included in the notification of prior consideration has been specified (location of the project activity and the technology under consideration) and the exemption for notification regarding cases for which a new baseline and monitoring methodology, or a revision of an approved methodology is proposed has been removed. The Board, at its seventy-ninth meeting, supported the direction of the proposed changes.	VVS para 113
	PCP	8		PCP paras 8, 8 _{bis} , 8 _{ter}

#	Doc.	Para no.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/section
20	PS	New	<p>The Board provided guidance at its seventy-fifth meeting that the requirement to obtain the approval of the Board to resubmit a request for issuance, when the previous request has been withdrawn, is to be eliminated, and any restriction for project participants to reduce or extend the length of the monitoring period in a resubmission of a request for issuance, if deemed necessary, should aim to protect environmental integrity. Based on this, the distinction between the three types of withdrawal of request for issuance and the need to obtain the Board's approval for resubmission have been removed. Also, a possibility for project participants to modify the period covered by the monitoring report after the withdrawal of the corresponding request for issuance has been introduced. In this case, a new on-site inspection is required if the end date of the monitoring period is after the date of the on-site inspection conducted by the DOE. In addition, the similar process applicable to the resubmission of a request for issuance after its rejection, i.e. the required permission of the Board for the resubmission and the prohibition to submitting a request for issuance for the same monitoring period after a second rejection, has been removed.</p>	PS para 263 _{ter}
	PCP	244, 246–250		PCP paras 244, 246–250
21	VVS	350	<p>Based on paragraph 27(e) of the annex to decision 3/CMP.1 and paragraph 20 of annex II to decision 4/CMP.1, the same DOE may not perform validation and verification for the same project activity unless the Board approves it to do so, or unless it is a small-scale project activity. This requirement is referred to in the VVS, but the process to submit and obtain such approval is not defined. In the meantime, the Board has been receiving many such requests and deciding on each request.</p> <p>The process of requesting and approving the same DOE to perform validation and verification for the same project activity has been elaborated based on the current practice of the Board.</p>	VVS paras 251 _{bis} and 350
	PCP	New		PCP paras 183 _{bis} –183 _{quinquies}
22	VVS	New	<p>The Board, at its seventy-fifth meeting, requested the secretariat to update the VVS to reflect requirements related to materiality and update the materiality guideline “Guideline on the application of materiality in verifications” (materiality guideline) to remove the requirements that will have been moved to the VVS.</p> <p>Most provisions of the “Guideline on the application of materiality in verifications” materiality guideline have been moved to the VVS and to the “Glossary: CDM terms” except for the flow chart on the application of materiality in verifications and examples of the application of materiality in verifications.</p>	VVS section 9.2.1 _{bis} and para 330 _{bis}

#	Doc.	Para no.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/section
23	PCP	51, 74, 153, 205, 216	<p>The Board provided guidance at its seventy-fifth meeting that opportunities need to be explored for DOEs or project participants to communicate with the secretariat to obtain clarifications via a telephone call on rulings of the Board rejecting requests for registration, issuance or renewal of crediting period.</p> <p>Based on this, an opportunity has been introduced for DOEs or project participants to request the secretariat to make a telephone call to them to provide clarifications on rulings for rejected requests for registration, issuance or renewal of crediting period.</p> <p>The Board, at its seventy-ninth meeting, supported the introduction of an opportunity for project participants and DOEs to request the secretariat to provide clarification on the rulings for rejected cases, but considered that the means of communication may be expanded to those other than telephone calls.</p> <p>Based on this, an internet-based call has been added as an optional means for providing clarifications on the rulings. Furthermore, the same means has also been added to the existing similar steps of direct communication in the project cycle.</p>	PCP paras 51, 74, 111 ^{bis} , 153, 161 ^{bis} , 205, 216 and 243 ^{bis}

Table 2. Improving the consistency and removing duplications of provisions

#	Doc.	Para No.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/section
24	PS	35	Add a provision on prior consideration of the CDM for PoAs that mirrors the corresponding provision in the PCP.	PS para 35
25	PS	35	Merge option (a)(b) to remove duplication	PS para 41
26	PS	37–38	Review the wording of requirements relating to the description of a project activity, and make it consistent with the PDD guidelines.	PS para 37. Also para 38 was removed to avoid duplication with section 7.2.5.
27	PS	48	Introduce the reference to the guideline to clarify the applicability of “Guidelines on the consideration of suppressed demand in CDM methodologies “	PS para 48
28	PS	55, 56, 208	Replace the reference of para 54 and 57 with para54-57 in para 208 and extend the application of para 55 and 56 to CPA.	PS para 55,56,208

#	Doc.	Para No.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/section
29	PS	60	Adjust the text to make it consistent with the current wording of the corresponding instruction in the PDD guidelines.	PS para 60
30	PS	75, 183, 205	Make it mandatory to follow the instructions for filling out the PDD, PoA-DD and CPA-DD forms and the monitoring report form as contained in these forms, to be consistent with paragraphs 63 and 212(e) of the VVS and the existing practice.	PS paras 75, 183 and 205
31	PS	78–79	Remove 78(c) to avoid the inconsistency with para 46 of VVS. Introduce 78bis to make it consistent with para 46 of VVS. Insert the phrase “and all other Parties involved as indicated in the PDD” to avoid the misunderstanding that only LOA from host party is required .	PS para 78bis
32	PS	89	Remove para 89 due to the duplication with para 81.	PS para 89
33	PS	128	Add a provision on the additionality for afforestation and reforestation project activities that it shall not follow the guidance referred in para 54-56 to determine the additionality.	PS para 128
34	PS	107,136	Review the wording of requirements relating to environmental impacts of the proposed small-scale CDM project activity. Review the wording of requirements relating to the renewal of crediting period of for afforestation and reforestation project activities	PS para 107 _{bis} , 136 _{bis}
35	PS	201–204	Remove para 203 due to duplication with para 31(e). Remove 201 and 204(b) due to duplication with section 7.6	PS Section 12.3
36	PS	209–228	Introduce the relevant requirement in the PS that corresponds to the requirement in the VVS regarding post-registration changes using a later version of a methodology (para 264).	PS para 277 _{bis}
37	PS	219–220	Merge the two paragraphs as they relate to the same requirement.	PS paras 219–220
38	PS	New	Introduce the relevant requirements on environmental impacts for a proposed CDM PoA that includes only small-scale non-A/R CPAs	PS paras 223 _{bis} , 223 _{ter} and 223 _{quarter}
39	PS	232	Change the operators of individual CPAs to CPA implementors, who are responsible for the operation of individual CPAs to be consistent with the CPA-DD.	PS para 232

#	Doc.	Para No.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/section
40	PS	Section 12.12	Delete section 12.12 due to the duplication with paras 81-85.	PS Section 12.12
41	PS	241–243	Move para 241-243 from Section 12.13 to 13.11.4 because the inclusion of CPA is a post-registration activity.	PS Section 13.11.4
42	PS	252 _{bis}	Introduce the relevant monitoring requirements in the PS that correspond to the required information in the monitoring report for project activities using the sampling approach to monitoring (section D.3).	PS para 252 _{bis}
43	PS	New	Add a provision on the letters of approval from new host parties that the coordinating/managing entity shall follow the requirements in section 7.6.	PS para 281bis
44	PS	292	Change the phrase “for determining GHG emission reductions” to “for determining the original baseline” to make it consistent with the tool referred to in the same paragraph regarding the requirement of renewal of crediting period.	PS para 292
45	PS	294	Clarify that the coordinating/managing entity shall prepare an updated PoA-DD including updated generic CPA-DDs, not a new completed PDD.	PS para 294
46	PS	297	Clarify that all the requirements in in the latest version of the registered PoA-DD and generic CPA-DDs and including eligibility criteria shall be met in updating specific-case CPA-PDD	PS para 297
47	PS	New	Incorporate the clarification on the date of receipt of request for registration as contained in paragraph 3(b) of the “Procedures for registration of a proposed CDM project activity” (EB 09 report, annex 5).	PS para 24(b) _{bis}
48	PS	New	Introduce a new general requirement on PoA to make it consistent with that in VVS.	PS para 190 _{bis}
49	PS	New	Introduce the relevant requirement in the PS that corresponds to the requirement in the VVS regarding the consistency in the names of the project participants when requesting the renewal of crediting period of a registered project activity or renewal of registered PoA (para 305).	PS para 229 _{bis}

#	Doc.	Para No.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/section
50	PS	New	Introduce a provision that requires the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity to ensure that the names of the project participants included in the request for renewal of crediting period are consistent with the names of the registered project participants for the CDM project activity or PoA.	PS para 286 _{bis}
51	VVS	Many	Standardize the terminology “monitoring plan in the registered PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD, or the monitoring plan in an approved revised PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD” as “registered monitoring plan” in the VVS.	Many
52	VVS	Many	Standardize the terminology “verification report” and “certification report” as “verification and certification report” to be consistent with the current reporting practice that most of the “verification reports” and “certification reports” have been submitted as combined reports.	Many
53	VVS	31–34	Consolidate section 7.4 “General reporting requirements” into section 7.15 “Validation status and outcomes, opinion and report” to remove the duplication. Move para 154 _{sexies} regarding the submission of validation report to right after para 155 on the required contents of the validation report in order to be consistent with section 9.6.1. “Verification and certification report” and section 11. “General validation requirements on renewal of crediting period or programme of activities”.	VVS section 7.4, paras 152(a), 154 _{quinquie} and 155 _{bis}
54	VVS	36, 38(c)	Remove the phrase “during the validation of the proposed CDM project activity” from section 7.5 to avoid the misunderstanding that the comments in the global stakeholder consultation may be received during the entire period of validation, while in fact it is limited only to 30 days from the publication of the PDD or PoA-DD.	VVS paras 36 and 38(c)
56	VVS	83	Introduce the reference to the tool to clarify the applicability of “clarification” to the approved tools to be consistent with the relevant requirements in the “Procedure: development, revision and clarification of baseline and monitoring methodologies and methodological tools”.	VVS para 83
57	VVS	101–105	Make the document structure consistent between the PS and the VVS in the areas of emission reductions calculation (PS section 7.2.7 and VVS section 7.12.7).	VVS sections 7.12.7 and 7.12.8 _{bis}
58	VVS	114(b)	Remove duplicated requirements between the PS and VVS on evidence to support “real and continuous actions to secure CDM status” in the section of prior consideration of the CDM.	VVS para 114(b)

#	Doc.	Para No.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/section
59	VVS	142	Remove the phrase “required to do so by the host Party” and add the phrase “considered significant by the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity or by the host Party” to make para 142 consistent with the other requirements on environmental impacts in the VVS (paras 141 and 144) as well as para 37(c) of Decision 3/CMP.1.	VVS para 142
60	VVS	144	Introduce the reference to the case where the project participants and the coordinating/managing entity considered the environmental impacts of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA is significant, which corresponds to the requirement on environmental impacts in the Project standard (PS para 72).	VVS para 144
61	VVS	154(c)	Add the reference to “forward action requests” (FARs) in the requirement on the validation report to make it consistent with the requirements on the means of validation (paras 28 and 30).	VVS para 155(a) _{bis}
62	VVS	155(b)–155(c)	Restructure the paragraph to make them consistent with the reporting requirements in sections 7.5–7.14. Merge the reporting requirement in paragraph 38(c) and para 155(c) to remove the duplication.	VVS paras 38(c) and 155(b)–(c)
63	VVS	155(d)	Add “a list of on-site inspection” as a validation requirement to be consistent with the verification requirement in VVS para 330(c) regarding the findings of on-site inspection.	VVS para 155(d)
64	VVS	159(c)	Delete a validation requirement on debundling for project activity in para 159(c) that duplicates with section 8.1.2 “Debundling for project activity”.	VVS para 159(c)
65	VVS	168	Insert the missing phrase “(or the appropriate equivalent)” for the thresholds of Type I and Type II of small-scale CDM project activities, as defined in paragraph 28 of decision 1/CMP.2.	VVS para 168
66	VVS	191	Remove the phrase “required by the host Party” and add the phrase “considered significant by the project participants or the host Party” to make para 191 consistent with the other requirement on socio-economic and environmental impacts in the VVS (para 190) as well as para 12(c) of Decision 5/CMP.1.	VVS para 191
67	VVS	Section 8.5.	Improve a consistency in the sequence of sub-sections and requirements in VVS section 8.5 in accordance with that of VVS section 7 “General validation requirements” and PS section 12 “Specific design requirements for programme of activities” for better readability and usability.	VVS section 8.5. (paras 229 _{bis} – 229 _{sexies} , 234-234 _{bis} , 235 _{bis} -239, 240 _{bis} -242 _{bis} .)

#	Doc.	Para No.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/section
68	VVS	239	Remove the reference to the application of para 113 mutatis mutandis to assess the prior consideration of CDM in para 239 to avoid the contradiction with the corresponding requirements in the PS and PCP (i.e. PS para 35 and PCP para 12). In addition, move the revised para 239 under section 8.5.4.5. "Demonstration of additionality of programme of activities as a whole" to be consistent with the structure of the VVS.	VVS para 240bis
69	VVS	244	Remove requirements on environmental analysis in the section for specific requirements for PoA due to the duplication with that in the section for all project types (VVS para 141).	VVS para 244
70	VVS	345(c)(i)	Introduce the reference to section 7.6, 7.7. and 7.8. in order to consistently validate a letter of approval for additional host Party in terms of approval, authorization and sustainable development.	VVS para 8(c)(i) of section 8 _{ter}
71	VVS	245	Add the validation requirement in para 245 of the VVS to determine in which level the environmental impacts analysis and/or environmental impacts assessment was(were) carried out, the whole PoA-level and/or at the CPA level, which corresponds to PS para 223.	VVS para 245
72	VVS	249	Move para 249 on inclusion of non-first CPAs to the section 8 _{ter} "Specific validation requirements on post-registration changes" to improve the consistency with the structure of the PCP and introduce a relevant requirement that corresponds and link to section 6.1.1 of the PCP regarding CPA inclusion.	VVS paras 14(a) of section 8 _{ter}
73	VVS	249, 348	Improve a consistency between paragraphs 249 and 348 regarding validation requirements on the inclusion of the first and non-first specific-case CPA since DOEs are required to validate the same aspects regardless of inclusion of the 1 st CPA or 2 nd CPA.	VVS paras 14(a) and 14(b) of section 8 _{ter}
74	VVS	255, 272, 330	Introduce the relevant requirements in the VVS to further operationalize the sampling approach in validation and verification in accordance with the "Standard: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities" (CDM-EB50-A30-STAN).	VVS paras 19, 23(e), 66(c), 138, 139(c), 140(a), 255, 262(c), 279 _{bis} and 330(c), as well as paras 1, 3(a)(b) and 5(f) of section 7.12.8 _{bis} .
75	VVS	257(e)	Move para 257(e) on the compliance with the form in VVS from section "9.2. General verification approach" to section 9.4. "Verification of compliance" and introduce the relevant verification requirement that correspond to the validation requirement in VVS section 7.10. regarding the compliance with the form.	VVS para 257(e) and section 9.4.1 _{bis} .

#	Doc.	Para No.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/section
76	VVS	270	Move the phrase “(technology, project equipment, and monitoring and metering equipment)” from para 270(a) to para 272. Delete the rest of para 270 due to the duplication with para 251, sections 9.4.1 - 9.5.5 and PCP para 192.	VVS paras 270 and 272
77	VVS	275	Paragraph 275 of the VVS states “The DOE shall determine whether the project implementation is in accordance with the provisions of the registered PDD and/or an approved revised PDD”. This requirement is in section 9.4.2 “Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s)”. On the other hand, the requirement to verify the compliance of the project implementation with the registered PDD already exists in section 9.4.1 “Compliance of the project implementation with the registered project design document”. It is therefore proposed to modify the text to limit the requirement to verify the compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s).	VVS para 275
78	VVS	290(e), footnote 40	Remove footnote 40 to make the requirements on the data vintage consistent with the “Tool to calculate emission factor for an electricity system” in accordance with paragraph 55 of EB75 report.	VVS para 290(e), footnote 40
79	VVS	292–328 (Section 9.5)	Introduce the relevant requirements in the VVS that correspond to the requirement in the PS, the monitoring report guidelines and the post-registration change request form, regarding specific changes to A/R project activities.	VVS section 9.5.5 _{bis}
80	VVS	Sections 9.5 and 10.3.1	Move section 9.5 “Post-registration changes” to the new sections 8 _{bis} . “General validation requirements on post-registration changes” and move section 10.3.1 “Post-registration changes to boundary of programme of activities” and 10.3.1 _{bis} “Changes to modalities of communication” to the new section 8 _{ter} “Specific validation requirements on post-registration changes” in accordance with the “Clarification: Validation of post-registration changes and verification by the same DOE for the same project activity or programme of activities” (CDM-EB77-A12-CLAR), which states that the DOE’s assessment of post-registration changes is a validation activity.	VVS sections 8 _{bis} . and 8 _{ter} , 9.5, 10.3.1 _{bis} . and 10.3.1

#	Doc.	Para No.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/section
81	VVS	294–295, 300–301, 306, 310, 312–313, 315 and 323–324	Para 3 of section 8 _{bis} clarifies the use of prior approval track and issuance track as a general requirement for post-registration changes to be consistent with paras 140 and 142 of the PCP. Revise or delete the reporting requirements on the post-registration changes to remove the contradiction and duplication with para 3 of section 8 _{bis} regarding the use of prior approval track and issuance track of post-registration changes. In addition to this purpose, delete paras 29 and 34 of section 8 _{bis} to avoid duplication with PS paras 278 and 281 and VVS paras 22 and 29.	VVS paras 3, 5, 15, 16, 21, 29, 31, 32, 34, 42 and 43 of section 8 _{bis} and paras 4 and 5 of section 8 _{ter}
82	VVS	327 and 328	Move paras 46 and 47 of section 8 _{bis} from the section “9.5.5. Changes to the project design of a registered project activity” to the section “9.5.1 _{bis} General” because a positive assessment opinion and negative assessment opinion apply to all types of PRC requests. Delete the process to request the guidance from the Board in para 4 of section 8 _{bis} when post-registration changes do not comply with the relevant CDM requirements, since this process is inconsistent with other validations. No compliance to the relevant CDM requirements automatically results in negative validation opinion in the other validations (e.g. validation of the registration and renewal of crediting period of project activities). Moreover, it is not practically necessary and not cost-effective to maintain this process given the fact that there have been no cases that the DOEs requested the guidance.	VVS paras 3, 4, 46 and 47 of section 8 _{bis} .
83	VVS	330	Introduce the relevant verification requirements in the VVS that correspond to the validation requirement of the VVS para 155(f) regarding the information on the DOE’s quality control within the verification team and in the verification process.	VVS para 330(h) _{bis}
84	VVS	330(f)	Add the statement on whether the post-registration changes will be submitted together with the request for issuance as a reporting requirement in the verification report to be consistent with the issuance track in paragraph 142 of PCP.	330(f)
85	VVS	352	Delete the 1 st sentence of para 352 regarding request for issuance in order to avoid the duplication with general verification requirements in para 333.	VVS para 352
86	VVS	Section 11	Separate section 11 “Renewal of crediting period” into section 11 “General validation requirements on renewal of crediting period or programme” and section 12 “Specific validation requirements on renewal of crediting period or programme” that corresponds to the entire structure of the VVS that separates general and specific requirements.	VVS sections 11 and 12

#	Doc.	Para No.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/section
87	VVS	363(c)	Revise para 363(c) to cover all cases in PS paras 288 and 289 regarding the application of the baseline and monitoring methodology and, where applicable, the standardized baseline at the time of renewal of crediting period or programme of activities.	VVS para 363(a)(iii)
88	VVS	New	Introduce para 21 _{bis} on the publication of PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD to be consistent with the fact that the VVS has para 255 on the publication of a monitoring report. Similarly, introduce para 363 _{bis} on the request for renewable of crediting period or PoA to be consistent with the fact that the VVS has para 155 _{bis} on request for registration. In addition, these are consistent with para 40(b) and 49(a) of Decision 3/CMP.1.	VVS paras 21 _{bis} , 363 _{bis}
89	VVS	New	Introduce “validation requirement” that has been missing in the section “Global stakeholder consultation” to ensure the consistency with other sections in the section “General validation requirements”.	VVS para 34 _{bis}
90	VVS	New	Introduce references to “standardized baseline” to the draft requirements that were proposed against version 05.0 of the VVS before the adoption of version 07.0 of the VVS.	VVS paras 37 _{ter} (c), 361 _{bis} and 365 _{bis} (b)
91	VVS	New	Introduce the relevant validation requirements” in the VVS that correspond to the PS section 11.9 “Approval and authorization”.	VVS section 7.7 including para 46 _{bis}
92	VVS	New	Introduce the relevant validation requirements in the VVS that correspond to the project design requirements in the PS on duration and crediting period (section 7.3).	VVS section 7.12 _{bis}
93	VVS	New	Introduce the relevant validation requirements in the VVS that correspond to the PS section 8.7 “Environmental impacts” in the section for specific design requirements for small-scale project activities.	VVS section 8.1.4.
94	VVS	New	Introduce the relevant validation requirements in the VVS that correspond to the PS paragraphs 124 _{bis} - 128 in the section for specific design requirements for afforestation and reforestation project activities regarding establishment and description of baseline scenario and emission reductions.	VVS sections 8.2.5 _{bis} and 8.2.5 _{ter}
95	VVS	New	Introduce the relevant validation requirements in the VVS that correspond to the PS section 12.3 “Description of component project activities”	VVS section 8.5.1 _{bis} . (para 230 _{bis})

#	Doc.	Para No.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/section
96	VVS	New	Introduce para 245 _{bis} in the VVS regarding specific validation requirements on environmental impacts for a proposed CDM PoA that includes only small-scale non-A/R CPAs, which corresponds to PS para 223 _{bis} .	VVS para 245 _{bis}
97	VVS	New	Introduce the relevant validation requirements in the VVS that correspond to the paragraph 137(e) and 137 _{bis} of the Amendment to the Project cycle procedure regarding modification to or addition of technologies/ measures.	VVS paragraphs 11 and 12 of section 8 _{ter}
98	VVS	New	Introduce the relevant verification requirements in the VVS that correspond to the requirement in the PS (para 258) and the monitoring report (section E.6) regarding the difference from estimated value in the registered PDD.	VVS para 273(d)
99	VVS	New	Introduce verification requirements in the VVS that correspond to requirements on the update of the status of the implementation/verification of the registered CDM project activities and PoAs in the PCP (PCP paras 188–189).	VVS section 9.6.1 _{bis} and para 330(d)
100	VVS	New	Introduce validation requirements in the VVS that correspond to requirements on the renewal of programme of activities in the PS. Delete first sentence of para 365 _{bis} (b) regarding the preparation of the updated PoA-DD to remove duplication with para 357.	VVS section 12.2.1 and para 365 _{bis} (b)
101	PCP	83	Incorporate the clarification on the date of receipt of request for registration as contained in paragraph 3(b) of the “Procedures for registration of a proposed CDM project activity” (EB 09 report, annex 5).	PCP para 83
102	PCP	136(b)(ii)	Introduce the relevant requirements in the PCP that correspond to the requirement in the PS regarding the change to the start date of crediting period (PS paras 273–276).	PCP para 136(b)(ii), 136 _{bis}
103	PCP	New	To ensure the consistency with similar steps in other processes in the PCP, introduce a provision that clarifies that a request for deviation from an approved methodology will be published after the successful completeness check.	PCP para 48 _{bis}
104	PS	157	Remove requirements on monitoring plan in the section for specific requirements for PoA due to the duplication with those in the section for all project type (PS para 54 and VVS para 138).	PS para 157
	VVS	243		VVS para 243

#	Doc.	Para No.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/section
105	PS	New	Introduce the relevant project design and validation requirements in the PS and the VVS that correspond to the requirements in the PCP regarding the request for deviation from an approved methodology before registration (section 4.5).	PS para 25(b) _{bis}
	VVS	New		VVS paras 81 and 83
106	PS	New	Introduce relevant requirements on the withdrawal of published PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD. Similarly, Introduce relevant requirements on the withdrawal of request for registration, issuance and renewal of crediting period or PoA	PS para 87 _{ter} and 87 _{quater} 263 _{ter} and 297 _{bis} .
	VVS	New		VVS paras 21 _{ter} , 155 _{quater} , 333 _{bis} , 363 _{ter}
107	PS	New	Introduce the validation requirements in the VVS that correspond to para 23 of the Amendment to the “Standard for demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of multiple methodologies for programme of activities”.	PS para 281(f)
	VVS	New		VVS para 37(e) of section 8 _{bis} .
108	PS	Many	Refer to “PoA(s)” and “CPA(s)”, “PoA-DD” and “CPA-DD” and “the coordinating/managing entity” in all applicable requirements.	PS many paras
	VVS	Many		VVS many paras
109	VVS	149	Remove the procedural requirements in the VVS on reporting the validation status to avoid duplication with the PCP.	VVS paras 148 and 149
	PCP	28		PCP para 28
110	VVS	New	Introduce the relevant validation and procedural requirements in the VVS and the PCP respectively that correspond to the requirements in the PS regarding the cases where, at the renewal of crediting period, the methodology is no longer applicable due to the revision or update of the baseline (PS para 287(c)).	VVS paras 361 _{bis} , 361 _{ter} and 361 _{quater}
	PCP	New		PCP para 266 _{quinquies}

Table 3. Other issues

#	Doc.	Para No.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/ section
111	PS	19	Consider introducing provisions that further deal with how confidential information is to be omitted from public information.	PS para 20

#	Doc.	Para No.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/ section
112	PS	22(e)	For PoAs, remove the distinction between large-scale, small-scale, large-scale A/R and small-scale A/R.	PS para 23(e)
113	PS	34(a)	Consider to include emails as secondary supporting evidence.	PS footnote 5
114	PS	42	Methodologies may refer to the documents that have been superseded by the PS. Therefore, an analysis will be done to determine whether it should be clarified in the PS that the compliance with such superseded documents is not required.	Not to introduce a general principle in the PS. The respective methodologies will be revised individually to update the references.
115	PS	24–25	Merge para 24 and 25 due to similar provisions	PS para 24(a)bis and 25
116	PS	57	Provide reference to the definition of “start date” of project activity (as defined in the “Glossary of CDM terms”.	PS para 57
117	PS	64(b)	Consider deleting “electronically”, as It appears that “kept and archived electronically” is not easy for some project owners, especially the project owners of small projects.	PS para 64(b)
118	PS	60	Introduce methodologies as references to clarify how the project participants or the coordinating/managing shall follow to provide the data and parameters that are not monitored throughout during the crediting period	PS para 60
119	PS	78–79	Clarify the text regarding the Parties that project participants (PPs) are required to obtain letters of approval (LoAs) from.	PS para 79 _{ter} and footnotes 11 and 11 _{bis}
120	PS	89	Clarify the text regarding the eligibility to be classified as small-scale project activities.	PS paras 89
121	PS	108	Move para 108 to section 8.5 as the provision fits better in that section.	PS paras 108 and 97
122	PS	105	Replace Attachment A of Appendix B” to Annex II to decision4/CMP with Guidelines on the demonstration of additionality of small-scale project activities. “	PS para 105
123	PS	196	Merge with para 39 due to the similarity of provisions.	PS paras 39 and 196

#	Doc.	Para No.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/ section
124	PS	248	Clarify the term “continued operation periods” in paragraph 194(b) of the PS, which states “Information on the implementation and actual operation of the project activity, including relevant dates (e.g. construction, commissioning, continued operation periods, etc.)” as a required element in the description of the implemented registered project activity.	PS para 248
125	PS	252(a)	Clarify the sentence starting with “For default values...” to avoid the confusion created by the word “ex post confirmed” in this para,	PS para 252
126	PS	287	Clarify that, at the time of renewal of crediting period, additionality does not have to be re-assessed.	287
127	PS	287	Clarify which version of the PDD form shall be used when project participants update the PDD at the time of renewal of crediting period, to make this point consistent with the relevant requirement in the PCP.	287
128	VVS	Many	Standardize terminologies by replacing the term “on-site assessment”, “on-site visit”, “site visit”, “physical site inspection” and “physical inspection” with “on-site inspection” to be consistent with the terminology used in the CDM modalities and procedures.	VVS many paras
129	VVS	37	Clarify how to handle the comments that the project activity, PoA or CPA does not comply with relevant CDM requirements and are not substantiated in order to ensure the accuracy, completeness and practicability of the validation process.	VVS para 37
130	VVS	40(d), 64, 113	Over time the secretariat has received a number of queries related to consistency in pre-registration documents, such as LoA, prior consideration notification, and PDD published for global stakeholder consultation as to how precisely they have to be consistent with regard to the title of the project activity. It is proposed to clarify the required degree of the “preciseness”.	VVS para 40(d)
131	VVS	139(b)	Modify the text to read “To assess <u>the feasibility of</u> the implementation of” the monitoring plan, to remove the obvious contradiction that the DOE cannot assess the implementation of the monitoring plan at the validation stage.	VVS para 139(b)
132	VVS	154–155	Merge paras 154 and 155 due to the similarity of provisions.	VVS paras 154, 155(a), 155(a) _{bis} , 155(b) and 155(b) _{bis}

#	Doc.	Para No.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/ section
133	VVS	155(d), 330(c)	Add the sampling approach used by the DOE as a reporting requirement as it is also one of means of validation and verification as defined in sections 7.3 and 9.3.	VVS para 155(d) and 330(c)
134	VVS	167	Replace “Attachment A to Appendix B of 4/CMP.1, annex II” with “Guidelines on the demonstration of additionality of small-scale project activities” as the former was superseded by the latter.	VVS para 167
135	VVS	229	Clarify the applicability of requirements in section 8.5 and necessary requirements for the validation of each type of PoA and CPA.	VVS para 229
136	VVS	296, 307 and 314	Introduce and clarify the validation requirements on post-registration changes that the DOE shall determine whether the post-registration changes comply with the relevant requirements in the Project standard because this is the key elements of the validation opinion on the post-registration changes.	VVS paras 11, 26 and 33 of section 8 _{bis} and para 1 of section 8 _{ter} .
137	VVS	233 and 345(c)(ii)	Clarify that multi-country PoAs or inclusions of additional host Parties into PoAs require “at least” one specific-case CPA-DD for each host Party.	VVS paras 233 and 8(c)(ii) of section 8 _{ter}
138	VVS	253, 350	Create a link with the “Procedure: Process for dealing with letters from DNAs that withdraw approval/authorization” adopted by the Board at EB76.	VVS paras 251 _{ter} , 350(a) and 350(c)
139	VVS	300, 312, 323	Delete the reporting requirements for post-registration changes that require DOEs to indicate the assessment opinion (it will be called “validation opinion on post-registration changes” if the proposed revised VVS is adopted) in the verification report in the issuance track. Instead, introduce the requirements in para 6 of section 8 _{bis} to require DOEs to prepare the validation opinion on post-registration changes using the CDM-PRCV-FORM (to be developed after the adoption of the draft revised VVS) even in the issuance track in order to standardize the documentation process and contents of the validation opinion on post-registration changes in prior-approval track and issuance track.	VVS paras 6, 15, 31 and 42 of section 8 _{bis} and para 4 of section 8 _{ter}
140	VVS	330	Cover all the relevant requirements to be reported in verification reports to be consistent with reporting requirements in section 9.4.	VVS para 330(d)
141	VVS	330(a)	Introduce a new reporting requirement to include a summary of its conclusion in a verification report, based on the good practice by DOEs observed to date.	VVS para 330(a)

#	Doc.	Para No.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/ section
142	VVS	361, 363(b)	Clarify the validation requirements for renewal of PoA on the consistency of names of the coordinating/managing entity and project participants between registered PoA-DD and updated PoA-DD.	VVS paras 361 and 363(a)(vi)
143	VVS	New	Clarify the meaning of the phrase “the DOE received no response from the local stakeholders and/or the DNA” by stating “the local stakeholders and/or the DNA provided no response to DOE’s request for the interview”.	VVS para 146 _{bis}
144	VVS	New	Introduce requirements that the DOE shall use the valid version of applicable validation report form (to be developed after the adoption of the draft revised VVS) when validating for the registration of a proposed CDM project activity or PoA and the inclusion of CPAs.	VVS paras 154 _{bis} , 154 _{ter} and 154 _{quater}
145	VVS	New	Introduce provisions on the applicability of general validation requirements related to project boundary and socio-environmental impacts to a proposed A/R CDM project activity.	VVS paras 171 _{bis} and 187 _{bis}
146	VVS	New	Introduce requirements on means of validation for post-registration changes and renewal of crediting period regarding the standard auditing techniques, CARs/CLs/FARs and other general validation requirements, which have been used and reported in most of the submitted validation reports for post-registration changes and renewal of crediting period.	VVS para 1 _{bis} of section 8 _{bis} . and 357 _{bis}
147	VVS	New	Introduce the requirements to link with the different procedure in the PCP for the inclusion of the first and non-first CPA.	VVS para 4 _{bis} of section 8 _{bis}
148	VVS	New	Introduce requirements that the DOE shall use the valid version of validation report form for inclusion of proposed CDM CPAs (to be developed after the adoption of the draft revised VVS) when validating the post-registration inclusion of CPAs.	VVS para 6 and 7 of section 8 _{bis}
149	VVS	New	Introduce reporting requirements for the validation report for renewal of crediting period or PoA and post-registration activities to be consistent with those in paras 150-153 and 155 regarding reporting requirements for validation of registration of project activities and PoA. These include a summary of the validation process and conclusion, a validation opinion and a list of interviewees and documents reviewed. These have been reported in many submitted validation reports for renewal of crediting period and post-registration activities.	VVS para 10(b) of section 8 _{bis} and paras 363(b) and 363(c)

#	Doc.	Para No.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/ section
150	VVS	New	Introduce requirements for post-registration changes that exempt the duty of on-site inspection for certain types of changes to programme design of programme of activities including “Expansion of geographic coverage or inclusion of additional host Parties”, “Revisions to eligibility criteria for inclusion of component project activities” and “Removal of methodologies and/or standardized baselines”.	VVS para 7 of section 8 _{ter} .
151	VVS	New	Introduce requirements on the changes to modalities of communication that general requirements for post-registration in section 8 _{bis} . 1, including the use of prior approval track or issuance track, do not apply to the changes to modalities of communication except the application of means of validation in section 7.1 mutatis mutandis.	VVS para 16 of section 8 _{ter} .
152	VVS	New	To operationalize the new section 13 “General validation requirements on re-registration of de-registered project activities”, introduce the reference to “re-registration of a de-registered CDM project activity and re-inclusion of an excluded CDM CPA” as examples of validation activities that require the authorization from the Board, if the DOE wishes to conduct the verification activity for the same CDM project activity or PoA for which the DOE has conducted the validation activity.	VVS para 251 _{bis}
153	VVS	New	Introduce requirements that the DOE shall use the valid version of applicable verification and certification report form (CDM-VCR-FORM) (to be developed after the adoption of the draft revised VVS) when verifying and certifying the registered CDM project activities or PoA.	VVS paras 328 _{bis} and 328 _{ter}
154	VVS	New	Introduce requirements that the DOE shall use the valid version of applicable validation report form for renewal of crediting period of the CDM project activity or CPA or renewal of PoA (to be developed after the adoption of the draft revised VVS) when validating the renewal of crediting period of the registered CDM project activity or CPA or the renewal of PoA.	VVS paras 362 _{bis} , 362 _{ter} , 365 _{ter} and 365 _{quater}
155	PCP	10	Include a timeframe for the update of the status of the proposed project activity (e.g. within two months of every second anniversary of the initial notification), by creating a simple process to allow PPs to easily comply with this obligation.	PCP para 10
156	PCP	78, 208	Clarify that the DNA can send an e-mail to the secretariat when requesting a review of a request for registration or of a request for issuance.	PCP paras 78 and 208

#	Doc.	Para No.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/ section
157	PCP	184	Change the minimum time gap between the publication of the monitoring report and the DOE's site-visit for verification from 14 days to 21 days, to allow sufficient time for the establishment and travel arrangement for the CDM assessment team members in case the verification is chosen for a performance assessment in accordance with the CDM accreditation procedure.	PCP para 184
158	PCP	188	Consider creating a simple process to allow PPs to easily comply with the obligation of updating the status of the project activity.	PCP para 188
159	PCP	237–243	Consider revising the timeframe for publication of rulings on the rejected requests for issuance.	PCP para 243
160	PCP	New	Clarify that if a request for registration is rejected after review, and if the project participants still wish to register the project activity, the process has to be restarted from the publication of the (revised) PDD for global stakeholder consultation.	PCP para 111 _{ter}
161	PCP	New	Mention in the PCP the reference dates on which the relevant CDM requirements must be applied to a project activity unless otherwise stated in the requirements (e.g. the publication date of the PDD for project participants and the submission date of request for registration or issuance for DOE).	General rule on the applicability of CDM requirements are found in the “CDM Executive Board decision and documentation framework”
162	PCP	New	Introduce provisions for the withdrawal of published PDDs and requests for post-registration changes.	PCP paras 28 _{ter} and 163 _{bis}
163	PCP	New	Introduce a step to publish the requests for post-registration changes.	PCP para 150 _{bis}
164	PCP	New	Remove the possibility for the Board to decide different courses of actions for requested several changes combined in the same request for post-registration change.	PCP para 160 _{bis} (Removed)
165	PCP	26–27	Clarify the role of the secretariat in the treatment of public comments in the global stakeholder consultation, in particular in relation to comments whose authenticity is questioned. It should be clearly stated that the DOE should provide the secretariat with instructions about which comments have to be removed. Modify the VVS accordingly to make it consistent with the PCP.	PCP paras 26–27
	VVS	35–37		VVS paras 35 _{bis} , 35 _{ter} and 38(a)

#	Doc.	Para No.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/ section
166	PS	73, 181, 182, 203, 230	Clarify which version of PDD form, PoA-DD form, CPA-DD form, monitoring report form, modalities of communication statement, methodology, guidelines, completeness checklist can be used by changing the phrase “latest version” to “valid version”.	PS paras 81, 235, 236, 259 and 287
	VVS	61(a), 63, 75, 125, 270(b), 125, 131(a), 159(b)		VVS paras 61(a), 63, 75, 125, 270(b) and footnotes 11, 13 and 21
167	PS	144(a)	Clarify the definition and limits for the small-scale A/R CDM project activities.	PS para 144(a)
	VVS	193		VVS para 193(a)
168	PS	New	Clarify the requirements on post-registration changes that the application of a later valid version of the applied methodology requires the compliance with all the requirements in the later valid version of the applied methodology.	PS para 277 _{bis}
	VVS	309, 321, 322		VVS paras 28, 40(c)(i) and 41(b) of section 8 _{bis} .
169	PS	New	Paragraph 356 states “The DOE shall confirm that a CPA that has been excluded shall not be re-included again in the PoA or any other PoAs, or qualify as a project activity”. At present, this requirement is a specific verification requirement for PoA. However, para 356 should be moved to and rephrased as a general validation requirement on the registration of project activities and PoA and a general validation requirement on post-registration activities. This is because it is not at the time of verification but at the time of validation on the registration of project activity and inclusion of CPAs that the DOE shall confirm that a CPA that has been excluded shall not be re-included again in the PoA or any other PoAs, or qualify as a project activity.	PS para 40 _{bis}
	VVS	356		VVS para 69 _{bis}
170	PS	New	Introduce the requirements for post-registration changes and renewal of crediting period in the PS and VVS regarding the compliance of the revised/updated PDD with the valid version of PDD form, which have been the reporting practice. This includes the validation requirements in the VVS to confirm whether information transferred to the later version of the PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD form is materially the same as that in the registered PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD.	PS para 267 _{bis} , 267 _{ter}
	VVS	New		VVS paras 8, 9, 10(a)(i) and 10(a)(ii) of section 8 _{bis} , 358 _{bis} , 363(a)(i) and 363(a)(ii)

#	Doc.	Para No.	Issue and/or proposed change	Revised paragraph/ section
171	VVS	343	Enable coordinating/managing entities and DOEs to complete the changes to modalities of communication at the earliest possible in case of a change of the coordinating/managing entity.	VVS paras 17 and 18 of section 8 _{ter}
	PCP	180		PCP paras 179 _{bis} –180 _{ter}

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
04.0	11 November 2014	Published within annex 9 to the annotate agenda of EB 81.
03.0	30 June 2014	Published within annex 7 to the annotated agenda of EB 80. Revision to include six new issues (entries #17 _{bis} , 22 _{bis} , 37 _{bis} , 40 _{bis} , 40 _{ter} in table 2, and 48 _{bis} in table 3, respectively)
02.0	19 May 2014	Revision to include two new issues (entries #28 and #69 in table 2 and table 4 respectively).
01.0	14 May 2014	Publish within annex 14 to the annotated agenda of EB79.

Decision Class: Regulatory

Document Type: Information note

Business Function: Issuance, Registration

Keywords: data collection and analysis, management of official documentation

Appendix 2. Draft Standard. CDM project standard (version 07.008.0)

CDM-EB81-AA-A09

Revision of CDM project standard, validation and verification standard, and project cycle procedure
Version 04.0

CDM-EB81-AA-A09

Standard

CDM project standard

Version 08.0



United Nations
Framework Convention on
Climate Change

TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	43
1.1. Background.....	43
1.2. Objectives	43
2. SCOPE, APPLICABILITY AND ENTRY INTO FORCE	44
2.1. General.....	44
2.2. Application	44
2.3. Entry into force.....	44
3. NORMATIVE REFERENCES	45
4. TERMS AND DEFINITIONS	45
5. PRINCIPLES	46
5.1. General.....	46
5.2. Relevance.....	46
5.3. Completeness.....	46
5.4. Consistency	46
5.5. Accuracy and conservativeness	46
5.6. Transparency.....	46
6. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS.....	47
6.1. Use of and compliance with applicable standards	47
6.2. Identification of project type	47
6.3. Selection of methodology.....	47
6.4. Selection of standardized baseline	48
6.5. Demonstration of prior consideration of the clean development mechanism	49
7. DESIGN REQUIREMENTS FOR ALL PROJECT TYPES	50
7.1. Description of project activity or programme of activities	50
7.2. Application of selected approved baseline and monitoring methodology and selected standardized baseline.....	51
7.2.1. General	51
7.2.2. Reference of methodology and standardized baseline	52

7.2.3.	Applicability of methodology and standardized baseline	52
7.2.4.	Project boundary	52
7.2.5.	Establishment and description of baseline scenario	52
7.2.6.	Demonstration of additionality	53
7.2.7.	Emission reductions	54
7.2.8.	Monitoring plan	55
7.3.	Duration and crediting period	56
7.3.1.	Duration of project activity	56
7.3.2.	Crediting period	56
7.4.	Environmental impacts	57
7.5.	Local stakeholder consultation	57
7.6.	Approval and authorization	58
7.7.	Modalities of communications	59
7.8.	Validation	59
8.	SPECIFIC DESIGN REQUIREMENTS FOR SMALL-SCALE PROJECT ACTIVITIES	61
8.1.	General requirements	61
8.2.	Project activity type and eligibility	61
8.3.	Bundling of project activity	63
8.4.	Debundling for project activity	63
8.5.	Description of project activity	64
8.6.	Application of selected baseline and monitoring methodology and selected standardized baseline	64
8.6.1.	General	64
8.6.2.	Demonstration of additionality	65
8.6.3.	Monitoring plan	65
8.7.	Environmental impacts	66
8.8.	Validation	66
9.	SPECIFIC DESIGN REQUIREMENTS FOR AFFORESTATION AND REFORESTATION PROJECT ACTIVITIES	66
9.1.	Description of project activity	66
9.2.	Project boundary	67

9.3.	Eligibility of land	68
9.4.	Addressing non-permanence	68
9.5.	Application of selected baseline and monitoring methodology and selected standardized baseline	68
9.5.1.	General	68
9.5.2.	Demonstration of additionality	69
9.5.3.	Monitoring	70
9.6.	Duration and crediting period	70
9.7.	Environmental impacts	71
9.8.	Socio-economic impacts	71
10.	SPECIFIC DESIGN REQUIREMENTS FOR SMALL-SCALE AFFORESTATION AND REFORESTATION PROJECT ACTIVITIES.....	71
11.	SPECIFIC DESIGN REQUIREMENTS FOR CARBON DIOXIDE CAPTURE AND STORAGE PROJECT ACTIVITIES	72
11.1.	Definitions for CCS project activities	72
11.2.	Description of project activity or programme of activities	73
11.3.	Host Party participation requirements	74
11.4.	Selection and characterization of the geological storage site	75
11.5.	Project boundary	78
11.6.	Risk and safety assessment	78
11.7.	Monitoring	80
11.8.	Requirements for financial provision	83
11.9.	Liability	84
11.10.	Environmental and socioeconomic impact assessments	84
11.11.	Verification and certification	85
12.	SPECIFIC DESIGN REQUIREMENTS FOR PROGRAMME OF ACTIVITIES.....	85
12.1.	Selection of methodology and standardized baseline	85
12.2.	Description of programme of activities	86
12.3.	Description of component project activities	87
12.4.	Eligibility criteria	88
12.5.	Application of selected baseline and monitoring methodologies and selected standardized baselines	88

12.5.1.	General requirements	88
12.5.2.	Demonstration of additionality	88
12.5.3.	Sampling	89
12.5.4.	Monitoring plan	89
12.6.	Debundling of small-scale component project activities	89
12.7.	Duration and crediting period	89
12.7.1.	Duration of programme of activities and component project activities	89
12.7.2.	Crediting period	90
12.8.	Environmental impacts	91
12.9.	Local stakeholder consultation	92
12.10.	Approval and authorization	92
12.11.	Modalities of communications	92
12.12.	Validation	93
12.13.	Inclusion of component project activities in programme of activities	93
13.	IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS FOR ALL PROJECT TYPES	94
13.1.	General requirements	94
13.2.	General description	94
13.3.	Description of implemented registered project activity or programme of activities	94
13.4.	Description of monitoring system	95
13.5.	Data and parameters	95
13.6.	Calculation of emission reductions or net removals	98
13.7.	Verification of implemented registered project activity or programme of activities and monitored emission reductions or net removals	98
13.8.	Post registration changes	99
13.8.1.	General requirements	99
13.8.2.	Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodology or applied standardized baseline	100
13.8.3.	Permanent changes	100
13.9.	Renewal of crediting period or programme	106
13.9.1.	Renewal of crediting period of project activities	106

13.9.2.	Renewal of crediting period of programme of activities.....	108
13.10.	Specific requirements for small-scale projects activities	109
13.11.	Specific requirements for programme of activities	109
13.11.1.	Monitoring reports	109
13.11.2.	Changes in programme of activities	110
13.11.3.	Changes of coordinating/managing entity	110
13.11.4.	Inclusion of component project activities in programme of activities	111
13.12.	De- registration of registered CDM project activity and exclusion of component project activities from/in programme of activities	111
13.13.	Re- registration of de-registered CDM project activity and re-inclusion of excluded component project activities	111
APPENDIX 1.	CHANGES THAT DO NOT REQUIRE PRIOR APPROVAL BY THE BOARD	113

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

1. The Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (hereinafter referred to as the CMP), at its first session, established the basis of the regulatory framework for the clean development mechanism (hereinafter referred to as the CDM) to implement Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol through the following:
 - (a) Annex to decision 3/CMP.1: Modalities and procedures for a clean development mechanism (hereinafter referred to as the CDM M&Ps);
 - (b) Annexes to decision 4/CMP.1, including annex II: Simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale clean development mechanism project activities (hereinafter referred to as the CDM SSC M&Ps);
 - (c) Annex to decision 5/CMP.1: Modalities and procedures for afforestation and reforestation project activities under the clean development mechanism (hereinafter referred to as the CDM A/R M&Ps);
 - (d) Annex to decision 6/CMP.1: Simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale afforestation and reforestation project activities under the clean development mechanism (hereinafter referred to as the CDM SSC A/R M&Ps);
 - (e) Decision 7/CMP.1;
 - (f) Annex to decision 10/CMP.7: Modalities and procedures for carbon dioxide capture and storage in geological formations under the clean development mechanism (hereinafter referred to as the CDM CCS M&Ps).
2. The CMP revised some of the provisions in these decisions through new decisions in subsequent sessions.
3. Pursuant to its mandate from the CMP to operationalize the CDM, the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism (hereinafter referred to as the Board) has adopted various standards (including methodologies, tools and standardized baselines), procedures, guidelines, clarifications and forms, and revised them, as appropriate, with a view to improving the CDM process.
4. ~~At its fifty-ninth meeting, the Board adopted the “CDM management plan 2011” whose objective 3(b) is: “Clarification, consolidation and enhancement of the consistencies of all the existing regulatory decisions of the board that relate to validation and verification of project activities”. One deliverable under this objective is to “develop a standard for project participants, i.e. obligations on project participants during validation, operation and verification of project activities”.~~

1.2. Objectives

5. The objectives of the “CDM project standard” (hereinafter referred to as this Standard) are to:

- (a) Enhance consistency and clarity of requirements applicable to any type of CDM project activities and CDM programmes of activities (PoA), and facilitate and promote a clear and common understanding by all parties involved in the CDM;
- (b) Improve the quality of project design documents (PDDs), PoA design documents (PoA-DDs), component project activity (CPA) design documents (CPA-DDs) and monitoring reports prepared by project participants and submitted in the CDM project cycle;
- (c) Enhance the overall efficiency and integrity in the CDM.

2. Scope, applicability and entry into force

2.1. General

- 6. This Standard provides project participants and coordinating/managing entities with a starting point for those wishing to design and implement a CDM project activity or PoA and seeking issuance of certified emission reductions (CERs). It specifies requirements for project participants and coordinating/managing entities to comply with in designing as well as implementing any type of CDM project activities or PoAs and monitoring greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions by sources or GHG removals by sinks.

2.2. Application

- 7. Principles in chapter 5 and requirements in chapters 6 and 7 of this Standard apply to any type of CDM project activities and PoA.
- 8. In addition to requirements in chapters 6 and 7, requirements in chapters 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 specifically apply to small-scale project activities, large-scale afforestation and reforestation (A/R) project activities, small-scale A/R project activities, carbon dioxide capture and storage (CCS) project activities and PoAs, respectively.

~~9. Therefore, requirements in chapters 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 applicable to project participants for CDM project activities apply, where applicable, to coordinating/managing entities for CDM PoAs.~~

~~10. Requirements in chapter 13 apply to any type of CDM project activities and, as applicable, to CDM PoA. However, as experience with PoA is evolving, the applicability of certain requirements to PoA are yet to be defined and will be addressed in the future.~~

~~11. The document information section at the end of this Standard lists all documents that are superseded by this Standard, the "CDM validation and verification standard" and the "CDM project cycle procedure".~~

2.3. Entry into force

- 12. Version 08.7.0 of this Standard enters into force on **25 June 2014-01 April 2015**.

3. Normative references

13. The following referenced documents are indispensable for the application of this Standard:
- (a) “CDM project cycle procedure” (hereinafter referred to as the Project cycle procedure);
 - (b) “Glossary of CDM terms”.

4. Terms and definitions

14. In addition to the definitions contained in the “Glossary of CDM terms”, the following terms apply in this Standard:
- (a) “Shall” is used to indicate requirements to be followed;
 - (b) “Should” is used to indicate that among several possibilities, one course of action is recommended as particularly suitable;
 - (c) “May” is used to indicate what is permitted;
 - (d) “Standardized baseline that standardizes additionality” is a standardized baseline established for a Party or a group of Parties to facilitate the determination of additionality (e.g. by providing a positive list of technologies, fuel or feedstock) for CDM project activities or PoAs, while providing assistance for assuring environmental integrity;
 - (e) “Standardized baseline that standardizes baseline scenario” is a standardized baseline established for a Party or a group of Parties to facilitate the determination of the baseline scenario (e.g. by providing a description of the baseline scenario) for CDM project activities or PoAs, while providing assistance for assuring environmental integrity;
 - (f) “Standardized baseline that standardizes baseline emissions” is a standardized baseline established for a Party or a group of Parties to facilitate the calculation of one or several sources of baseline emissions (e.g. by providing standardized values of parameters such as emission factors) for CDM project activities or PoAs, while providing assistance for assuring environmental integrity.

5. Principles

5.1. General

15. The following principles¹ guide project design as well as project implementation and monitoring of GHG emission reductions by sources or GHG removals by sinks, and contribute to enhancing the environmental integrity of CDM project activities and PoAs.

5.2. Relevance

16. Select the GHG sources, GHG sinks, GHG reservoirs, data, methodologies and all other information appropriate to the needs of the intended user.²

5.3. Completeness

17. Include all relevant GHG sources and sinks, and information to support compliance with all requirements.

5.4. Consistency

18. Enable meaningful comparisons in project-related information.

5.5. Accuracy and conservativeness

19. Reduce bias and uncertainties as far as is practical/cost-effective, or otherwise use conservative assumptions, values and procedures to ensure that GHG emission reductions by sources or GHG removals by sinks are not over-estimated.

5.6. Transparency

20. Disclose sufficient and appropriate project-related information in a truthful manner to allow intended users to make decisions with reasonable confidence. Not disclose proprietary or confidential information marked so by project participants or coordinating/managing entities without the written consent of the provider of the information, except as required by national law. In this context, information used to determine additionality, to describe the baseline methodology and its application, and to support an environmental impact assessment shall not be considered as proprietary or confidential.

¹ This text is adapted to the CDM and is taken from ISO 14064-2:2006 - Greenhouse gases -- Part 2: Specification with guidance at the project level for quantification, monitoring and reporting of greenhouse gas emission reductions or removal enhancements; it is reproduced with the permission of the International Organization for Standardization, ISO. This standard can be obtained from any ISO member and from the website of the ISO Central Secretariat at the following address: www.iso.org. Copyright remains with ISO.

² Intended users may include project participants, coordinating/managing entities, designated operational entities (DOEs), the Executive Board of the CDM, the UNFCCC secretariat, designated national authorities (DNAs) and local and other stakeholders.

6. General requirements

6.1. Use of and compliance with applicable standards

21. While designing as well as implementing and monitoring a CDM project activity or PoA, project participants **or the coordination/managing entity** shall consider and use, in addition to this Standard, all applicable methodologies, standardized baselines, tools and documents adopted by the CMP or the Board.³
22. Project participants **or the coordination/managing entity** shall ensure that the proposed CDM project activity or PoA complies with all requirements in the CDM M&Ps applicable to the project activity or PoA, as presented in paragraph 1 above, all applicable requirements in this Standard and all other applicable CDM rules and requirements **adopted by the CMP and the Board**.

6.2. Identification of project type

23. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall determine the type of CDM project activity or PoA they want to design and implement:
 - (a) Large-scale project activity;
 - (b) Small-scale project activity;
 - (c) Large-scale afforestation or reforestation project activity;
 - (d) Small-scale afforestation or reforestation project activity; or
 - (e) CCS project activity; or
 - (f) Programme of activities, **either large scale, small scale, large scale A/R or small scale A/R, or CCS**.

6.3. Selection of methodology

24. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall select a baseline and monitoring methodology that has been approved by the Board and that is applicable to the proposed CDM project activity or PoA (hereinafter referred to as selected methodology).
25. In their consideration of baseline and monitoring methodologies applicable to the proposed CDM project activity or PoA, **in accordance with the applicable guidelines and/or procedure**, project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** may:
 - (a)_{bis} Develop and propose a new methodology;**
 - (a) Submit a request for revision to an approved methodology through a designated operational entity (DOE) or directly to the UNFCCC secretariat (hereinafter referred to as the secretariat) **in accordance with the applicable procedure;**

³ These documents are available on the UNFCCC CDM website.

(b) ~~Develop and propose a new methodology, in accordance with the applicable guidelines and procedure~~ Submit a request for clarification on an approved methodology or methodological tool through a DOE or directly to the secretariat;

(c) Submit a request for deviation from an approved methodology through a DOE before or during validation of the proposed project activity or PoA.^{3bis}

~~26. Project participants wishing to seek clarification on the applicability of a baseline and monitoring methodology or methodological tool approved by the Board may submit a request for clarification through a DOE or directly to the secretariat in accordance with the applicable procedure.~~

6.4. Selection of standardized baseline

27. Project participants may select an approved standardized baseline (hereinafter referred to as selected standardized baseline) if the approved standardized baseline is valid and applicable to the proposed CDM project activity or PoA and to the selected methodology in accordance with its applicability section.

28. However, project participants shall select an approved standardized baseline (hereinafter referred to as selected standardized baseline) if:

(a) The approved standardized baseline is valid and applicable to the proposed CDM project activity or PoA and to the selected methodology in accordance with its applicability section;

(b) The selection of the applicable approved standardized baseline is mandatory.⁴

29. Notwithstanding the provisions in paragraphs 27 and 28 above, project participants shall not select an applicable approved standardized baseline that standardizes additionality if the start date of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA is before the date when the approved standardized baseline becomes valid.

30. If the PDD or PoA-DD has been published for global stakeholder consultation when no applicable approved standardized baseline was valid, and if after the publication of the PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation but before the submission of a request for registration of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA, an applicable approved standardized baseline whose selection is mandatory has become valid, the request for registration may be submitted without selecting the standardized baseline within 240 days after the standardized baseline became valid.

31. In their consideration of an approved standardized baseline applicable to the proposed CDM project activity or PoA, project participants shall follow the "Procedure: Development, revision, clarification and update of standardized baselines", if they wish to:

(a) Propose a new standardized baseline;

^{3bis} See the relevant provisions in the "CDM validation and verification standard" (CDM-EB65-A04-STAN) for the examples of deviation of project-specific situations.

⁴ Such standardized baselines include ASB0001 and ASB0003 that state in their applicability section that the latest approved and valid values of the standardized baseline are the only values of the CO₂ emission factor(s) that shall be applied for the project electricity system.

- (b) Request a revision(s) to an approved standardized baseline;
- (c) Seek clarification on an approved standardized baseline; or
- (d) Propose an updated standardized baseline.

6.5. Demonstration of prior consideration of the clean development mechanism

- 32. If the start date of a proposed CDM project activity, as determined in paragraph 65 below, is prior to the date of publication of the PDD for the global stakeholder consultation, project participants shall demonstrate that the CDM benefits were considered necessary in the decision to undertake the project as a proposed CDM project activity.
- 33. For a proposed CDM project activity with a start date on or after 2 August 2008, project participants shall inform the host Party's designated national authority (DNA), **if the DNA exists,** and the secretariat of their intention to seek CDM status in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.
- 34. For a proposed CDM project activity with a start date before 2 August 2008 and prior to the date of publication of the PDD for global stakeholder consultation, project participants shall demonstrate that the CDM was seriously considered in the decision to implement the proposed project activity. Such demonstration requires the following elements to be satisfied:
 - (a) Project participants shall provide evidence of their awareness of the CDM prior to the start date of the proposed project activity, and that the benefits of the CDM were a decisive factor in the decision to proceed with the project;⁵
 - (b) Project participants shall provide evidence that continuing and real actions were taken to secure CDM status for the proposed project activity in parallel with its implementation;⁶
 - (c) Project participants shall provide an implementation timeline of the proposed CDM project activity. The timeline should include, where applicable, the date when the investment decision was made, the date when construction works started, the date when commissioning started and the date of start-up (e.g. the date when commercial production started). Project participants shall provide a

⁵ Evidence to support this could include, inter alia, minutes and/or notes related to the consideration of the decision by the Board of Directors, or equivalent, of the project participants, to undertake the project as a CDM project activity.

⁶ Evidence to support this should include one or more of the following: contracts with consultants for CDM/PDD/methodology/standardized baseline services; draft versions of PDDs and underlying documents such as letters of authorization, and if available, letters of intent; emission reduction purchase agreement (ERPA) term sheets, ERPAs, or other documentation related to the sale of the potential CERs (including correspondence with multilateral financial institutions or carbon funds); evidence of agreements or negotiations with a DOE for validation services; submission of a new methodology or standardized baseline, or requests for clarification or revision of existing methodologies or standardized baselines to the Board; publication in a newspaper; interviews with DNA; **earlier correspondence on the project with the DNA or the secretariat. Letters, email exchanges and other documented communications may help to substantiate the evidence.**

timeline of events and actions, which have been taken to achieve CDM registration, with description of the evidence used to support these actions.

35. The requirements in paragraphs 32–34 above do not apply to CDM PoAs. However, the coordinating/managing entity may notify to the DNA(s) of the host Party(ies) of the PoA and the secretariat the intention to seek the CDM status for the PoA in accordance with the Project cycle procedure for the purpose of determining the start date of the PoA.

7. Design requirements for all project types

7.1. Description of project activity or programme of activities

36. Project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall provide a description of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA in the PDD or PoA-DD respectively that provides an understanding of the nature of the project activity or PoA and its implementation.
37. When describing the proposed CDM project activity or PoA, project participants or the coordinating/managing shall provide information on, inter alia:
- (a) Provide a title for the project activity or PoA;
 - (a)_{bis}. Sectoral scope(s) of the project activity or PoA;
 - (b) Describe the purpose and general description of the project activity or PoA, including a summary of the scope of activities/measures that are to be implemented within the project activity how it contributes to sustainable development of the host Party;
 - ~~(c) Explain how the project activity or PoA will reduce GHG emissions or increase GHG removals;~~
 - ~~(d) Identify the location of the project activity, including information allowing the unique identification of the project activity. The physical/geographical location of the project activity, or the physical/geographical boundary of the PoA;~~
 - ~~(e) Describe the technologies and measures to be employed and/or implemented by the project activity or the CPAs in the PoA. to enable the identification of the project's scale and type, demonstration of additionality, application of the selected methodology and, where applicable, of the selected standardized baseline, and calculations of GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals, including a description of how environmentally safe and sound technology(ies) applied in the project activity. Include a description of how the technologies and measures and know-how to be used are transferred to the host Party;~~
 - (e)_{bis} The facilities, systems and equipment in operation under the existing scenario prior to the implementation of the project activity and in the baseline scenario as established in accordance with section 7.2.5 below. Clearly explain how the same types and levels of services provided by the project activity would have been provided in the baseline scenario
 - (e)_{ter} The types and levels of services provided by the systems and equipment that are being modified and/or installed under the project activity and their relation, if any, to other manufacturing/production equipment and systems outside the project

boundary. Include in the description information on the age and average lifetime of the equipment based on manufacturer's specifications and industry standards, and existing and forecast installed capacities, load factors and efficiencies. Provide energy and mass flows and balances of the systems and equipment included in the project activity if necessary.

~~(f) Indicate the sectoral scope(s) and type of the project activity or PoA;~~

~~(g) Explain the contribution of the project activity or PoA to sustainable development.~~

~~38. Project participants shall describe the scenario prior to the implementation of the proposed CDM project activity or CPA, including the technology(ies) employed.~~

39. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall identify:

(a) Parties involved in the proposed CDM project activity **or PoA, including the host Party(ies);**

(b) Project participants of the proposed CDM project activity **or PoA;**

(c) The coordinating/managing entity in the case of a proposed CDM PoA.

40. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall provide information on sources of public funding for the proposed CDM project activity or PoA. In cases where public funding from Parties included in Annex 1 of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (hereinafter referred to as the Convention) is involved, project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall provide an affirmation obtained from Parties included in Annex 1 that such funding does not result in a diversion of official development assistance, is separate from, and is not counted towards the financial obligations of those Parties.

40_{bis}. The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall confirm that the proposed CDM project activity or CPA is not a CPA that has been excluded from a registered CDM PoA as a result of erroneous inclusion of CPAs.

7.2. Application of selected approved baseline and monitoring methodology and selected standardized baseline

7.2.1. General

41. Project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall use the valid version(s) of the selected approved methodology(ies) and, where applicable, of the selected standardized baseline(s), that is(are) valid at the time of i.e. the latest version, or the previous version if the submission of the request for registration of the CDM project activity or CPA PoA for registration, to the secretariat in accordance with the Project cycle procedure, taking into account is still within the grace period of the previous version for use:

(a) The grace period of the methodology(ies) if it(they) has(have) been revised;

(b) The grace period of the standardized baseline(s), where applicable, if it(they) has(have) been revised.

42. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall apply the selected methodology(ies) and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline(s), to the proposed CDM project activity or CPAs **in the proposed CDM PoA** including any tools, standards or guidelines required by the methodology(ies).

7.2.2. Reference of methodology and standardized baseline

43. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall specify the reference (number, title and version) of the selected methodology(ies) and, where applicable, of the selected standardized baseline(s) that is(are) applied to the proposed CDM project activity or CPAs **in the proposed CDM PoA**, including any other methodologies or tools to which the selected methodology(ies) refers.

7.2.3. Applicability of methodology and standardized baseline

44. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall demonstrate why the selected methodology(ies) and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline(s), is(are) applicable to the proposed CDM project activity or CPAs **in the proposed CDM PoA** by showing that all applicability conditions of the methodology(ies) and, where applicable, the standardized baseline(s) are met.

7.2.4. Project boundary

45. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall define the boundary of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA, including the physical delineation of the project activity **or each CPA**, and which sources and GHGs are included in the project or CPA boundary, in accordance with the selected methodology(ies) and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline(s).
46. In cases where the selected methodology(ies) allows project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** to choose whether a source or gas is to be included in the project or CPA boundary, project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall explain and justify the choice.

7.2.5. Establishment and description of baseline scenario

47. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall establish ~~the a~~ baseline scenario for the proposed CDM project activity or CPA in accordance with the selected methodology(ies) **or the PoA**.
48. When establishing the baseline scenario, and where “future anthropogenic emissions by sources are projected to rise above current levels due to the specific circumstances of the host Party”, project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** ~~should~~ **may** follow the “Guidelines on the consideration of suppressed demand in CDM methodologies” **to propose revision to an approved methodology to cover such scenario if it is not covered in the methodology.**
49. As a general principle, national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances shall be taken into account in the establishment of a baseline scenario, without creating perverse incentives that may impact host Parties’ contributions to the ultimate objective of the Convention.

50. When establishing ~~the~~^a baseline scenario, project participants ~~or the coordinating/managing entity~~ shall take into account the following two types of national and/or sectoral policies:
- (a) National and/or sectoral policies or regulations that give comparative advantages to more emissions-intensive technologies or fuels over less emissions-intensive technologies or fuels;⁷
 - (b) National and/or sectoral policies or regulations that give comparative advantages to less emissions-intensive technologies over more emissions-intensive technologies (e.g. public subsidies to promote the diffusion of renewable energy or to finance energy efficiency programmes).⁸
51. Project participants ~~or the coordinating/managing entity~~ shall address the two types of policies described in paragraph 50 above as follows:
- (a) Only national and/or sectoral policies or regulations described in paragraph 50(a) above that have been implemented before adoption of the Kyoto Protocol by the Conference of the Parties (hereinafter referred to as the COP) (decision 1/CP.3, 11 December 1997) shall be taken into account when establishing a baseline scenario. If such national and/or sectoral policies were implemented since the adoption of the Kyoto Protocol, the baseline scenario should refer to a hypothetical situation without the national and/or sectoral policies or regulations being in place;
 - (b) National and/or sectoral policies or regulations described in paragraph 50(b) above that have been implemented since the adoption by the COP of the CDM M&P (decision 17/CP.7, 11 November 2001) need not be taken into account in establishing a baseline scenario (i.e. the baseline scenario could refer to a hypothetical situation without the national and/or sectoral policies or regulations being in place).
52. Project participants ~~or the coordinating/managing entity~~ shall describe the established baseline scenario for the proposed CDM project activity or CPA, including the technology(ies) that would be employed and/or the activities that would take place in the absence of the project activity or CPA.
53. The following applies to a proposed CDM project activity or CPA using an approved standardized baseline that standardizes the baseline scenario instead of paragraphs 47–52 above and 123–125 below: Project participants shall describe the baseline scenario(s) as per the selected standardized baseline(s).

7.2.6. Demonstration of additionality

54. Project participants shall demonstrate, in accordance with the selected methodology(ies) and the requirements relating to prior consideration of the CDM contained in section 6.5 above, that the anthropogenic emissions of GHG by sources are reduced below those that would have occurred in the absence of the proposed CDM project activity.

⁷ Such policies, which increase GHG emissions, are called ~~type-E+~~ policies.

⁸ Such policies, which decrease GHG emissions, are called ~~type-E-~~ policies.

55. For demonstration of additionality of the proposed CDM project activity **or PoA**, and if it is required by the selected methodology and/or any tool referenced in the methodology, project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall follow:
- (a) “Guidelines on the assessment of investment analysis”;
 - (b) “Guidelines for objective demonstration and assessment of barriers”.
56. In the demonstration of additionality of the proposed CDM project activity **or PoA**, project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** should also consider the following:
- (a) “Guidelines on additionality of first-of-its-kind project activities”;
 - (b) “Guidelines on common practice”.
57. The following applies to a proposed CDM project activity using an approved standardized baseline that standardizes additionality instead of paragraphs 54–56 above and 104 and 128 below: Project participants shall demonstrate that the proposed CDM project activity meets the additionality criteria (e.g. positive lists of technologies) identified in the selected standardized baseline(s) as well as the requirements relating to prior consideration of the CDM contained in section 6.5 above.

7.2.7. Emission reductions

58. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall provide ex ante calculations of baseline, project and leakage GHG emissions as well as GHG emission reductions of the proposed CDM project activity or CPA for each year of the crediting period, in accordance with the selected methodology(ies) and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline(s). Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall describe all steps undertaken for these calculations and provide all results.
59. If the selected methodology(ies) and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline(s) includes different scenarios or cases or provides different options and/or default values to choose, project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall justify which ones are applied to and/or chosen for the proposed CDM project activity or CPA.
60. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall, **in accordance with the selected methodology(ies)**, provide the data and parameters that are not monitored **throughout during the crediting period but are determined only once before the registration of the CDM project activity or PoA** and remain fixed throughout the crediting period. These data and parameters shall be available at the time of validation.
61. In cases where the selected methodology(ies) and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline(s) allows the use of sampling for the determination of parameter values for calculating GHG emission reductions, project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** may use sampling. In such cases, project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall develop and describe the sampling plan in accordance with the “Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities”.
- 61^{bis}. The project participants and the coordinating/managing entity shall use the global warming potentials (GWPs) adopted by the CMP at its seventh session, in accordance

with decision 4/CMP.7, to calculate the emission reductions and removals achieved by CDM project activities and PoAs in the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol. This requirement shall apply from 1 January 2013, notwithstanding any GWPs stated to be applicable in the relevant procedures, standards, guidance, approved baseline and monitoring methodologies, methodological tools and other rules being used in relation to that project activity or PoA.

61_{ter.} The project participants and the coordinating/managing entity shall apply the GWPs valid for the second commitment period for the purposes of demonstrating additionality and ex-ante calculation of emission reductions or removals, if the PDDs and PoA-DDs to be published for global stakeholder consultation or requests for registration of project activities or PoAs are submitted on or after 1 January 2013. Requests for registration submitted before 1 January 2013 that have applied the GWPs valid for the first commitment period in relation to additionality demonstration are not required to re-assess additionality or re-do ex-ante calculation of emission reductions or removals applying the GWPs valid for the second commitment period.

61_{quater.} The PDDs for project activities and the PoA-DDs for PoAs registered before 1 January 2013 are not required to be amended, re-published for global stakeholder consultation, or re-validated using the GWPs as applied by decision 4/CMP.7.

61_{quinques.} All references in baseline and monitoring methodologies and methodological tools to one or more GWPs, including specific references to GWPs valid for the first commitment period, from 1 January 2013, shall be read as references to the relevant GWPs valid for the second commitment period.

7.2.8. Monitoring plan

7.2.8.1. General

62. Project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall develop and describe the monitoring plan for the proposed CDM project activity or CPA in accordance with the selected methodology(ies), where applicable, the selected standardized baseline(s) and all other applicable CDM rules and requirements.

62_{bis} Project participants or the coordinating/managing entity may choose to submit the monitoring plan for the proposed CDM project activity, PoA or CPA either at the time of validation or:

(a) At any time prior to the submission of request for issuance for the first monitoring period; or

(b) Together with the request for issuance for the first monitoring period.

62_{ter.} In cases where the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity choose to make a delayed submission of a monitoring plan for the proposed CDM project activity, PoA or CPA in accordance with paragraph 62_{bis} above, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall clearly state the delayed submission of a monitoring plan and that the PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD submitted for registration do not contain information related to monitoring plan.

7.2.8.2. Data and parameters monitored

63. The monitoring plan shall include all data, parameters and related information required by the selected methodology(ies) and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline(s).

7.2.8.3. Other elements of monitoring plan

64. The monitoring plan shall include the following:
- (a) The operational and management structure to be put in place to implement the monitoring plan;
 - (b) Provisions to ensure that data monitored and required for verification and issuance be kept and archived **electronically** for two years after the end of the crediting period or the last issuance of CERs, whichever occurs later;
 - (c) Definition of responsibilities and institutional arrangements for data collection and archiving;
 - (d) Quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) procedures;
 - (e) Uncertainty levels, methods and the associated accuracy level of measuring instruments to be used for various parameters and variables;
 - (f) Specifications of the calibration frequency for the measuring equipments. In cases where neither the selected methodology and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline, nor the Board's guidance specify any requirements for calibration frequency for measuring equipments, project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall ensure that the equipments are calibrated either in accordance with the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specifications. If local/national standards or the manufacturer's specifications are not available, international standards may be used.

7.3. Duration and crediting period**7.3.1. Duration of project activity**

65. Project participants shall determine the start date of the proposed CDM project activity and provide a description of how this start date has been determined **as per the definition of start date provided in "Glossary of CDM terms"**.
66. Project participants shall define the expected operational lifetime of the proposed CDM project activity.

7.3.2. Crediting period

67. Project participants shall select the type (fixed or renewable) and duration of the crediting period for the proposed CDM project activity considering that:
- (a) Each renewable crediting period shall be at most seven years and may be renewed at most two times, for a maximum total length of 21 years;
 - (b) A fixed crediting period shall be at most 10 years.

68. Project participants shall determine the start date⁹ of the crediting period of the proposed CDM project activity considering that the crediting period shall only start **on or** after the date of registration of the proposed project activity as a CDM project activity.
69. Project participants shall determine only one start date for the crediting period, even in cases of phased implementation of the proposed CDM project activity.
70. Project participants shall state the start date of the crediting period in the format dd/mm/yyyy, and shall not use any qualifications to the start date, such as “expected”.

7.4. Environmental impacts

71. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall carry out an analysis of the environmental impacts of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA, including transboundary impacts. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall provide a summary of the analysis and references to all related documentation.
72. If project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** or the host Party considers the environmental impacts of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA significant, project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall carry out an environmental impact assessment in accordance with the host Party’s procedures. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall provide all conclusions and references to all related documentation.

7.5. Local stakeholder consultation

73. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall invite local stakeholders to provide comments on the proposed CDM project activity or PoA **CPA at its design stage (i.e. before implementation)** and shall demonstrate how due steps/actions were taken to appropriately engage stakeholders and solicit comments.
74. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall invite comments from local stakeholders in an open and transparent manner, in a way that facilitates comments to be received from local stakeholders and allows for a reasonable time for comments to be submitted. **Project participants shall conduct the local stakeholder consultation in accordance with applicable national regulations, if any.** Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall describe the proposed CDM project activity or PoA in a manner that allows the local stakeholders to understand the project activity or PoA, taking into account confidentiality provisions of the applicable CDM M&Ps.
75. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall prepare a summary of the comments provided by local stakeholders.
76. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall demonstrate that they considered all comments received for the proposed CDM project activity or PoA. **The**

⁹ The start date of the crediting period provided in the CDM-PDD by the project participants is an indicative date and if it is prior to the date of registration of the project activity, it will be updated by the secretariat as the effective date of registration in accordance with the Project cycle procedure. This update will not affect the specified length of the crediting period nor does this affect the rights of the project participants to subsequently request a change of the start date in accordance with the same procedure.

project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall request the DNA(s) of the host Party(ies) to forward comments from local stakeholders, if any, to them.

77. Project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall complete the local stakeholder consultation process before the start date of the project activity, PoA or CPA, as defined in the "Glossary: CDM terms" and submitting the PDD or PoA-DD of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA to a DOE for validation.

77_{bis}. If, during the validation of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA, complaints submitted to the DNA(s) on the handling of the outcome of the local stakeholder consultation are forwarded to the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity through the DOE in accordance with the Project cycle procedure, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall take due account of such complaints and modify the PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD as appropriate before the DOE concludes the validation.

77_{ter}. If significant changes to the project design occur after the invitation of comments from the local stakeholders, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall conduct local stakeholder consultation with additional relevant stakeholders, if there is any.

7.6. Approval and authorization

78. Project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall obtain a letter of approval¹⁰ from the DNA of each Party involved in the proposed CDM project activity or PoA confirming that:¹¹

(a) The Party is a Party to the Kyoto Protocol;

(b) Participation in the proposed CDM project activity or PoA is voluntary;

~~(c) Project participants are authorized to participate in the proposed CDM project activity.~~

78_{bis}. Each project participant shall obtain a letter of approval from at least one Party involved in the proposed CDM project activity confirming that the project participant is authorized to participate in the proposed CDM project activity.

79. In addition to the requirement in paragraph 78 above, ~~for project participants from the host Party,~~ the letter of approval ~~from the host Party~~ shall also confirm that the proposed CDM project activity assists the host Party in achieving sustainable development.

¹⁰ Project activities from multilateral funds involving many host Parties do not necessarily require letters of approval from the DNA of each Party. However, those not providing a letter may be giving up some of their rights and privileges in terms of being a Party involved in the proposed project activity.

A letter of approval from a Party may cover more than one proposed CDM project activity, provided that projects are clearly listed in the letter.

¹¹ At the time of making the PDD public at the stage of validation, a Party involved may or may not have provided its approval of the proposed CDM project activity, but by the time of requesting registration, approval from all Parties involved including the host Party shall be obtained.

79^{bis}. A CDM project activity or a bundle of small-scale CDM project activities shall have only one host Party, which is the Party in which the project activity(ies) is located as set out in the PDD.

79^{ter}. Where the methodology applied to the proposed CDM project activity provides for the application of a system, such as an electricity grid, and that the system extends across more than one Party, a letter of approval is required ~~only~~ from the host Party ~~and all other Parties involved as indicated in the PDD.~~^{11bis}

7.7. Modalities of communications

80. Project participants ~~or the coordinating/managing entity~~ shall define for the proposed CDM project activity or PoA their modalities of communication with the Board and present them in a Modalities of communication statement (MoC statement), with the following content:

- (a) The title of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA (and UNFCCC reference number if available);
- (b) The date of submission of the MoC statement (to a DOE for inclusion in the request for registration or to the secretariat for changes after registration);
- (c) The designation of a focal point for each scope of authority, contact details and specimen signatures of the authorized signatories of each focal point entity;
- (d) A list of all project participants, contact details and specimen signatures of their authorized signatories;
- (e) The signature of an authorized signatory (electronic if available) of all project participants confirming their agreement with the MoC statement.

7.8. Validation

81. The project participants ~~or the coordinating/managing entity~~ wishing to submit a CDM project activity for validation shall prepare a PDD using the ~~latest valid~~ version of the ~~applicable CDM-PDD form applicable to the project activity,~~ taking into account the grace period of the form if it has been revised.¹²

82. When completing the PDD, project participants ~~or the coordinating/managing entity~~ shall provide all necessary information and documentation to demonstrate compliance of the proposed CDM project activity with all applicable requirements in this Standard and other CDM rules and requirements.

83. When completing the PDD, the project participants ~~or the coordinating/managing entity~~ ~~should shall~~ follow the ~~applicable guidelines instructions~~ for completing PDD, ~~PoA-DD or CPA-DD forms as contained in the form.~~

84. Project participants ~~or the coordinating/managing entity~~ shall select a DOE for the validation of the proposed CDM project activity that is accredited for the validation

^{11bis} This requirement replaces the clarification provided by the Board at its twenty-eighth meeting, as recorded in paragraph 14 of its meeting report.

¹² All various PDD forms ~~and related guidelines~~ are available on the UNFCCC CDM website.

function and sectoral scopes(s)¹³ of the project activity. Project participants shall have a contractual arrangement with the DOE for the validation.

85. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall submit the completed PDD of the proposed CDM project activity, together with supporting documentation, to the selected DOE for validation.

85_{bis} The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity wishing to submit a PDD contains information that are treated as confidential/proprietary shall submit documentation in two versions:

(a) One version where all parts containing confidential/proprietary information are made illegible (e.g. by covering those parts with black ink) so that the version can be made publicly available without displaying confidential/proprietary information;

(b) A version containing all information that is to be treated as strictly confidential/proprietary by all parties handling this documentation (designated operational entities (DOEs) and applicant entities (AEs); Board members and alternate members; panel/committee and working group members; external experts requested to consider such documents in support of work for the Board; the secretariat).

86. Information used to demonstrate additionality, describe the application of the selected methodology and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline, and support an environmental impact assessment shall not be considered proprietary or confidential. **Make any data, values and formulae included in electronic spreadsheets provided accessible and verifiable.**

87. Before publishing the PDD for the proposed CDM project activity or **CPA-the PoA-DD for the proposed CDM PoA** for global stakeholder consultation, in accordance with the Project cycle procedure, project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** may request the DOE to seek guidance from the Board on the acceptability of a deviation from

(a) The selected methodology(ies); or

(b) A section (or sections) in the selected methodology that is(are) not standardized by the selected standardized baseline(s), if the proposed CDM project activity uses an approved standardized baseline.

87_{bis} The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall prepare a revised PDD or PoA-DD and submit it to any DOE for publication for a new global stakeholder consultation in accordance with the Project cycle procedure, and request **the DOE to restart the validation if: the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity have changed the approved baseline and monitoring methodology or the combination thereof applied in the PDD or PoA-DD.**

~~(a) The project participants have changed the design of the project activity or PoA as described in the PDD or PoA-DD after its publication for global stakeholder~~

¹³ The list of all 16 sectoral scopes, the DOEs accredited in each scope as well as the approved baseline and monitoring methodologies linked with these sectoral scopes are given on the UNFCCC CDM website.

~~consultation but before the submission of a request for registration of the project activity or PoA, and if the environmental impact assessment conducted in accordance with paragraph 64 above or the national or local environmental permissions obtained for the project activity or PoA are no longer valid due to the change; or~~

~~(b) The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity have changed the approved baseline and monitoring methodology or the combination thereof applied in the PDD or PoA-DD.~~

87_{ter} The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity may request the DOE to withdraw the request for registration in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.

87_{quater} The project participants or the coordinating/ managing entity may requested the DOE to withdraw the published PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD before the submission of a request for registration of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.

8. Specific design requirements for small-scale project activities

8.1. General requirements

88. Project participants designing a small-scale CDM project activity following the CDM SSC M&Ps shall only use small-scale methodologies and, where applicable, standardized baselines. However, project participants may use a large-scale methodology and, where applicable, a standardized baseline for a project activity that is within the small-scale project activity thresholds if the project activity follows the CDM M&Ps.

8.2. Project activity **type and eligibility**

89. Project participants shall indicate, from among the following below, the project type of the proposed small-scale CDM project activity, and shall demonstrate that the project activity qualifies as this type:

(a) Type I: Renewable energy project activities with a maximum output capacity of 15 MW (or an appropriate equivalent). **In this context:**

(i) “Output” is the installed/rated capacity as indicated by the manufacturer of the equipment or plant, irrespective of the actual load factor of the plant. The installed/rated capacity for renewable electricity generating units that involve turbine-generator systems shall be based on the installed/rated capacity of the generator;

(ii) Regarding the “appropriate equivalent” of 15 MW, decision 17/CP.7, paragraph 6(c)(i), refers to MW, but the project participants may refer to MW(p)¹⁴, MW(e) or MW(th). As MW(e) is the most common denomination, MW is defined as MW(e), and otherwise an appropriate conversion factor is to be applied;

¹⁴ For solar photovoltaic applications, 15 MW(p) may be defined by manufacturers' specifications under testing conditions of 1000 W/m² and 25 deg C or 600 W/m² and 35 deg C.

- (iii) For biomass, biofuel and biogas project activities, the maximal limit of 15 MW(e) is equivalent to a 45 MW thermal output of the equipment or the plant (e.g. boilers). For thermal applications of biomass, biofuels or biogas (e.g. cook stoves), the limit of 45 MWth is the installed/rated capacity of the thermal application equipment or device(s) (e.g. biogas stoves). For electrical or mechanical applications, the limit of a 15 MW installed/rated output shall be used. In the case of co-firing renewable and fossil fuels, the rated capacity of the system when using fossil fuel shall apply;
- (iv) For thermal applications of solar energy projects, "maximum output" shall be calculated using a conversion factor of 700 Wth/m² of aperture area of glazed flat plate or evacuated tubular collector, i.e. the eligibility limit in terms of aperture area is 64,000 m² of the collector.¹⁵ The project participants may also use other conversion factors determined as per the requirements in paragraph 99 below, but shall then justify why the chosen conversion factor is more appropriate to the project activity;
- (b) Type II: Energy efficiency improvement project activities that reduce energy consumption, on the supply and/or demand side, with a maximum output of 60 GWh per year (or an appropriate equivalent) in any year of the crediting period. In this context, for thermal energy efficiency project activities, the maximum energy saving of 60 GWh(e) per year is equivalent to 180 GWh(th) per year saving; or
- (c) Type III: Other project activities not included in Type I or Type II that result in GHG emission reductions not exceeding 60 kt CO₂e per year in any year of the crediting period.

90. In connection with paragraph 89 above and the scope of the maximum output capacity of 15 MW, project participants shall consider the following:

- (a) Regarding "maximum output", "output" is the installed/rated capacity as indicated by the manufacturer of the equipment or plant, irrespective of the actual load factor of the plant. The installed/rated capacity for renewable electricity generating units that involve turbine-generator systems shall be based on the installed/rated capacity of the generator;
- (b) Regarding the "appropriate equivalent" of 15 MW, decision 17/CP.7, paragraph 6(c)(i), refers to MW, but project participants may refer to MW(p)¹⁶, MW(e) or MW(th). As MW(e) is the most common denomination, MW is defined as MW(e), and otherwise an appropriate conversion factor is to be applied;
- (c) For biomass, biofuel and biogas project activities, the maximal limit of 15 MW(e) is equivalent to a 45 MW thermal output of the equipment or the plant (e.g. boilers). For thermal applications of biomass, biofuels or biogas (e.g. cook stoves), the limit of 45 MWth is the installed/rated capacity of the thermal application equipment or device(s) (e.g. biogas stoves). For electrical or

¹⁵ This conversion is not applicable for solar thermal parabolic and trough type collectors used for high grade solar thermal energy applications.

¹⁶ For solar photovoltaic applications, 15 MW(p) may be defined by manufacturers' specifications under testing conditions of 1000 W/m² and 25 deg C or 600 W/m² and 35 deg C.

mechanical applications, the limit of a 15 MW installed/rated output shall be used. In the case of co-firing renewable and fossil fuels, the rated capacity of the system when using fossil fuel shall apply;

- (d) For thermal applications of solar energy projects,¹⁷ “maximum output” shall be calculated using a conversion factor of 700 Wth/m² of aperture area of glazed flat plate or evacuated tubular collector, i.e. the eligibility limit in terms of aperture area is 64,000 m² of the collector. Project participants may also use other conversion factors determined as per the requirements in paragraph 99 below, but shall then justify why the chosen conversion factor is more appropriate to the project activity.

91. Project participants shall ensure that the proposed small scale CDM project activity remains, for every year during the crediting period, within the limits of the type of project activity defined in paragraph 89 above. If during its implementation and monitoring the project activity goes beyond the limit of its type in any year of the crediting period, the GHG emission reductions that can be claimed during this particular year shall be capped at the maximum GHG emission reductions estimated in the registered PDD for that year during the crediting period.

92. Project participants shall consider that:

- (a) The three types of small scale CDM project activities defined referred to in paragraph 89 above are mutually exclusive. In a small scale project activity with more than one component following the CDM SSC M&Ps, each component shall meet the threshold criterion of each applicable type;
- (b) A small-scale CDM project activity may contain more than one component, each belonging to one of the three project types referred to in paragraph 89 above. In this case, the sum of the size of components of a small scale CDM project activity belonging to the same project type shall not exceed the limits for small-scale project activities of the project type.

8.3. Bundling of project activity

93. If project participants bring together more than one small-scale CDM project activities as a bundle, project participants shall follow the “General principles for bundling”.

94. Project participants shall also ensure that the sum of the output capacity of the proposed CDM project activities within a sub-bundle does not exceed the maximum output capacity limit for its type.

8.4. Debundling for project activity

95. Project participants shall demonstrate that the proposed small-scale CDM project activity is not a debundled component of a large-scale project activity.

96. Project participants shall follow the applicable provisions in the “Guidelines on assessment of debundling for SSC project activities”.

¹⁷ This conversion is not applicable for solar thermal parabolic and trough type collectors used for high grade solar thermal energy applications.

8.5. Description of project activity

97. ~~In describing the proposed small-scale CDM project activity, project participants shall indicate the type of project activity, as defined in paragraph 89 above. If the project participants wish to include in the proposed small-scale CDM project activity more than one component by presenting them in the same PDD, the project participants shall provide the information regarding the sections covering the type and technology/measure of the project activity and application of the selected methodology separately for each component.~~

8.6. Application of selected baseline and monitoring methodology and selected standardized baseline**8.6.1. General**

98. If the proposed small-scale CDM project activity involves more than one component, project participants shall provide ex ante calculations of baseline, project and leakage GHG emissions as well as GHG emission reductions for each year of the crediting period and for each component separately.
99. To determine the performance of equipment used in the proposed small-scale CDM project activity, project participants shall use:
- (a) The appropriate value specified in the selected methodology or, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline;
 - (b) The national standard for the performance of the equipment type (project participants shall identify the standard used) if the value specified in subparagraph (a) is not available;
 - (c) An international standard for the performance of the equipment type, such as International Organization for Standardization (ISO) and International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) standards (project participants shall identify the standard used) if the value specified in subparagraphs (a) and (b) above is not available;
 - (d) The manufacturer's specifications, provided that they are tested and certified by national or international certifiers, if the value specified in subparagraphs (a)–(c) above is not available;
 - (e) Performance data from test results conducted by an independent entity for equipment installed under the project activity if the value specified in subparagraphs (a)–(d) is not available.
100. In cases where leakage is to be considered in the proposed small-scale CDM project activity, project participants shall consider leakage only within the boundaries of non-Annex I Parties.
101. In case of replacement of existing equipments, project participants shall estimate the point in time where the existing equipments would be replaced in the absence of the proposed small-scale CDM project activity in accordance with the "Tool to determine the remaining lifetime of equipment".

102. For household devices/appliances, project participants may disregard the remaining lifetime.
103. Project participants shall consider that norms, specifications, standards and test procedures cited in the selected methodology and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline refer to the **latest valid** version of the documentation available at the time of submission of the PDD to the DOE for validation.

8.6.2. Demonstration of additionality

104. For demonstration of additionality of a proposed small-scale CDM project activity, project participants shall apply or use one of the following:
- (a) **Guidelines on the demonstration of additionality of small-scale project activities. ~~“Attachment A of Appendix B” to Annex II to decision 4/CMP.1.~~** In such cases, project participants should also follow the “Non-binding practice examples to demonstrate additionality for SSC project activities”;
 - (b) Any applicable additionality tool; or
 - (c) “Guidelines for demonstrating additionality of microscale project activities” **instead of paragraph 55 and 56 above**, if the proposed project activity meets one of the following criteria:
 - (i) Type I: Project activities up to 5 MW that employ renewable energy as their primary technology;
 - (ii) Type II: Energy efficiency project activities that aim to achieve energy savings at a scale of no more than 20 GWh per year; or
 - (iii) Type III: Other project activities not included in Type I or Type II that aim to achieve GHG emissions reductions at a scale of no more than 20 kt CO₂e per year.

8.6.3. Monitoring plan

105. In developing the monitoring plan for the proposed small-scale CDM project activity, project participants shall consider the following:
- (a) Data variables that impact the GHG emission reductions continuously (e.g. quantity of the fuel inputs, amount of heat or electricity produced, gas captured) shall be measured continuously and recorded at appropriate intervals. Data elements that are generally constant (e.g. emission factors, calorific value, system efficiencies) shall be measured or calculated at least once a year, unless other specifications are provided in the selected methodology or, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline;
 - (b) Measuring equipments shall be certified to national or IEC standards;
 - (c) The calibration of measuring equipments shall be carried out by an accredited person or institution;

- (d) Measured data with high levels of uncertainty or without adequate calibration shall be compared with location/national data and commercial data to ensure consistency.
106. For parameters to be measured in accordance with the selected methodology or, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline, project participants shall include in the monitoring plan the following:
- (a) The measurement methods and procedures, including accepted industry standards or national or international standards that will be applied; the measuring equipments that will be used; how the measurements will be undertaken; the accuracy of the measurement methods; the measurement intervals and the responsible person/entity who will undertake the measurements;
 - (b) The calibration procedures to be applied and the responsible person/entity who will perform the calibration.

8.7. Environmental impacts

107. ~~The following Paragraph 108_{bis} below shall apply instead of paragraphs 71–72 above: If required by the host Party, project participants shall carry out an analysis of the environmental impacts of the proposed small scale CDM project activity, and provide a summary of the analysis and the reference to all related documentation.~~
- 107_{bis}. If required by the host Party, the project participants shall carry out an analysis of the environmental impacts of the proposed small-scale CDM project activity, and provide a summary of the analysis and the reference to all related documentation.

8.8. Validation

108. ~~If project participants wish to present a small scale CDM project activity with more than one component in the same PDD, project participants shall provide the information regarding the sections covering the type and technology/measure of the project activity and application of the selected methodology and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline separately for each component.~~

9. Specific design requirements for afforestation and reforestation project activities

9.1. Description of project activity

109. When describing the proposed A/R CDM project activity, project participants shall:
- (a) Describe the present environmental conditions of the area planned for the project activity, including the climate, hydrology, soils and ecosystems;
 - (b) Describe the presence, if any, of rare and endangered species and their habitats;
 - (c) Describe the species and varieties selected for the project activity;
 - (d) Describe the technologies and know-how that will be transferred to the host Party(ies), if applicable;

- (e) Describe or list the legal title(s) to the land, current land tenure and rights enabling determination of the owner of the temporary CERs (tCERs) or long-term CERs (lCERs) to be issued for the project activity.

9.2. Project boundary

- 110. Project participants shall define the project boundary that geographically delineates the proposed A/R CDM project activity under the control of the project participants, including information allowing the unique identification(s) of the project activity. If the proposed A/R CDM project activity contains more than one discrete area of land, each discrete area of land shall have a unique identification.
- 111. Project participants shall demonstrate that, for all areas of land planned for the proposed A/R CDM project activity, the control over afforestation or reforestation as required by the CDM A/R M&Ps is already established or is expected to be established. The control of the project participants over afforestation or reforestation shall be considered as established if the project participants have the exclusive right to perform the proposed A/R CDM project activity, defined in a way that is acceptable under the legal system of the host country.
- 112. When submitting the PDD **to a DOE** for validation, project participants shall have established the control over afforestation or reforestation for at least two-thirds of the total area of land planned for proposed A/R CDM project activity.
- 113. When submitting the PDD **to a DOE** for validation, project participants shall demonstrate that all areas of land planned for the proposed A/R CDM project activity comply with all requirements, except those related to the control.
- 114. If the control over afforestation or reforestation is not established for all areas of land planned for the proposed A/R CDM project activities when submitting the PDD **to a DOE** for validation, project participants shall:
 - (a) Demonstrate additionality separately for:
 - (i) The area of land for which control over the project activity is already established by the project participants;
 - (ii) The entire area of land;
 - (b) Estimate the baseline net GHG removals by sinks separately for:
 - (i) The area of land for which control over the project activity is already established by the project participants;
 - (ii) The entire area of land.
- 115. Project participants shall express each of the estimates of baseline net GHG removals by sinks on a per hectare basis. The **larger-largest** of these estimates shall be used to determine the baseline net GHG removals by sinks for the proposed A/R CDM project activity.
- 116. For all areas of land for which control over the **registered** A/R CDM project activity has not yet been established when the PDD is submitted **to a DOE** for validation, project

participants shall provide evidence of control at the latest by the time of submitting the first monitoring report **to a DOE** for verification.

117. When submitting the first monitoring report **to a DOE** for verification, the project boundary shall be fixed in such a way that it geographically delineates exclusively the registered CDM A/R project activity under the control of the project participants.

9.3. Eligibility of land

118. Project participants shall demonstrate that each discrete area of land to be included in the project boundary is eligible for an A/R CDM project activity, in accordance with the selected methodology, the “A/R methodological tool: Demonstration of eligibility of lands for A/R CDM project activities” or, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline. **For such demonstration, for both large- and small-scale A/R CDM project activities, it is sufficient to follow this procedure-tool and it is not essential to differentiate between afforestation and reforestation project activities.**

9.4. Addressing non-permanence

119. Project participants shall specify which of the following approaches to address non-permanence has been selected for the proposed A/R CDM project activity, considering that **this the selected** approach shall remain fixed for the crediting period including any renewals:
- (a) Issuance of tCERs; or
 - (b) Issuance of ICERs.

9.5. Application of selected baseline and monitoring methodology and selected standardized baseline

9.5.1. General

120. Project participants shall select the carbon pools and GHGs to account for the proposed A/R CDM project activity in accordance with the selected methodology.
121. If the selected methodology allows the exclusion of certain carbon pools and project participants do so, they shall justify the exclusion.
122. Project participants shall ensure that the application of default data in estimation of the net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks for the proposed A/R CDM project activity results in conservative estimates.

123. The following applies instead of paragraphs 49–51 above: In establishing a baseline scenario, project participants shall take into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances, such as historical land use practices, without creating perverse incentives that may impact host Parties’ contributions to the ultimate objective of the Convention, in the following manner:

- (a) National and/or sectoral land-use policies or regulations, which give comparative advantages to afforestation/reforestation activities and have been implemented since the adoption by the COP of the CDM M&P (decision 17/CP.7, 11 November 2001), need not be taken into account in developing a baseline**

~~scenario (i.e. the baseline scenario could refer to a hypothetical situation without the national and/or sectoral policies or regulations being in place).~~

124. Project participants shall establish the baseline scenario separately for each stratum of the proposed A/R CDM project activity in accordance with the selected methodology.

~~124_{bis}. Paragraphs 124_{ter}, 125, 126 and 127 below shall apply instead of paragraphs 49–51, 52, 58 and 61 above respectively.~~

~~124_{ter}. In establishing a baseline scenario, the project participants shall take into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances, such as historical land use practices, without creating perverse incentives that may impact host Parties' contributions to the ultimate objective of the Convention in the following manner: national and/or sectoral land-use policies or regulations, which give comparative advantages to afforestation/reforestation activities and have been implemented since the adoption by the COP of the CDM M&Ps (decision 17/CP.7, 11 November 2001), need not be taken into account in developing a baseline scenario (i.e. the baseline scenario could refer to a hypothetical situation without the national and/or sectoral policies or regulations being in place).~~

~~125. The following applies instead of paragraph 52 above:~~ Project participants shall describe the baseline scenario established for each stratum of the proposed A/R CDM project activity, including the land-use that would occur in the absence of the project activity.

~~126. The following applies instead of paragraph 58 above:~~ Project participants shall calculate and provide an estimate of the ex ante baseline net GHG removals by sinks, ex ante actual net GHG removals by sinks, leakage, and net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks for the proposed A/R CDM project activity for each year of the crediting period, in accordance with the selected methodology and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline.

~~127. The following applies instead of paragraph 61 above:~~ In cases where the selected methodology allows the use of sampling for the determination of parameter values for calculating net GHG removals, project participants may use sampling, in accordance with the requirements of the methodology and any applicable tool referenced in the methodology.

9.5.2. Demonstration of additionality

~~128. The project participants following Paragraph 128_{bis} below shall not apply instead of paragraphs 54 - 56 above:~~ Project participants shall demonstrate, in accordance with the selected methodology and the requirements relating to prior consideration of the CDM contained in section 6.5 above, that the actual net GHG removals by sinks are increased above the sum of the changes in carbon stocks in the carbon pools within the project boundary that would have occurred in the absence of the proposed A/R CDM project activity. Instead the project participants shall demonstrate, in accordance with the selected methodology and the requirements relating to prior consideration of the CDM contained in section 6.3 above, that the actual net GHG removals by sinks are increased above the sum of the changes in carbon stocks in the carbon pools within the project boundary that would have occurred in the absence of the proposed A/R CDM project activity.

9.5.3. Monitoring

129. Project participants shall plan management activities, including harvesting cycles, and verifications such that a systematic coincidence of verification and peaks in carbon stocks would be avoided.
130. Project participants shall monitor forest establishment and management, if required for the compliance with the applicability conditions of the selected methodology.
131. Project participants shall describe how the geographic coordinates of the project boundary, including boundaries of strata if any, are determined and recorded.
132. Project participants shall describe, or provide reference to, standard operating procedures (SOPs) and quality control (QC) and quality assurance (QA) procedures implemented for data monitoring, as required by the selected methodology.
133. Project participants shall identify measures to minimize potential leakage and describe how these will be implemented.
134. Project participants shall specify the procedures for the periodic review of implementation of activities and measures to minimize leakage, if required by the selected methodology.

9.6. Duration and crediting period

135. Paragraph 66 above ~~does shall~~ not apply to A/R CDM project activities.

136. ~~The following applies~~ Paragraph 136^{bis} below shall apply instead of paragraph 67 above: ~~Project participants shall select a crediting period for the proposed A/R CDM project activity, either renewable or fixed, considering that:~~

~~(a) Each renewable crediting period shall be a maximum of 20 years and may be renewed at most two times, for a maximum total length of 60 years;~~

~~(b) A fixed crediting period shall be at most 30 years;~~

~~(c) The provisions of paragraphs 12 and 13 of decision 17/CP.7 do not apply to A/R CDM project activities. An A/R project activity starting after 1 January 2000 can also be validated and registered after 31 December 2005 as long as the first verification of the project activity occurs after the date of registration of this project activity. Given that the crediting period starts at the same date as the starting date of the project activity, projects starting in 2000 onwards can accrue tCERs/ICERs as of the starting date.~~

136^{bis}. The project participants shall select a crediting period for the proposed A/R CDM project activity, either renewable or fixed, considering that:

(a) Each renewable crediting period shall be at most 20 years and may be renewed at most two times, for a maximum total length of 60 years;

(b) A fixed crediting period shall be at most 30 years;

(c) The provisions of paragraphs 12 and 13 of decision 17/CP.7 do not apply to A/R CDM project activities. An A/R project activity starting after 1 January 2000 can also be validated and registered after 31 December 2005 as long as the first

verification of the project activity occurs after the date of registration of this project activity. Given that the crediting period starts at the same date as the starting date of the project activity, projects starting in 2000 onwards can accrue tCERs/ICERs as of the starting date.

9.7. Environmental impacts

137. Paragraphs 138–140 below apply instead of paragraphs 71–72 above.
138. Project participants shall carry out an analysis of the environmental impacts of the proposed CDM A/R project activity, including impacts on biodiversity and natural ecosystems and impacts outside the project boundary. Project participants shall provide a summary of the analysis and references to all related documentation.
139. If project participants or the host Party consider the environmental impacts of the proposed A/R CDM project activity significant, project participants shall carry out an environmental impact assessment in accordance with the host Party's procedures. Project participants shall provide all conclusions and references to all related documentation.
140. If the environmental impacts of the proposed A/R CDM project activity are considered significant, project participants shall provide a description of the planned monitoring and remedial measures to address these significant impacts.

9.8. Socio-economic impacts

141. Project participants shall carry out an analysis of the major socio-economic impacts of the proposed A/R CDM project activity, including impacts outside the project boundary. Project participants shall provide a summary of the analysis and references to all related documentation.
142. If project participants or the host Party consider any negative impact as significant, project participants shall carry out a socio-economic impact assessment, in accordance with the host Party's procedures. Project participants shall provide all conclusions and references to all related documentation.
143. If the socio-economic impacts of the proposed A/R CDM project activity are considered significant, project participants shall provide a description of the planned monitoring and remedial measures to address these significant impacts.

10. Specific design requirements for small-scale afforestation and reforestation project activities

144. Project participants shall demonstrate that the proposed small-scale A/R CDM project activity:
- (a) Complies with ~~the thresholds for the small scale A/R CDM project activities~~ the definition and limit for small-scale A/R CDM project activities defined in decision 9/CMP.3.^{15bis} as follows: "Small-scale afforestation and reforestation project

^{15bis} Decision 9/CMP.3 revised the limit for small-scale A/R CDM project activities defined in the annex to decision 5/CMP.1.

activities under the CDM” are those that are expected to result in net anthropogenic greenhouse gas removals by sinks of less than 16 kt of CO₂ per year and are developed or implemented by low-income communities and individuals as determined by the host Party. If a small-scale afforestation or reforestation project activity under the CDM results in net anthropogenic greenhouse gas removals by sinks greater than 16 kt of CO₂ per year, the excess removals will not be eligible for the issuance of tCERs or ICERs”;

- (b) Complies with one of the types of small-scale A/R CDM project activities defined in appendix B of the annex to decision 6/CMP.1 and qualifies to apply one of the simplified baseline and monitoring methodologies for small-scale A/R CDM project activities;
 - (c) Is not part of a debundled large-scale A/R CDM project activity, in accordance with the rules defined in appendix C of the annex to decision 6/CMP.1.
145. Project participants shall provide a written declaration that the proposed small-scale A/R CDM project activity is developed or implemented by low-income communities and individuals as determined by the host Party.

11. Specific design requirements for carbon dioxide capture and storage project activities

11.1. Definitions for CCS project activities

- 146. **Carbon dioxide capture and storage** - the capture and transport of carbon dioxide from anthropogenic sources of emissions, and the injection of the captured carbon dioxide into an underground geological storage site for long-term isolation from the atmosphere;
- 147. **Geological storage site** - a paired geological formation, or a series of such formations, consisting of an injection formation of relatively high porosity and permeability into which carbon dioxide can be injected, coupled with an overlying cap rock formation of low porosity and permeability and sufficient thickness which can prevent the upward movement of carbon dioxide from the storage formation;
- 148. **Operational phase** - the period that begins when carbon dioxide injection commences and ends when carbon dioxide injection permanently ceases;
- 149. **Closure phase** - the phase that follows the operational phase and is the period that begins when carbon dioxide injection permanently ceases and ends when the geological storage site has been closed;
- 150. **Closure of a geological storage site** - the completion of the sealing of the geological storage site, including the appropriate plugging of wells relating to the geological storage site;
- 151. **Post-closure phase** - the phase that follows the closure phase and is the period that begins when the geological storage site has been closed;
- 152. **Seepage** - a transfer of carbon dioxide from beneath the ground surface or seabed ultimately to the atmosphere or ocean;

153. **Site development and management plan** - the documented description of how a geological storage site will be operated and managed;
154. **History matching** - the process of comparing observed results from the monitoring and measurement of a geological storage site with the results of the predictive numerical modelling of the behaviour of carbon dioxide injected into the geological storage site, and the use of the observed results to calibrate and update numerical models and modelling results. It can involve multiple iterations;
155. **Liability** - the legal responsibility arising from the CCS project activity or the relevant geological storage site, with the exception of the obligations arising from a net reversal of storage as set out in section "Addressing non-permanence in CCS project activities" of the Project cycle procedure but including all obligations related to the operation of the storage site (e.g. monitoring, remedial measures, etc.), to compensate for or remedy any significant damages, including damage to the environment, such as ecosystem damage, other material damages or personal injury;
156. **Remedial measures** - actions and measures intended to stop or control any unintended physical leakage or seepage of carbon dioxide, to restore the integrity of a geological storage site, or to restore long-term environmental quality significantly affected by a CCS project activity;
157. **Net reversal of storage of carbon dioxide** means that:
- (a) For a verification period during the crediting period, the accumulated verified reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases (GHGs) that have occurred as a result of a registered CDM project activity are negative (i.e. the seepage from the geological storage site of the CCS project activity exceeds the remainder of the emission reductions achieved by the CCS project activity);
 - (b) For a verification period after the end of the last crediting period, seepage has occurred from the geological storage site of the CCS project activity.

11.2. Description of project activity or programme of activities

158. In addition to the requirements mentioned in section 7.1 above, for CCS project activities the project participants shall:
- (a) Provide a description and analysis of the environmental conditions in the area of the geological storage site prior to any storage of carbon dioxide, including a description of the following:
 - (i) The hydrology, aquifer and groundwater properties, such as acidity and dissolved gases;
 - (ii) Where appropriate, the soils and soil gas properties, such as a carbon dioxide isotope analysis and carbon dioxide flux rate;
 - (iii) The ecosystems and the possible presence of rare or endangered or sensitive species and their habitats;
 - (iv) Climatic data;

- (b) Demonstrate that the proposed project activity¹⁸ does not involve:
 - (i) The transport of carbon dioxide from one country to another; and/or
 - (ii) A geological storage site that is located in more than one country.

11.3. Host Party participation requirements

159. Project participants implementing a CCS project activity shall demonstrate that the host Party of the CCS project activity has:
- (a) Submitted an expression of its agreement to the UNFCCC secretariat to allow the implementation of CCS project activities on its territory; and
 - (b) Established laws or regulations in accordance with the host Party participation requirements set out in section “Participation requirements of host Party for CCS project activities” of the Project cycle procedure, which state that, prior to hosting CDM CCS project activities on its territory, a host Party shall ensure that it has established laws and/or regulations which:
 - (i) Set procedures that include provisions for the appropriate selection, characterization and development of geological storage sites, recognizing the project requirements for CCS project activities under the CDM set out in section 11.4 below;
 - (ii) Define means by which rights to store carbon dioxide in, and gain access to, a subsurface pore space can be conferred to project participants;
 - (iii) Provide for timely and effective redress for affected entities, individuals and communities for any significant damages, such as environmental damage, including damage to ecosystems, other material damages or personal injury, caused by the project activity, including in the post-closure phase;
 - (iv) Provide for timely and effective remedial measures to stop or control any unintended seepage of carbon dioxide, to restore the integrity of a geological storage site, and to restore long-term environmental quality significantly affected by a CCS project activity;
 - (v) Establish means for addressing liability arrangements for carbon dioxide geological storage sites, taking into account the provisions set out in section 11.9 below;
 - (vi) For a host Party that accepts the obligation to address a net reversal of storage, establish measures to fulfil such an obligation.

¹⁸ As per paragraphs 10 and 41 of decision 5/CMP.8; the CMP decided that the eligibility of these types of project activities shall be considered by the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice at its forty-fifth session, and also decided that although these types of project activities would merit inclusion under the CDM, more practical experience of carbon dioxide capture and storage project activities in geological formations under the CDM would be beneficial.

159. In addition to the requirements for approval and authorization set out section 7.6 above, project participants shall seek written confirmation of the following from the DNA of the host Party:
- (a) That the right to store carbon dioxide in, and gain access to, the proposed geological storage site has been conferred to them;
 - (b) That the host Party agrees to the financial provision described in the PDD (see section 11.8 below);
 - (c) That the host Party accepts the allocation of liability as proposed in the PDD and the transfer of liability (see section 11.9 below);
 - (d) Whether the host Party accepts the obligation to address a net reversal of storage in the situation referred to in section "Addressing non-permanence in CCS project activities" of the Project cycle procedure.

11.4. Selection and characterization of the geological storage site

160. The project participants shall describe the selection and characterization of geological storage site. Projects participants shall demonstrate that they have selected a geological storage site:
- (a) In which, under the proposed conditions of use:
 - (i) There is no significant risk of seepage (as evidenced by the results of the risk and safety assessment carried out in accordance with section 11.6 below);
 - (ii) No significant environmental or health risks exist (as evidenced by the risk and safety assessment carried out in accordance with section 11.6); and
 - (iii) The selected geological storage site complies with all laws and regulations of the host Party, as applicable;
 - (b) That is not located in international waters.
161. When selecting a geological storage site, projects participants shall evaluate:
- (a) All available evidence, such as data, analysis and history matching, indicating that the injected carbon dioxide will be completely and permanently stored such that, under the proposed or actual conditions of use, no significant risk of seepage or risk to human health or the environment exists. The results of this evaluation should be supported by, and consistent with, the results of the risk and safety assessment carried out in accordance with section 11.6 below;
 - (b) Whether the geological storage site is suitable for potable water supply.
162. If the proposed geological storage site is suitable for potable water supply, a decision about whether the site is eligible for geological storage shall be made by the host Party, taking into account the results of the site characterization and the risk and safety assessment of the proposed geological storage site, following the procedures outlined in the CCS modalities and procedures.

163. When characterizing the geological storage site, project participants shall take the following steps:

- (a) Step 1: data and information collection, compilation and evaluation. The project participant shall collect sufficient data and information to characterize the geological storage site and determine potential seepage pathways. The project participant shall evaluate (i) the collected data and information in order to make a preliminary assessment of the site's storage capacity and to assess the viability of monitoring and (ii) the quality of the data and information and, where required, collect new data;
- (b) Step 2: characterization of the geological storage site architecture and surrounding domains. The project participant shall assess the known and inferred structures within the injection formation(s) and cap rock formation(s) that would act as barriers to, or facilitators of, the migration of injected carbon dioxide. The project participant shall compile a numerical three-dimensional static earth model (or models) of the geological storage site. The project participant shall assess the uncertainty associated with key parameters used to build the model. The model shall be used by the project participant to characterize, inter alia:
 - (i) The structure of the geological containment;
 - (ii) All relevant geological properties of the injection formation(s);
 - (iii) The cap rock formation(s) and overburden;
 - (iv) The fracture system;
 - (v) The areal and vertical extent of the geological storage site (e.g. the injection formation, the cap rock formation, overburden, secondary containment zones and surrounding domains);
 - (vi) The storage capacity in the injection formation(s);
 - (vii) The fluid distribution and physical properties;
 - (viii) Other relevant characteristics;
- (c) Step 3: characterization of dynamic behaviour, sensitivity characterization and risk assessment. The project participant shall assess how the injected carbon dioxide can be expected to behave within the geological storage site architecture and surrounding domains, with a particular focus on the risk of seepage. The project participant shall utilize numerical dynamic modelling of the injected carbon dioxide using the static model developed in step 2 above to assess:
 - (i) Coupled processes (i.e. the interaction between each single process in the model);
 - (ii) Where possible, reactive processes (e.g. the interaction of injected carbon dioxide with in situ minerals in the numerical model); and
 - (iii) Short-term and long-term simulations.

Such numerical modelling shall be used to provide insight into the pressure

and extent of carbon dioxide in the geological storage site over time, the risk of fracturing the cap rock formation(s) and the risk of seepage. Multiple simulations shall be conducted to identify the sensitivity of the assessments to assumptions made. The simulations carried out in this step shall form the basis for risk and safety assessments, detailed in section 11.6 below;

- (d) Step 4: establishment of a site development and management plan. Drawing on steps 1–3 above, the project participant shall establish a site development and management plan. The development and management plan shall address the proposed conditions of use for the geological storage site and include, inter alia, descriptions of:
 - (i) The preparation of the site;
 - (ii) Well construction, such as materials and techniques used, and the location, trajectory and depth of the well;
 - (iii) Injection rates and the maximum allowable near-wellbore pressure;
 - (iv) Operating and maintenance programmes and protocols;
 - (v) The timing and management of the closure phase of the proposed CCS project activity, including site closure and related activities.
164. When characterizing and selecting a geological storage site, project participants shall use a wide range of data and information, including, inter alia:
- (a) Geological information, such as descriptions of the overburden and cap rock formation(s) and injection formation(s), locations of mapped faults, subsurface well and wellbore information, permeability and porosity, which are important in determining the injectivity of the injection formation, and the cap rock formation containment capacity, and information about regional tectonics, including the stress field and historical seismic activity;
 - (b) Geophysical information, such as the thickness and lateral extent of the storage and cap rock formation(s), pressure, temperature, the existence of faults, and reservoir heterogeneity. Sources of data may include, inter alia, well logs, sonic logs and seismic surveys;
 - (c) Geomechanical information, such as the stress state and the rock fracture pressure within the injection formation(s) and the cap rock formation(s). Sources of data include borehole data, such as breakouts inferred from calliper and televiewer logs, minifrac results, information about anisotropy within the reservoir, and mud loss events;
 - (d) Geochemical information, such as information on rock and fluid properties and mineralogy. Fluid properties, such as the brine salinity, should also be used to determine dissolution trapping rates;
 - (e) Hydrogeological information, such as aquifer characteristics and aquifer flow direction and rates within the geological storage site, the overburden and surrounding domains.

165. Project participants shall demonstrate that they have selected and characterized the geological storage site in accordance with the requirements referred to in paragraphs 160–164 above and provide all relevant supporting documents. Project participants shall describe and document transparently the methods, assumptions and models used, the type and sources of information and data used, as well as the process and steps taken to characterize and select the geological storage site, including the findings and outcomes from each step.

11.5. Project boundary

166. The following applies in addition to paragraphs 45 and 46 above [Project standard]: The project participants shall define the boundary of a CCS project activity to include:
- (a) Where applicable, the following:
 - (i) The installation where the carbon dioxide is captured;
 - (ii) Any treatment facilities;
 - (iii) Transportation equipment, including pipelines and booster stations along a pipeline, or offloading facilities in the case of transportation by ship, rail or road tanker;
 - (iv) Any reception facilities or holding tanks at the injection site;
 - (v) The injection facility;
 - (vi) Subsurface components, including the geological storage site and all potential sources of seepage, as determined during the characterization and selection of the geological storage site;
 - (b) The vertical and lateral limits of the carbon dioxide geological storage site that are expected when the carbon dioxide plume stabilizes over the long term during the closure phase and the post-closure phase.

11.6. Risk and safety assessment

167. Project participants shall carry out a comprehensive risk and safety assessment in order to assess the integrity of the geological storage site and potential impacts on human health and ecosystems in proximity to the proposed CCS project activity. The risk and safety assessment shall also be used to inform environmental and socioeconomic impact assessments. The risk and safety assessment shall:
- (a) Consider specific risks associated with containment failure resulting in emissions of greenhouse gases from above-ground installations and seepage from subsurface installations, and the potential effects on, inter alia:
 - (i) The contamination of underground sources of drinking water;
 - (ii) The chemical properties of seawater;
 - (iii) Human health and ecosystems (e.g. as a result of carbon dioxide accumulations at dangerous levels in non-turbulent air);

- (b) Consider the risk of continuous slow seepage from a geological storage site. This type of event can arise due to, inter alia:
 - (i) Seepage along injection well(s) or abandoned well(s);
 - (ii) Seepage along a fault or fracture;
 - (iii) Seepage through the cap rock formation;
 - (c) Consider the risk of sudden mass release of carbon dioxide from surface CCS installations, for example due to pipeline rupture;
 - (d) Cover the full chain of CCS, including surrounding environments;
 - (e) Provide assurance of safe operational integrity regarding the containment of carbon dioxide, based on site-specific information about the geological storage site, potential seepage pathways, and secondary effects of storing carbon dioxide in the geological storage site, such as brine migration;
 - (f) Be used to determine operational data for the application of the site development and management plan, such as to set the appropriate maximums of injection pressure that will not compromise the confining cap rock formation(s) and the overburden of the geological storage site;
 - (g) Take account of the effects of potential induced seismicity or other geological impacts, as well as any other potential consequences for the environment, including on local ecosystems, property and public health, and global environmental effects on the climate directly attributable to the CCS project activity, including effects due to seepage;
 - (h) Be used to help prioritize locations and approaches for enhanced monitoring activities;
 - (i) Provide a basis for remedial measures, including plans for responses that can stop or control any unintended emissions from surface CCS installations and seepage of carbon dioxide, restore the integrity of a geological storage site, and restore long-term environmental quality significantly affected by a CCS project activity. Such measures and plans shall accompany monitoring plans;
 - (j) Include a communication plan.
168. In order to assess the potential risks of carbon dioxide capture, transportation and storage in a geological storage site, project participants shall take the following steps:
- (a) Step 1: hazard characterization. The project participant shall analyse the following:
 - (i) Potential hazards resulting from the capture, transportation and injection of carbon dioxide;
 - (ii) Potential seepage pathways from the geological storage site;
 - (iii) The magnitude of potential seepage for identified potential seepage pathways;

- (iv) Critical parameters affecting potential seepage, such as the maximums of injection formation pressure, injection rates and temperature;
 - (v) The sensitivity to various assumptions made during numerical modelling;
 - (vi) Any other factors which could pose a hazard to human health and the environment;
 - (b) Step 2: exposure assessment. The project participant shall undertake an exposure assessment based on the characteristics of surrounding populations and ecosystems, the potential fate and behaviour of any seeped carbon dioxide, and other factors;
 - (c) Step 3: effects assessment. The project participant shall undertake an effects assessment based on the sensitivity of species, communities or habitats linked to potential seepage events identified during the hazard characterization and the effects of elevated carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere, biosphere and hydrosphere;
 - (d) Step 4: risk characterization. The project participant shall assess the safety and integrity of the geological storage site in the short-, medium- and long-term, including an assessment of the risk of seepage under the proposed conditions of use set out in the site development and management plan;
 - (e) Step 5: contingency plan for large incidents, including seepage. The project participant shall prepare all the necessary plans that are to be put in place in case of large incidents, including availability of trained personnel, materials and equipment and financial means to mitigate adverse impacts of the incident and teams prepared to act as swiftly as possible.
169. Project participants shall provide:
- (a) A detailed description of the risk and safety assessment referred to in paragraphs 167 and 168 above;
 - (b) A copy of the communications and contingency plans referred to in paragraphs 167 and 168 above; and
 - (c) References to all relevant supporting documents.

11.7. Monitoring

170. Project participants shall include in the PDD provisions for monitoring the proposed CCS project activity that meet the following objectives:
- (a) To provide assurance of the environmental integrity and safety of the geological storage site;
 - (b) To confirm that the injected carbon dioxide is contained within the geological storage site and within the project boundary;
 - (c) To ensure that injected carbon dioxide is behaving as predicted in order to minimize the risk of any seepage or other adverse impacts;

- (d) To ensure that good site management is taking place, taking account of the proposed conditions of use set out in the site development and management plan, established in step 4 of section 11.4 above;
 - (e) To detect and estimate the flux rate and total mass of carbon dioxide from any seepage;
 - (f) To determine whether timely and appropriate remedial measures have been carried out in the event of seepage;
 - (g) To determine the reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases that have occurred as a result of the registered CCS project activity.
171. In developing the monitoring plan for the proposed CCS project activity, project participants shall meet the objectives set out above by:
- (a) Reflecting the principles and criteria of international good practice for the monitoring of geological storage sites and consider the range of technologies described in the relevant sections of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 2006 Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories and other good practice guidance;
 - (b) Transparently specifying which parameters and information will be monitored and collected, and the location and frequency of application of different monitoring techniques during the operational phase, closure phase and post-closure phase;
 - (c) Providing for specific techniques and methods that can:
 - (i) Detect and estimate the quantity of the carbon dioxide stored in the geological storage site;
 - (ii) Detect potential seepage via pathways in the cap rock formation(s) and in the overburden and surrounding domains in the geological storage site;
 - (iii) Estimate the flux rate and total mass of carbon dioxide from any seepage;
 - (d) Including provisions for history matching, by using the monitoring results to calibrate and update the numerical models that were used to characterize the geological storage site;
 - (e) Providing for measurement of the carbon dioxide stream and composition, including impurities, at various points in the carbon dioxide capture, transportation and storage chain, including at the point(s) of injection into the geological storage site, at an appropriate frequency;
 - (f) Providing for measurement of the temperature and pressure at the top and bottom of the injection well(s) and observation well(s), at an appropriate frequency;
 - (g) Providing for the monitoring and measurement of various geological, geochemical and geomechanical parameters, such as fluid pressures, displaced fluid characteristics, fluxes and microseismicity, at an appropriate frequency;

- (h) Providing for the monitoring and measurement of relevant parameters in the overburden and surrounding domains of the geological storage site, such as the monitoring of groundwater properties, soil gas measurements and measurements of the surface concentrations of carbon dioxide in the air, which shall be calibrated to detect signs of seepage, at an appropriate frequency;
 - (i) Providing for the detection of corrosion or degradation of the transport and injection facilities;
 - (j) Providing for an assessment of the effectiveness of any remedial measures taken in the event of seepage.
172. Project participants shall, for each verification period, carry out history matching and, where necessary, update the numerical models used to characterize the geological storage site by conducting new simulations using the monitored data and information. Project participants shall adjust the numerical models if significant deviations (as defined in the approved CCS methodology used by the CCS project activity) occur between observed and predicted behaviour. The project participants shall immediately notify the host Party and the CDM Executive Board in writing if a significant deviation occurs at any stage of the project cycle.
173. Where significant deviations are observed during history matching or when requesting a renewal of the crediting period, the project participants shall, as appropriate:
- (a) Recharacterize the geological storage site, in accordance with section 11.4 above;
 - (b) Revise the project boundary;
 - (c) Update the risk and safety assessment, in accordance with section 11.6 above;
 - (d) Update the environmental and socioeconomic impact assessments, referred to in section 11.10 below;
 - (e) Revise the monitoring plan, in order to improve the accuracy and/or completeness of data and information, taking into account observed deviations determined during history matching, changes to the project boundary, changes to the risk and safety assessment, changes to the environmental and socioeconomic impact assessments, new scientific knowledge and improvements in the best available technology;
 - (f) Update the site development and management plan, taking account of the results of the activities described in subparagraphs (a–e) above, where appropriate.
174. Where the information prepared in accordance with paragraph 173 above indicates that the geological storage site no longer meets the requirements set out in paragraphs 160 and 161 above, the issuance of CERs shall cease.
175. Project participants shall account for any seepage that occurs during the crediting period(s) of a CCS project activity as project or leakage emissions in the calculation of the monitored reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases that have occurred as a result of the registered CDM CCS project activity. Any seepage that occurs after the end of the last crediting period shall be quantified and reported in monitoring reports.

176. The monitoring of the geological storage site shall:
- (a) Begin before injection activities commence, to ensure adequate time for the collection of any required baseline data;
 - (b) Be conducted at an appropriate frequency during and beyond the crediting period(s) of the proposed CCS project activity;
 - (c) Not be terminated earlier than 20 years after the end of the last crediting period of the CDM project activity or after the issuance of CERs has ceased, whichever occurs first;
 - (d) Only be terminated if no seepage has been observed at any time in the past 10 years and if all available evidence from observations and modelling indicates that the stored carbon dioxide will be completely isolated from the atmosphere in the long term. This may be demonstrated through the following evidence:
 - (i) History matching confirms that there is agreement between the numerical modelling of the carbon dioxide plume distribution in the geological storage site and the monitored behaviour of the carbon dioxide plume;
 - (ii) Numerical modelling and observations confirm that no future seepage can be expected from the geological storage site.
177. The project participant(s) liable for the geological storage site, or an entity that is under contract to the project participant(s), shall conduct the monitoring of the geological storage site unless and until the transfer of liability to the host Party is effected in accordance with section 11.9 below.

11.8. Requirements for financial provision

178. Project participants shall establish a financial provision that:
- (a) Meets all obligations in accordance with the laws and regulations of the host Party arising from the establishment and operation of the proposed CCS project activity;
 - (b) Allows for the ongoing safe operation of the geological storage site in accordance with the laws and regulations of the host Party;
 - (c) Addresses the risk of project participant insolvency in accordance with the laws and regulations of the host Party;
 - (d) Offers a means of redress for affected communities and ecosystems in the event of seepage from a geological storage site of a CCS project activity in accordance with the laws and regulations of the host Party;
 - (e) Enables the host Party to discharge its obligations arising in connection with the transfer of liability.
179. The financial provision shall cover:
- (a) The cost of ongoing monitoring, at an appropriate frequency, of the geological storage site and of verification and certification by a DOE for at least 20 years

after the end of the last crediting period of the CCS project activity or after the issuance of CERs has ceased, whichever occurs first;

- (b) In the event of seepage, the cost associated with the obligations set out in section “Addressing non-permanence in CCS project activities” of the Project cycle procedure;
 - (c) The cost of any remedial measures required by laws and regulations of the host Party;
 - (d) Any other requirements determined by the host Party that are agreed at the time of the host Party approval and described in the PDD.
180. Project participants shall describe the type and amount of the financial provision and provide a detailed cost estimate for each of the requirements referred to in paragraph 179 above, including underlying assumptions and justifications.
181. The financial provision shall, in accordance with the laws and regulations of the host Party, be transferable to the host Party upon fulfilment of all obligations of the project participants in accordance with the CDM rules and requirements and the laws and regulations of the host Party, or upon insolvency of the project participant(s).

11.9. Liability

182. Project participants shall clearly document in the PDD how the liability obligations arising from the proposed CCS project activity or its geological storage site are allocated during the operational phase, closure phase and post-closure phase.
183. Relevant provisions of laws and regulations of the host Party, including those referred to in section 11.3 above, shall apply to matters related to liability.
184. During the operational phase and any time thereafter until a transfer of liability to the host Party has been effected in accordance with paragraph 185 below, liability shall reside with the project participants.
185. A transfer of liability from a project participant(s) to the host Party shall be effected after:
- (a) The monitoring by the project participant of the geological storage site has been terminated in accordance with the conditions for such termination, as set out in section 11.7 above;
 - (b) The host Party has established that the conditions set out by the DNA in its letter of approval, referred to in section 11.3 above, and those set out in the relevant laws and regulations applicable to the geological storage site, have been complied with.
186. Project participants shall notify the Board in writing, through the relevant DNA, not less than six months before the transfer of liability is scheduled to occur.

11.10. Environmental and socioeconomic impact assessments

187. The following applies instead of paragraphs 71 and 72 above: The project participants shall carry out comprehensive environmental and socioeconomic impact assessments in accordance with the laws and regulations of the host Party, including with regard to

potential transboundary impacts, drawing upon the risk and safety assessment referred to in section 11.6 above. Such assessments shall:

- (a) Include a detailed description of the planned monitoring and remedial measures to address any environmental and socioeconomic impacts identified, and be compiled in accordance with procedures as required by the host Party;
 - (b) Analyse thoroughly and exhaustively air emissions (e.g. nitrogen oxides, sulphur oxides, dust, mercury, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons), solid waste generation, and water use associated with current CCS technologies;
 - (c) Be conducted applying the best available techniques in order to facilitate a high level of protection for the environment as a whole and for communities;
 - (d) Include at least a comprehensive analysis of the environmental and socioeconomic impacts including consideration of the potential impacts of carbon dioxide storage on potable water supply.
188. Project participants shall provide a detailed summary of the environmental and socioeconomic impact assessment and provide references to all relevant supporting documents.

11.11. Verification and certification

189. Project participants may select the time for the initial verification and certification of a CCS project activity by a DOE, taking into account that subsequent verification and certification reports shall be submitted by the DOE to the Executive Board not later than five years after the end of the previous verification period.
190. Verification and certification of a CCS project activity shall continue, in accordance with paragraph 186 above, beyond the end of the last crediting period by the DOE appointed by project participants and until such time as the monitoring of the geological storage site has been terminated in accordance with the conditions for the termination of monitoring, as set out in paragraph 176 above.

12. Specific design requirements for programme of activities

12.1_{bis} General

- 190_{bis} The coordinating/managing entity shall develop generic CPA-DDs and specific-case CPA-DDs referring to relevant requirements in section 7 and 8, 9 or 10 above as well as relevant requirements in section 11 below.

12.1. Selection of methodology and standardized baseline

191. In selecting an approved methodology(ies) and, where applicable, an approved standardized baseline(s), the coordinating/managing entity shall consider that any approved methodology and approved standardized baseline are applicable to CPAs under a PoA.¹⁹

¹⁹ See EB 68 meeting report, paragraph 97.

12.2. Description of programme of activities

192. The coordinating/managing entity shall develop a framework for the implementation of the proposed CDM PoA and inclusion of CPAs under the PoA.
193. The coordinating/managing entity shall describe the policy/measure or stated goal that the proposed CDM PoA seeks to promote.
194. The coordinating/managing entity shall confirm that the proposed CDM PoA is a voluntary action by the coordinating/managing entity.
- ~~196. The coordinating/managing entity shall provide the identification of:~~
- ~~(a) Coordinating/managing entity of the proposed CDM PoA;~~
 - ~~(b) Party(ies) involved in the proposed CDM PoA;~~
 - ~~(c) Project participants involved in the proposed CDM PoA.~~
197. The coordinating/managing entity shall define the boundary for the proposed CDM PoA in terms of a geographical area (e.g. municipality, region within a country, country or several countries) within which all CPAs to be included in the PoA will be implemented, ~~The coordinating/managing entity shall take~~ing into consideration ~~that~~ all applicable national and/or sectoral policies and regulations within the chosen boundary ~~are reflected~~ in the establishment of the baseline.
198. As part of the proposed CDM PoA, the coordinating/managing entity shall prepare generic CPA-DDs with generic information applicable to all CPAs that will be included in the PoA. For PoAs applying more than one technology/measure or more than one methodology, the coordinating/managing entity shall prepare a generic CPA for each technology/measure, each methodology and each combination thereof.²⁰
- ~~198_{bis} The coordinating/managing entity shall consider any specific guidance in applied methodologies regarding the requirement to prepare separate generic CPA-DDs for each different technology/measure, taking into account differences in the means of demonstration of additionality, emission reduction calculations, and monitoring methods applicable to the technologies/measures being implemented. As an exception, when the technologies/measures are included in the positive lists for additionality demonstration under the "Guidelines on demonstration of additionality of small-scale project activities" or "Guidelines on demonstration of additionality of microscale project activities" the~~

²⁰ For instance a PoA for efficient residential lighting applying more than one methodology will need more than one generic CPA-DD (e.g. a generic CPA-DD for efficient residential lighting under AMS-II.C and a generic CPA-DD for efficient residential lighting under AMS-II.J). Similarly a PoA for energy efficiency activities applying a single methodology but including different technologies will need more than one generic CPA-DD (e.g. a generic CPA-DD for efficient street lighting under AMS-II.C and a generic CPA-DD for efficient water pumping under AMS-II.C). Furthermore, a PoA for treatment of domestic manure would need more than one generic CPA-DD for applying more than one combination of methodologies (e.g. a generic CPA-DD for applying the combination AMS-III.R.+AMS-I.E.+AMS-I.I. and a generic CPA-DD for applying the combination AMS-III.R.+AMS-I.I). However, separate generic CPA-DDs are not required to cover cases that do not differ in terms of emission reduction calculations (e.g. separate generic CPA-DDs are not required for installing prefabricated project stoves of efficiency N under methodology AMS-II.G by manufacturer M1 versus installing prefabricated project stoves of efficiency N under methodology AMS-II.G by manufacturer M2).

generic CPA-DD may cover more than one technology/measure, however the CME shall still include all the information related to eligibility criteria, emission reduction calculations and monitoring requirements for each technology/measure separately taking into account any specific guidance in the applied methodologies.

199. Also as part of the proposed CDM PoA, the coordinating/managing entity shall develop specific-case CPAs²¹ under the PoA as follows:
- (a) For PoAs applying the same technology/measure under the same methodology across all CPAs, **at least only one specific-case CPA-DD but no more than five specific case CPA-DDs** shall be provided;
 - (b) For PoAs applying more than one technology/measure or more than one methodology, **at least one specific-case CPA-DD but no more than five specific case CPA-DDs** for each generic CPA-DD shall be provided. In cases where not all specific-case CPA-DDs to cover all generic CPA-DDs can be provided at the time of the publication of the PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, at least one specific-case CPA-DD **but no more than five specific case CPA-DDs** corresponding to any of the generic CPA-DDs shall be provided at the time of the publication of the PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation. In this case, **at least one specific-case CPA-DD but no more than five specific case CPA-DDs** shall be provided for each of the remaining generic CPA-DDs at the time of request for registration of the PoA or after the registration of the PoA. In the latter case, the specific-case CPA-DDs shall be provided for approval by the Board in accordance with the post-registration change process as defined in the Project cycle procedure. If the generic CPA-DD contains more than one technology/measure in accordance with paragraph 198 bis above, the specific CPA-DD(s) to be submitted may correspond to any one of the technologies/measures or their combination.
 - (c) For PoAs hosted in more than one Party, one specific-case CPA-DD for each host Party shall be provided at the time of the publication of the PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation. In this case, if the PoA-DD defines more than one generic CPA-DD, the specific-case CPA-DD for a host Party may correspond to any generic CPA-DD. However, the requirements in subparagraph (b) above shall still apply to the PoA as a whole.
200. The coordinating/managing entity shall establish and implement, and provide a description of, the operational and management arrangements for the implementation of the proposed CDM PoA. These arrangements may be integrated with the management system required in the “Standard for demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of multiple methodologies for programme of activities”.

12.3. Description of component project activities

201. Each CPA shall have only one host Party.

202. The coordinating/managing entity shall provide the geographic reference or other means of identification²² of the CPAs.

²¹ Also referred to as actual case or real case CPA-DD.

~~203. The coordinating/managing entity shall describe the CPAs, including the technology(ies) and/or measures to be used, to enable the identification of the project's scale and type, demonstration of additionality, application of the selected methodology(ies) and, where applicable, of the selected standardized baseline(s) and calculations of GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals.~~

204. The coordinating/managing entity shall identify ~~the~~ the entity/individual responsible for the operation of the CPAs (name and contact details).

~~(a) The host Party of the CPAs.~~

205. The coordinating/managing entity shall confirm that ~~the all~~ CPAs ~~is are~~ neither registered as a CDM project activity nor included in another registered PoA.

12.4. Eligibility criteria

206. The coordinating/managing entity shall define in the proposed CDM PoA the eligibility criteria for inclusion of a CPA under the PoA, in accordance with the "Standard for demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of multiple methodologies for programme of activities".

12.5. Application of selected baseline and monitoring methodologies and selected standardized baselines

12.5.1. General requirements

207. The coordinating/managing entity applying combinations of technologies/measures and/or approved CDM methodologies among CPAs of a PoA shall apply the combinations in accordance with the "Standard for demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of multiple methodologies for programme of activities" and the Project cycle procedure.

12.5.2. Demonstration of additionality

208. ~~The following applies Paragraph 208_{bis} below shall apply instead of paragraphs 54 and 57 above: The coordinating/managing entity shall demonstrate that the proposed CDM PoA is additional in accordance with the "Standard for demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of multiple methodologies for programme of activities".~~

208_{bis}. The coordinating/managing entity shall demonstrate that the proposed CDM PoA is additional in accordance with the "Standard: Demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of multiple methodologies for programmes of activities".

²² For example: the geographic reference for stationary CPAs; the registration number or GPS devices for mobile CPAs.

209. The coordinating/managing entity shall consider that a full additionality assessment is not required in the context of CPA. Instead, the confirmation of additionality for CPAs should be conducted by means of the eligibility criteria.

12.5.3. Sampling

210. If the coordinating/managing entity utilizes sampling for the determination of parameter values for calculating GHG emission reductions, the coordinating/managing entity shall develop and describe the sampling plan in accordance with the “Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities”.

210^{bis} In the case the request for issuance of PoA is done as per para 298(c)(ii) and (iii), the sampling shall be conducted at the level of the batch or CPA.

12.5.4. Monitoring plan

~~211. The coordinating/managing entity shall develop and provide a description of the monitoring plan for a CPA and identify the monitoring provisions and data parameters that a CPA has to apply/monitor in accordance with the selected methodology and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline.~~

12.6. Debundling of small-scale component project activities

212. The coordinating/managing entity shall demonstrate that the proposed small-scale CPA is not a debundled component of a large-scale activity, in accordance with ~~the applicable provisions of~~ the “Guidelines on assessment of debundling for SSC project activities”.

12.7. Duration and crediting period

12.7.1. Duration of programme of activities and component project activities

213. ~~The following~~ Paragraphs ~~213^{bis}–222~~ **Error! Reference source not found.** shall apply instead of paragraphs 65–66 above: ~~The coordinating/managing entity shall determine the start date of the proposed CDM PoA and provide a description of how the start date has been determined. The start date of a PoA shall be either of the two dates below:~~

~~(a) The date of notification of the intention to seek the CDM status by the coordinating/managing entity to the secretariat and the DNA; or~~

~~(b) The date of publication of the PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation.~~

213^{bis}. The coordinating/managing entity shall determine the start date of the proposed CDM PoA and provide a description of how the start date has been determined. The start date of a PoA shall be either of the two dates below:

(a) The date of notification of the intention to seek the CDM status by the coordinating/managing entity to the DNA(s) of the host Party(ies) and the secretariat; or

(b) The date of publication of the PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation.

214. The coordinating/managing entity shall specify the duration of the proposed CDM PoA, which shall not exceed 28 years (60 years for ~~an the proposed CDM~~ A/R PoA), counting from the start date of the PoA.

215. The coordinating/managing entity shall determine the start date and expected operational lifetime of any proposed CPA and provide a description of how the start date has been determined. The start date of a CPA is the earliest date at which either the implementation or construction or real action of the CPA begins.
216. The coordinating/managing entity shall confirm that the start date of any proposed CPA is on or after the start date of the PoA.²³

12.7.2. Crediting period

217. Paragraphs 218-222 below **shall** apply instead of paragraphs 67–70 above.
218. The coordinating/managing entity shall renew the PoA every seven years (every 20 years for an A/R PoA) counting from the date of its registration.
219. The coordinating/managing entity shall select the type (fixed or renewable) and duration of the crediting period of a proposed CPA, considering **that the start date of the crediting period of a CPA shall be on or after:**²⁴
- (a) **The start date of the crediting period for the CPA shall be on or after:**
- (i) The date of registration of the PoA, if the corresponding CPA DD is submitted together with the request for registration;
 - (ii) The date of approval of the **corresponding specific case** CPA-DD, if the specific case CPA-DD is **corresponding** submitted for approval by the Board in accordance with paragraph 199(b) above;
 - (iii) The date when the CPA was included in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.
- ~~220. The coordinating/managing entity shall select the type (fixed or renewable) and duration of the crediting period of a proposed CPA, considering that:~~
- (b) If a renewable crediting period type is chosen for a CPA, each renewable crediting period shall be at most seven years (20 years for an A/R CPA) and may be renewed at most two times, for a maximum total length of 21 years (60 years for an A/R CPA). The first renewal of the crediting period of the CPA shall be conducted no later than seven years after the start date of the crediting period of the CPA;
 - (c) A fixed crediting period shall be at most 10 years;
 - (d) The duration of the crediting period of a CPA shall not exceed the duration of the PoA, regardless of the crediting period type (renewable or fixed) of the CPA;

²³ Exceptions indicated for A/R project activities under paragraph 136(c) also apply to A/R CPAs, i.e. any A/R project activity that started after 1 January 2000, but has not been registered as a CDM project activity may be included as a CPA in an A/R PoA after 31 December 2005 as long as the first verification of the A/R CPA occurs after the date of inclusion of this CPA, and the A/R CPA can accrue temporary certified emission reductions (tCERs) or long-term certified emission reductions (lCERs) as of the starting date.

²⁴ See footnote 22 above.

- (e) Where ICERs are expected to be issued for a PoA, the dates of renewal of the crediting periods of all CPAs included in the PoA are to be aligned with the date of renewal of the PoA.
- 221. The coordinating/managing entity shall determine only one start date for the crediting period of the proposed CDM CPA, even in cases of phased implementation of the CPA.
- 222. The coordinating/managing entity shall state the start date of the crediting period of the proposed CDM CPA in the format dd/mm/yyyy, and shall not use any qualifications to the start date, such as “expected”.

12.8. Environmental impacts

~~223. The analysis of the environmental impacts and the environmental impact assessment, as per sections 7.4, 8.7 and/or 9.7 above, may be carried out for the whole PoA or at the CPA level. The coordinating/managing entity shall reflect and describe the level applied. Paragraph 223_{bis} below shall apply for the cases referred to in these paragraphs instead of paragraphs 71 and 72 above. For all other cases, paragraphs 71 and 72 above shall apply. The analysis of the environmental impacts and the environmental impact assessment, as per sections 7.4, 8.7 and/or 9.7 above, may be carried out for the whole PoA or at the CPA level. The coordinating/managing entity shall reflect and describe the level applied. Paragraph 169_{bis} or 169_{ter} below shall apply for the cases referred to in these paragraphs instead of paragraphs 71 and 72 above. For all other cases, paragraphs 71 and 72 above shall apply.~~

223_{bis}. If the proposed CDM PoA will include only small-scale non-A/R CPAs, the coordinating/managing entity shall carry out an analysis of the environmental impacts of the proposed CDM PoA, if required by the host Party(ies). The coordinating/managing entity shall provide a summary of the analysis and references to all documentation;

~~223_{ter}. If the proposed CDM PoA will include A/R CPAs, the coordinating/managing entity shall:~~

~~(a) Carry out an analysis of the environmental impacts of the proposed CDM PoA, including the impacts on biodiversity and natural ecosystems and the impacts outside the project boundary. The coordinating/managing entity shall provide a summary of the analysis and references to all related documentation;~~

~~(b) Carry out an environmental impact assessment in accordance with the host Party(ies)' procedures, if the coordinating/managing entity or the host Party(ies) considers the environmental impacts of the proposed CDM PoA significant. The coordinating/managing entity shall provide all conclusions and references to all related documentation;~~

~~(c) If the environmental impacts of the proposed PoA are considered significant, the coordinating/management entity shall provide a description of the planned monitoring and remedial measures to address these significant impacts.~~

223_{quater}. For any type of proposed CDM PoAs, the analysis of the environmental impacts and the environmental impact assessment may be carried out for the whole PoA or at the CPA level. The coordinating/managing entity shall reflect and describe the level applied.

12.9. Local stakeholder consultation

224. The local stakeholder consultation, as per section 7.5 above, may be carried out for the whole PoA or at the CPA level. The coordinating/managing entity shall specify the level of consultation applied.
225. For the actual-specific case CPAs, of which CPA-DDs are to be published together with the PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation of the proposed CDM PoA, the local stakeholder consultation shall be completed before the submission of the PoA-DD to a DOE for validation. If the local stakeholder consultation is carried out at the CPA level, for CPAs to be included in the registered after the registration of the PoA, the local stakeholder consultation shall be completed before their inclusion in the PoA.

12.10. Approval and authorization

~~226. Paragraphs 227–232 below apply instead of paragraphs 78–79 above.~~

~~227. The coordinating/managing entity shall obtain a letter of approval from the DNA of each Party involved in the proposed CDM PoA at the time of request for registration of the PoA, confirming that:~~

~~(a) The Party is a Party to the Kyoto Protocol; and~~

~~(b) Participation in the proposed CDM PoA is voluntary.~~

~~228. A new host Party(ies) may be added after the registration of the PoA. In this case, the coordinating/managing entity shall request for approval by the Board of the addition in accordance with paragraph 209 below, and following the post registration change process as defined in the Project cycle procedure.~~

~~229. In addition to the requirement in paragraph 227, for the coordinating/managing entity from the host Party, the letter of approval from the host Party shall also confirm that the proposed CDM PoA assists the host Party in achieving sustainable development.~~

~~230. The coordinating/managing entity shall obtain from each host Party a letter of authorization of its coordination of the proposed CDM PoA.~~

231. Each project participant shall be authorized to participate in the proposed CDM PoA by at least one Party involved in the proposed PoA.

232. The operators of individual CPAs CPA implementors, who are responsible for the operation of individual CPAs, are not required to be project participants. CDM project participation is only recorded at the PoA level.

~~232_{bis}. Where the methodology applied to the proposed CDM PoA provides for the application of a system, such as an electricity grid, and that the system extends across more than one Party, a letter of approval is required only from the host Party(ies).~~

12.11. Modalities of communications

233. The following Paragraph 233_{bis} shall applies instead of paragraph 80(e) above: For a proposed CDM PoA, the MoC statement shall be signed only by an authorized signatory of the coordinating/managing entity.

233^{bis}. The MoC statement shall be signed only by an authorized signatory of the coordinating/managing entity.

12.12. Validation

234. Paragraphs 235–240 below apply instead of paragraphs 81–85 above.

235. A coordinating/managing entity wishing to submit a CDM PoA to a DOE for validation shall complete a PoA-DD using the latest valid version of the CDM-PoA-DD form applicable to the PoA, taking into account the grace period of the form if it has been revised.

236. Along with the PoA-DD for the proposed CDM PoA, the coordinating/managing entity shall complete the relevant CPA-DDs in accordance with paragraph 199 above, using the latest valid version of the CPA-DD form applicable to the CPAs, and taking into account the grace period of the form if it has been revised.

237. When completing the PoA-DD form and the CPA-DD form, the coordinating/managing entity shall follow the applicable guidelines/instructions for completing the corresponding forms as contained in the forms.

238. When completing a PoA-DD and a CPA-DD, the coordinating/managing entity shall provide all necessary information and documentation to demonstrate the compliance of the proposed CDM PoA and CPA with all applicable requirements in this Standard and other CDM rules and requirements.

239. The coordinating/managing entity and/or project participants shall select a DOE for the validation of the proposed CDM PoA and CPA that is accredited for the validation function and sectoral scopes(s) of the PoA. The coordinating/managing entity and/or project participants shall have a contractual arrangement with the DOE for the validation.

240. The coordinating/managing entity shall submit to the selected DOE for validation the completed PoA-DD, the generic CPA-DD and the completed specific-case CPA-DD.

12.13. Inclusion of component project activities in programme of activities

241. A coordinating/managing entity may include a CPA in a registered CDM PoA at any time during the duration of the PoA provided that the requirements in paragraphs 242–243 below are met.

242. To include a CPA in a registered CDM PoA, the coordinating/managing entity shall ensure that the proposed CPA meets all applicable requirements, including the eligibility criteria for inclusion of a CPA under the PoA specified in the latest version of the registered CDM PoA.

243. The coordinating/managing entity shall then submit to a DOE a completed CPA-DD specific to the proposed CPA demonstrating compliance of the CPA with all applicable requirements.

13. Implementation and monitoring requirements for all project types

13.1. General requirements

244. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall implement the registered CDM project activity **or PoA** in accordance with the description in the registered PDD, **PoA-DD or CPA-DD** including all physical features.
245. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall operate the registered CDM project activity **or PoA** in accordance with the description in the registered PDD, **PoA-DD or CPA-DD**.
246. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall monitor the registered CDM project activity **or PoA** and its GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals in accordance with the monitoring plan as described in the registered PDD, **PoA-DD or CPA-DD** (hereinafter referred to as the registered monitoring plan).
- 246_{bis}. All monitoring, verifications and requests for issuance of CERs in respect of emission reductions and removal enhancements achieved by CDM project activities and PoAs in the second commitment period (from 1 January 2013) shall be calculated using the GWPs as applied by decision 4/CMP.7.**

13.2. General description

247. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall provide the following information regarding the implemented registered CDM project activity **or PoA**:
- (a) Title and number;
 - (b) Project participants involved;
 - (c) Location;
 - (d) Reference of applied methodology(ies), tool(s) and, where applicable, standardized baseline(s);
 - (e) Type, duration and start date of the crediting period;
 - (f) Number and date of the monitoring period.

13.3. Description of implemented registered project activity **or programme of activities**

248. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall provide a description of the implemented registered CDM project activity **or PoA** as follows:
- (a) Description of the installed technology, technical processes and equipments;
 - (b) Information on the implementation and actual operation of the project activity, including relevant dates (e.g. construction, commissioning, **continued—start of operation—periods**, etc.). For project activities that consist of more than one site, project participants shall describe the status of implementation and start date of

operation for each site. For project activities with phased implementation, project participants shall indicate the progress of the project activity achieved in each phase;

(c) Description of:

- (i) The events or situations that occurred during the monitoring period that may impact the applicability of the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline;
- (ii) How the issues resulting from these events or situations have been addressed.

(d) Monitoring information on the sustainable development co-benefits of the registered CDM project activity or PoA

249. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall indicate whether any request for prior approval by the Board of changes to the registered CDM project activity **or PoA** has been submitted, in accordance with the Project cycle procedure, and, if applicable, the date of approval.

13.4. Description of monitoring system

250. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall describe the monitoring system and provide line diagrams (graphical schemes) showing all relevant monitoring points. This description may include data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculations and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, and emergency procedures for the monitoring system.

13.5. Data and parameters

251. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall provide all parameters used to calculate baseline, project, and leakage GHG emissions by sources or GHG removals by sinks as well as other relevant parameters required by the applied methodology, the registered monitoring plan for the monitoring period and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall provide information on how data and parameters have been monitored.
252. For each parameter, project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall:
- (a) Provide the values of the monitored parameter for the purpose of calculating GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals. Where data are measured continuously, they shall be presented using an appropriate time interval (e.g. monthly for a monitoring period of six months or more; weekly if the monitoring period is less than six months; daily if the monitoring period is one month or less). For default values **(such as an IPCC value), where it is ex post confirmed where they are not fixed at validation**, the most recent value shall be applied;

- (b) Describe the equipment used to monitor each parameter, including details on accuracy class, and calibration information (frequency, date of calibration and validity), if applicable as per monitoring plan;
- (c) Describe how the parameters are measured/calculated and the measurement and recording frequency;
- (d) Provide and/or identify the source of data (e.g. logbooks, daily records, surveys, etc.);
- (e) Provide the calculation method of the parameter, where relevant;
- (f) Describe the QA/QC procedures applied (if applicable per monitoring plan);
- (g) Provide information about appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values and any other reference values that have been used in the calculation of GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals.

252_{bis}. If data and parameters monitored are determined by a sampling approach, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall describe how the sampling has been conducted in accordance with the sampling plan in the registered PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD.

253. Project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall indicate whether any request for temporary deviations or permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodology or applied standardized baseline has been submitted, in accordance with the Project cycle procedure, and, if applicable, include the date of approval.
254. For a registered CDM project activity using an approved standardized baseline that standardizes baseline emissions, project participants shall apply, in the first monitoring report of the first crediting period, the version of the applied standardized baseline that contains more conservative standardized value(s)²⁵ of the parameter(s) (e.g. emission factors) between the latest version²⁶ applicable at the first day of the first monitoring period and the latest version applicable at the last day of the first monitoring period.²⁷ In the subsequent monitoring reports for the first crediting period, project participants shall apply:

²⁵ A more conservative value(s) provides lower baseline emissions. However, if a standardized parameter(s) (e.g. the grid emission factors) as an approved standardized baseline is(are) also used for the purpose of determining the project emissions and/or leakage emissions, a more conservative value(s) provides lower emission reductions.

²⁶ The latest version of the applied standardized baseline(s), referred to in paragraphs 254 and 255, does not refer to the previous version(s) that is(are) still valid after a major and/or minor revision(s) in accordance with the "Procedure: Development, revision, clarification and update of standardized baselines" but refers to the latest version only.

²⁷ See EB 70 meeting report, paragraph 45(c). For example, if version 01.0 is the latest version of the applied standardized baseline at the first day of the first monitoring period while version 02.0 is the latest version at the last day of the first monitoring period and contains more conservative values, version 02.0 applies to the first monitoring report. However, if version 01.0 is the latest version both at the first and last days of the first monitoring period, then version 01.0 applies to the first monitoring report.

- (a) The same version as the one applied in the first monitoring report, where the registered CDM project activity applies:
 - (i) An approved constant standardized baseline that standardizes baseline emissions and that does not require an ex post application of the standardized values; or
 - (ii) An approved dynamic standardized baseline²⁸ that standardizes baseline emissions; or
 - (b) The latest version applicable at the first day of each monitoring period, where the registered CDM project activity applies an approved constant standardized baseline that standardizes baseline emissions and that requires an ex post application of the standardized values.²⁹
255. For a registered CDM project activity using an approved standardized baseline that standardizes baseline emissions, if the selected type of crediting period is renewable, project participants shall apply, in the first monitoring report for the second or third crediting period, the version of the applied standardized baseline that contains more conservative standardized value(s) of the parameter(s) (e.g. emission factors) between the latest version applicable on the submission date of the notification of their intention to request a renewal of the crediting period and the latest version applicable on the first day of the first monitoring period in the new crediting period.³⁰ In the subsequent monitoring reports for the second or third crediting period, project participants shall apply:
- (a) The same version as the one applied in the first monitoring report of the respective crediting period, where the registered CDM project activity applies:
 - (i) An approved constant standardized baseline that standardizes baseline emissions and that does not require an ex post application of the standardized values; or
 - (ii) An approved dynamic standardized baseline that standardizes baseline emissions; or
 - (b) The latest version applicable at the first day of each monitoring period, where the registered CDM project activity applies an approved constant standardized baseline that standardizes baseline emissions and that requires an ex post application of the standardized values.

²⁸ See EB70 meeting report, paragraph 45(f). A “constant standardized baseline” refers to a standardized baseline without a dynamic factor(s) such as approved standardized baselines ASB0001, ASB0002, ASB0003 and ASB0004. On the other hand, a “dynamic standardized baseline” refers to a standardized baseline with a dynamic factor(s) (e.g. autonomous improvement factors). For example, one option in the calculation of baseline emissions in the approved methodology AM0070 requires that a specific electricity consumption of a certain class and design of refrigerators be reduced annually by a fixed percentage of autonomous improvement factors. Therefore, a standardized baseline developed using the methodological approach of AM0070 can be a dynamic standardized baseline.

²⁹ This refers to an approved standardized baseline that requires project participants to use the latest standardized value(s) of baseline emission parameter(s) in the latest version of the standardized baseline for the monitoring reports subsequent to the first monitoring report.

³⁰ See EB 70 meeting report, paragraph 45(d).

13.6. Calculation of emission reductions or net removals

256. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall identify the formulae used and provide the calculations of the following for the monitoring period of the registered CDM project activity **or PoA**:

- (a) Baseline GHG emissions or baseline net GHG removals;
- (b) Project GHG emissions or actual net GHG removals;
- (c) Leakage GHG emissions;
- (d) GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals.

256_{bis}. If the monitoring period starts before 31 December 2012 and ends anytime thereafter, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall calculate GHG emission reductions or removals based on the pro-rata approach in the following manner:

- (a) The amount of (raw) emission reductions or removals achieved in the monitoring period for each GHG shall be allocated proportionally to the duration of the period up to 31 December 2012 and the period from 1 January 2013 onwards before multiplying with the GWPs for the respective periods in accordance with paragraph 61_{ter} above;
- (b) If annual caps are applied in the calculation of GHG emission reductions or removals, the annual caps shall be pro-rated to the periods before and after 31 December 2012. In cases where further apportionment is required, the total emission reductions shall be pro-rated.

256_{ter}. If the monitoring report covers the first date of the renewed crediting period, and where there was a delay in the submission of notification of intention of renewal of crediting period, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall determine the first day in which CERs are claimed in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.

257. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall provide a comparison of actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic removal of the registered CDM project activity **or PoA** with estimates in the registered PDD, **PoA-DD or CPA-DD**.

258. For any registered CDM project activity **or PoA**, except A/R project activities, project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall explain the cause of any increase in the actual GHG emission reductions achieved during the current monitoring period (e.g. higher water availability, higher plant load factor, etc.), including all information (i.e. data and/or parameters) that is different from that stated in the registered PDD, **PoA-DD or CPA-DD**.

13.7. Verification of implemented registered project activity **or programme of activities** and monitored emission reductions or net removals

259. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** wishing to report, for verification and certification **by a DOE**, on the GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals of the implemented registered CDM project activity **or PoA** shall prepare a monitoring report for the relevant monitoring period using the latest version of the monitoring report form **(CDM-MR-FORM or CDM-POA-MR-FORM)** applicable to the project activity, taking into account the grace period of the form if it has been revised.

260. When completing a monitoring report form, project participants shall provide all necessary information and documentation to demonstrate compliance of the implemented registered CDM project activity **or PoA** and monitored GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals with all applicable requirements in this Standard and other applicable CDM rules and requirements.
- 261.** When completing a monitoring report form, project participants ~~should~~ **shall** follow the instructions for filling out the monitoring report form (~~CDM-MR-FORM~~) attached to the **CDM-MR-FORM.**
262. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall select a DOE for the verification of the implemented registered CDM project activity **or PoA** and monitored GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals for the relevant monitoring period that is accredited for the verification function and sectoral scope(s) of the project activity. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall have a contractual arrangement with the DOE for the verification.
263. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall submit the completed monitoring report of the implemented registered CDM project activity **or PoA** for the relevant monitoring period, together with supporting documentation, to the selected DOE for **publication and** verification.
- 263_{bis}.** The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity may request the DOE to withdraw the published monitoring report in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.
- 263_{ter}.** The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity may request the DOE to withdraw the request for issuance in accordance with the Project cycle procedure. In this case, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity may prepare a revised monitoring report with reduced or extended monitoring period for publication and verification by the same or different DOE.
264. If the DOE's verification of the **implemented registered CDM project activity's** monitoring report has been selected by the secretariat as a performance assessment under the "Procedure for accrediting operational entities by the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism (CDM)", project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall facilitate access to the project site for the CDM assessment team.

13.8. Post registration changes

13.8.1. General requirements

265. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall identify and document any actual or proposed changes to the operation, implementation and/or monitoring of the registered CDM project activity **or PoA** taking into account the types of changes described in appendix 1, which describes the types of changes that do not require prior approval by the Board.
266. If there is any change regarding the modalities or information in the MoC statement or its annexes after a request for registration has been submitted, project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall revise the MoC statement in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.

267. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall ensure that any DOE referred to in paragraphs 269, 272, 276, 278, ~~and 285~~, **285_{ter}** and **285_{quater}** below is accredited for the validation function and sectoral scope(s) of the registered CDM project activity **or PoA**.

267_{bis}. The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity wishing to submit a request for approval of changes shall prepare a revised PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD (both track-change and clean versions) using the valid version of the applicable PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD form, taking into account the grace period of the form if it has been revised. The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall provide a summary of the changes, including the reasons for the changes and any additional information relating to the changes in PDD.

267_{ter}. Apart from the types of changes described in appendix 1 project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall take account of the types of changes described in sections below, which describe the types of changes that require prior approval by the Board.

13.8.2. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodology or applied standardized baseline

268. If project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** are temporarily unable to monitor the registered CDM project activity **or PoA** in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology or the applied standardized baseline, project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall describe the nature, extent and duration of the non-conforming monitoring and the proposed alternative monitoring of the project activity **or PoA** in the monitoring report.

269. In such cases, project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall either:

- (a) Inform the DOE contracted to perform a verification for the monitoring period during which they were unable to monitor the registered CDM project activity **or PoA** in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology or the applied standardized baseline; or
- (b) Request any DOE at any time prior to the commencement of verification of a monitoring period to assess the proposed alternative monitoring of the project activity **or PoA**.

270. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall apply conservative assumptions or discount factors to the calculations to the extent required to ensure that GHG emission reductions will not be over-estimated as a result of the deviation.

13.8.3. Permanent changes

13.8.3.1. Corrections

271. If project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** make any corrections to project information or parameters fixed at validation as described in the registered PDD, **PoA-DD or CPA-DD**, project participants shall document these corrections in a revised PDD, **PoA-DD or CPA-DD**.

272. In such cases project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall either:

- (a) Inform the DOE contracted to perform a verification regarding the corrections; or
- (b) Request any DOE at any time prior to the commencement of verification to assess the corrections.

13.8.3.2. Changes to the start date of the crediting period

273. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** of a registered CDM project activity **or PoA** may not request any changes to the start date of the crediting period of the project activity or included CPA ~~for which if the start date of the crediting period was prior to the date of registration may not request any changes in the start date of the crediting period.~~

274. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** of a registered CDM project activity **or PoA** may not request any changes to the start date of the crediting period of the project activity or included CPA of more than two years – not more than four years for project activities hosted by a Least Developed Country.

275. Project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** of a registered CDM project activity **or PoA** are not required to request prior approval by the Board for the following changes of the start date of the crediting period, but shall notify the secretariat of the changes in accordance with the Project cycle procedure:

- (a) Bringing forward the start date up to one year earlier than the one indicated in the registered PDD **or included CPA-DD**, taking into account that the start date shall not be earlier than the effective date of registration of the project activity **or inclusion of the CPA**;
- (b) Postponing the start date by up to one year – or by up to two years for project activities hosted by a Least Developed Country – later than the one indicated in the registered PDD **or included CPA-DD**.

276. Where the proposed change of the start date of the crediting period of a registered CDM project activity **or included CPA** constitutes a difference of more than one year but ~~less than up to~~ two years – more than two years but ~~less than up to~~ four years for project activities hosted by a Least Developed Country –, project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall:

- (a) Demonstrate that no changes have occurred to the project activity **or CPA** that would result in a less conservative baseline, and that substantive progress has been made by the project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** to start the project activity **or CPA**;
- (b) Submit this demonstration to a DOE for assessment prior to making a request for approval by the Board in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.

13.8.3.2_{bis} Delay in submission of monitoring plan

276_{bis}. The project participant or the coordinating/managing entity may submit the monitoring plan of a registered CDM project activity, PoA or CPA in accordance with section 7.2.8.1 above.

276^{ter.} If the proposed monitoring plan of a registered CDM project activity, PoA or CPA is submitted for validation at any time prior to the submission of the request for issuance for the first monitoring period, then the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall request any DOE to validate the monitoring plan. The monitoring plan shall be approved by the Board prior to the approval of request for issuance for the project activity or PoA.

276^{quater.} If the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity wish to submit a proposed monitoring plan together with the request for issuance for the first monitoring period, then the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall request the DOE contracted to perform verification for the first monitoring period to also perform validation of the monitoring plan.

13.8.3.3. Permanent changes ~~from to~~ the registered monitoring plan, applied methodology or applied standardized baseline

277. If project participants ~~or the coordinating/managing entity~~ are unable to implement the registered monitoring plan and it will not be possible to monitor the registered CDM project activity in accordance with a monitoring plan that would comply with the applied methodology, any applicable tools and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline, project participants ~~or the coordinating/managing entity~~ shall describe the nature and extent of the non-conforming monitoring in a revised PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD and the proposed alternative monitoring of the project activity (unless the registered PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD already contains this description).

277^{bis.} In case where the proposed changes to the monitoring plan refer to a later version of the applied methodology in the registered PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall justify that ~~all the requirements in the later version of the methodology have been met and~~ that the application of the later version of the applied methodology ~~and tools~~ does not impact the conservativeness of the monitoring and verification process, including the related emission reduction or removal calculations.

278. In such cases, project participants ~~or the coordinating/managing entity~~ shall either:

- (a) ~~Inform the DOE contracted to perform a verification for the monitoring period during which it was identified that the project participants are unable to implement the registered monitoring plan and it will not be possible to monitor the project activity in accordance with a monitoring plan that would comply with the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline; or~~
- (b) Request any DOE at any time prior to the commencement of verification of a monitoring period to assess the proposed alternative monitoring of the project activity ~~or PoA~~.

279. Project participants ~~or the coordinating/managing entity~~ shall apply conservative assumptions or discount factors to the calculations to the extent required to ensure that GHG emission reductions will not be over-estimated as a result of the change.

13.8.3.4. Changes to the project design of a registered project activity or programme design of a registered programme of activities

280. Where there are changes to the project design of a registered CDM project activity, or programme design of a registered PoA or CPA, project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall prepare a revised PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD which describes the nature and extent of the proposed or actual changes, including:

280_{bis}. Changes to a registered CDM project activity may include, but not limited to:

- (a) Changes in the effective output capacity due to increased installed capacity or increased number of units, or installation of units with lower capacity or units with a technology which is less advanced than that described in the PDD;
- (b) Addition of component or extension of technology;
- (c) Removal or addition of one site (or more) of a project activity registered with multiple-sites;
- (d) Actual operational parameters which are within the control of project participants differing from the expected parameters;
- (e) Any consequential changes to the baseline methodology and/or the standardized baseline resulting from subparagraphs (a)–(d) above, including changing or adding another baseline methodology and/or another standardized baseline or applying a baseline scenario that is more appropriate as a result of the proposed or actual modifications to the project activity.

280_{ter}. Changes to a registered CDM PoA shall be limited to:

- (a) Changes to programme boundary to expand geographical coverage or to include additional host Parties;
- (b) ~~Updates~~ The following revisions to the eligibility criteria under the circumstances indicated in the “Standard for demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of multiple methodologies for programme of activities” (e.g. to implement changes decided by the Board if an issue related to environment integrity is identified):
 - (i) If the version of methodologies applied by the PoA is revised or replaced subsequent to being placed on hold;
 - (ii) If the revision of the eligibility criteria of a registered PoA is initiated by the Board at any time during the lifetime of the PoA if an issue related to environmental integrity is identified;
 - (iii) If the use of positive lists is introduced based on the “Guidelines on the demonstration of additionality of small-scale project activities” or the provisions of “Guidelines on demonstrating additionality of microscale project activities”;
- (c) If a PoA includes more than one generic CPA-DD, addition of specific case CPA-DDs corresponding to generic CPA-DDs for which a specific case CPA-DD has not been submitted at the time of request for registration of the PoA;

(d) Removal of methodologies and/or standardized baseline from the registered PoA;

(e) Addition or change of technologies/measures with or without addition or change of applied methodologies in the registered PoA-DD as follows:

(i) Changes that allow a shift to more efficient less GHG-intensive or at least equivalent technologies/measures;^{30bis}

(ii) Changes that introduce complementary measures/technologies involving mass and/or energy transfer to/from the originally registered technology/measure (e.g. addition or change of Type I methodologies in a registered PoA primarily applying Type III methodologies);^{30ter}

280^{quater}. In the cases referred to in paragraph 280^{ter} (e) above, the scope of changes shall not cover adding technologies/measures and methodologies that are not related to the technologies and methodologies included in the originally registered PoA.^{30quater}

281. Project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall report in the revised PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD the impacts of the proposed or actual changes to the registered CDM project activity, PoA or CPA on the following:

(a) The applicability and application of the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline under which the project activity or PoA has been registered;

(b) Compliance of the monitoring plan with the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline;

(c) The level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring of the project activity or PoA;

(d) The additionality of the project activity, PoA or CPA;

(e) The scale of the project activity or CPA

(f) The eligibility criteria of PoA

281^{bis}. If the change to a registered CDM PoA is to include additional host Party in accordance with paragraph 280^{ter} (a) above, the coordinating/managing entity shall provide a specific-case CPA-DD for the additional host Party. In this case, the specific-case CPA-DD may correspond to any generic CPA-DD if the PoA defines more than one generic

^{30bis} Examples of this are shifting to LED lighting from CFL lighting, introducing LED lamps with the Solar Home System (SHS) instead of CFL lamps with the same SHS, shifting from AMS-II.G to AMS-I.E to distribute renewable biomass burning cookstoves instead of efficient cookstoves using non-renewable biomass, introducing institutional cookstoves for a registered household cookstoves PoA, introducing charcoal-burning stoves (fully accounting for production emissions of charcoal) in a registered PoA that distributes household wood-burning stoves.

^{30ter} An example of this is changing the utilization of recovered methane (e.g. from flaring to heat generation, from heat generation to electricity generation). This may involve the addition/change of Type I methodologies to registered PoAs applying Type III waste/wastewater methodologies.

^{30quater} An example of this is a PoA registered for biogas digesters providing biogas for cooking in households intending to implement mass rapid transport technologies; this will not be eligible.

CPA-DD. The coordinating/managing entity shall obtain a letter of approval from each DNA of new host parties in accordance with the requirement in section 7.6.

282. In cases where the proposed or actual changes affect the additionality of the registered CDM project activity, **PoA or CPA**, as referred to in paragraph 281(d) above, the demonstration of the impacts of changes shall be based on all original input data. In addition:³¹
- (a) In the case of investment analysis, project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall only modify the key parameters in the original spread sheet calculations affected by the proposed or actual modifications to the project activity **or PoA**;
 - (b) In cases where only barriers have been claimed to demonstrate additionality, project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall demonstrate that the barriers are still valid under the new circumstances.³²
283. The following applies to a registered CDM project activity using an approved standardized baseline that standardizes additionality instead of paragraph 282 above: In cases where the proposed or actual changes affect the additionality of the registered CDM project activity, as referred to in paragraph 281(d) above, the demonstration of the impacts of changes shall be based on the additionality criteria (e.g. positive lists of technologies) identified in the applied standardized baseline(s).
284. Where project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** cannot demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline under which the CDM project activity **or PoA** has been registered, project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall:
- (a) Revise the PDD, **PoA-DD or CPA-DD** applying:
 - (i) The latest version of the methodology and/or the standardized baseline; or
 - (ii) Another methodology and/or another standardized baseline that is(are) applicable to the project activity **or PoA**; and
 - (b) Demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the selected methodology and/or the selected standardized baseline.
285. In such cases, project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall either:
- (a) Submit the revised PDD, **PoA-DD or CPA-DD**, together with ~~the~~ monitoring report, ~~for verification~~ to the DOE contracted to perform ~~the~~ verification for ~~the~~ monitoring period of the relevant project activity; or

³¹ If a proposed or actual modification adversely impacts the additionality of the project activity, subsequent requests for issuance based on such modifications will be rejected.

³² ~~If a proposed or actual modification adversely impacts the additionality of the project activity, subsequent requests for issuance based on such modifications will be rejected.~~

- (b) Request any DOE at any time prior to the commencement of verification of a monitoring period to validate the revised PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD.

13.9. Renewal of crediting period or programme

286. Project participants wishing to renew the crediting period of a registered CDM project activity or renewal of PoA shall notify the secretariat of their intention in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.

286_{bis} The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall ensure that the names of the project participants included in the request for renewal of crediting period are consistent with the names of the registered project participants for the CDM project activity or PoA.

13.9.1. Renewal of crediting period of project activities

287. To support a request for renewal of crediting period of a registered CDM project activity, the project participants shall, using the valid version of the applicable PDD form, taking into account the grace period of the form if it has been revised, update the sections of the PDD of the project activity relating to the baseline, estimated GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals enhancements and, the monitoring plan and the crediting period using a baseline and monitoring methodology. The project participants are not required to reassess the additionality of the project activity and update the section relating to additionality of the project activity is not to be reassessed. The required updates are as follows:

- (a) Project participants shall use the valid version of the approved methodology applied in the original PDD, i.e. the version, that is valid at the time of the latest version or the previous version if the submission of the revised PDD for the renewal of the crediting period is still within the grace period of the previous version for use;
- (b) If the methodology applied in the original PDD was withdrawn after the registration of the project activity and replaced by a consolidated methodology, project participants shall use the latest valid version of the respective approved consolidated methodology, i.e. the version that is valid at the time of the latest version or the previous version if the submission of the revised PDD for the renewal of the crediting period is still within the grace period of the previous version for use; or
- (c) If the registered project activity does not meet the applicability criteria of the options provided for in subparagraphs (a) or (b) above, due to their revision or due to the update of the baseline, project participants shall either:
 - (i) Select another applicable methodology; or
 - (ii) Request, through the DOE, a deviation from a the valid version of the methodology (including a consolidated methodology thereof) applied in the registered PDD, or from any other selected methodology, for the purpose of the renewal of the crediting period.

288. In updating the PDD of the registered CDM project activity in accordance with paragraph 287 above, project participants shall consider the application of an approved standardized baseline to the project activity as follows:
- (a) Project participants shall use the valid version of an approved standardized baseline if:
 - (i) An approved standardized baseline is applied in the original PDD and the valid version of the standardized baseline is applicable to the project activity and to the methodology applied in accordance with paragraph 287 above; or
 - (ii) An approved standardized baseline is not applied in the original PDD but the valid version of an approved standardized baseline whose selection is mandatory³³ is applicable to the project activity and to the methodology applied in accordance with paragraph 287 above;
 - (b) If the valid version of the standardized baseline applied in the original PDD is no longer applicable to the project activity and/or to the valid version of the methodology applied in the original PDD due to a revision of the standardized baseline after the registration of the project activity, project participants shall:
 - (i) Select another applicable approved standardized baseline; or
 - (ii) Use only the valid version of the methodology that is applied in the original PDD, that is still applicable to the project activity and that can be used independently for estimating emission reductions without using the standardized baseline applied in the original PDD;
 - (c) Project participants may use the valid version of an applicable approved standardized baseline if:
 - (i) An approved standardized baseline is not applied in the original PDD;
 - (ii) The valid version of an approved standardized baseline that standardizes baseline emissions only and does not require mandatory selection is applicable to the project activity and to the methodology applied in accordance with paragraph 287 above;
 - (d) Project participants shall not use an applicable approved standardized baseline if:
 - (i) An approved standardized baseline is not applied in the original PDD;
 - (ii) The valid version of an approved standardized baseline that standardizes additionality and/or the baseline scenario and does not require mandatory selection is applicable to the project activity and to the methodology applied in accordance with paragraph 287 above; or
 - (e) If the updated PDD has been submitted for the notification of the intention to request a renewal of crediting period when no applicable approved standardized baseline was valid, and if after the submission of the updated PDD for the

³³ For an explanation on the standardized baseline whose selection is mandatory, see footnote 4 above.

notification of the intention to request a renewal of crediting period but before the submission of a request for renewal of crediting period, an applicable approved standardized baseline whose selection is mandatory has become valid, the request for renewal of crediting period may be submitted without selecting the standardized baseline within 240 days after the standardized baseline became valid.

289. To demonstrate the validity of the original baseline or its update, project participants are not required to re-assess the baseline scenario. Instead, project participants shall assess the GHG emission reductions that would have resulted from that scenario.
290. Project participants shall assess and incorporate the impact of national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances existing at the time of requesting renewal of the crediting period on the current baseline GHG emissions, without reassessing the baseline scenario.
291. The requirements contained in paragraph 290 above are not applicable to a registered CDM project activity using the valid version of an applicable approved standardized baseline that standardizes the baseline scenario in accordance with paragraph 288 above.
292. Where data and parameters used for determining ~~GHG emission reductions~~ the original baseline that ~~are~~ was determined ex ante (and not monitored during the crediting period) are no longer valid, project participants shall update such data and parameters in accordance with the “Tool to assess the validity of the original/current baseline and to update the baseline at the renewal of a crediting period”.
- ~~292_{bis}. The project participants shall commence the next crediting period on the day immediately after the expiration of the current crediting period.~~
- ~~292_{ter}. The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity wishing to combine a request for approval of any types of changes to the project activity, or PoA or specific case CPA with the request for renewal of the crediting period may submit the request in accordance with Project cycle procedure~~
293. Project participants shall engage a DOE to undertake a validation of the updated PDD of the registered CDM project activity.

13.9.2. Renewal of ~~crediting period of~~ programme of activities

294. To support a request for renewal of ~~the crediting period of~~ a registered CDM PoA, the coordinating/managing entity shall comply with the requirements in paragraphs 287–293 above, with the following exceptions:
- (a) ~~The coordinating/managing entity shall U~~update the eligibility criteria for inclusion of CPAs in the PoA as per the latest applicable version of methodology(ies) and, where applicable, standardized baseline(s) and include them in new versions of PoA-DD and ~~the generic CPA-DD its generic CPA-DD part;~~
- (b) ~~Instead of preparing a revised version of the PDD, t~~The coordinating/managing entity shall prepare an updated PoA-DD including updated generic CPA-DDs;
- ~~(i) — A new completed PoA-DD;~~

~~(ii) A new version of the generic CPA-DD;~~

- (c) If the version of the PoA has been revised in accordance with the Project cycle procedure, because the applied methodology and/or the standardized baseline has(have) been revised or replaced after having been placed on hold or withdrawn, the renewal shall occur seven years (or 20 years for A/R project activities) after the approval of the revised version(s) of the methodology and/or the standardized baseline.
295. The result of the process presented in paragraph 294 above defines a new version of the PoA-DD and ~~the generic CPA-DD its generic CPA-DD part.~~
296. The coordinating/managing entity shall engage a DOE to undertake a validation of the new version of the PoA-DD and the generic CPA-DD.
297. To renew the crediting period of a CPA, the coordinating/managing entity shall submit to a DOE, after having ensured that the CPA meets all requirements ~~in the latest version of the registered PoA-DD and generic CPA-DDs and including eligibility criteria., the completed latest version of the generic~~ updated specific case CPA-DD.

13.9.2_{bis}. Withdrawal of request for renewal of crediting period

297_{bis}. At any time before the adoption of the decision on the request of renewal of crediting period, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity may contact the DOE to withdraw the request for renewal of crediting period.

13.10. Specific requirements for small-scale projects activities

297_{ter} ~~For Type II and Type III small-scale CDM project activities, t~~The project participants shall ensure that the registered proposed small-scale CDM project activity ~~or the sub-bundle of small-scale project activities~~ remains, for every year during the crediting period, within the limit of the type of ~~the small-scale CDM~~ project activity ~~or the sub-bundle~~ defined in paragraph 81 above. If, during its implementation and monitoring, the project activity goes beyond the limit of the type in any year of the crediting period, the GHG emission reductions that can be claimed during this particular year shall be capped at the amount calculated with the limit of the type.

13.11. Specific requirements for programme of activities

13.11.1. Monitoring reports

298. The coordinating/managing entity shall:
- (a) Maintain all monitoring results of all CPAs in accordance with the record keeping system identified in the registered PoA-DD;
 - (b) Prepare, for each monitoring period, either a single monitoring report or ~~two ten~~ separate monitoring reports ~~at the most~~, whereby:
 - (i) In the case of a single monitoring report, the report shall contain all monitoring results of all CPAs included in the PoA;
 - (ii) In the case of ~~two more than one~~ separate monitoring reports, each CPA shall only be included in one of the ~~two~~ monitoring reports and ~~all the two~~

monitoring reports shall together contain all monitoring results of all CPAs included in the PoA (i.e. ~~all the two~~ monitoring reports shall contain ~~two~~ mutually exclusive batches of CPAs)

- (c) Request the issuance of CERs, tCERs or ICERs, through a DOE, as follows:
 - (i) In a single request, if only one monitoring report has been published covering all CPAs except for the case in paragraph 298 (c)(ii) below; or
 - (ii) In ~~two ten~~ separate requests ~~at the most~~, if originally ~~there were less number of monitoring reports published one monitoring report was published~~, but during the course of verification the CME decided to separate the monitoring results into ~~two several~~ monitoring reports. In this case, ~~two the number of the request for issuance shall not be less than the number of monitoring reports published and~~ separate monitoring reports shall be prepared and submitted;
 - (iii) In ~~two ten~~ separate requests ~~at the most~~, with each request correspond to ~~each monitoring report that is if two several separate monitoring reports are prepared by the CME;~~
- (d) Separate the monitoring results of individual CPAs and group the monitoring results by CPA type defined by the relevant generic CPA-DD;
- (e) Make available the monitoring report and all monitoring results requested by a DOE for verification purposes.

13.11.2. Changes in programme of activities

~~299. The coordinating/managing entity may request changes to the registered PoA and/or the CPAs of the registered PoA under the conditions specified by the Project cycle procedure. In such cases coordinating/managing entity shall prepare the required documentation in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.~~

13.11.3. Changes of coordinating/managing entity

- 300. If the coordinating/managing entity of a registered CDM PoA changes after the registration of the PoA, the new coordinating/managing entity shall:
 - (a) Obtain a new letter of authorization from each host Party stating the change and confirming the authorization of coordination of the new coordinating/managing entity of the PoA;
 - (b) Provide a confirmation that the registered PoA will be developed and implemented with the same framework as described in the registered PoA-DD;
 - (c) Demonstrate compliance with requirements related to the operational and management arrangements described in paragraph 200 above;
- 301. The new coordinating/managing entity shall submit the documentation referred to in paragraph 300 above to a DOE for validation.

13.11.4. Inclusion of component project activities in programme of activities

302. The coordinating/managing entity may include a CPA in a registered CDM PoA at any time during the duration of the PoA provided that the requirements in paragraphs 242–243 above are met.
303. To include a CPA in a registered CDM PoA, the coordinating/managing entity shall ensure that the proposed CPA meets all applicable requirements, including the eligibility criteria for inclusion of a CPA under the PoA specified in the latest version of the registered CDM PoA.
304. The coordinating/managing entity shall then submit to a DOE a completed CPA-DD specific to the proposed CPA demonstrating compliance of the CPA with all applicable requirements.

13.12. De- registration of registered CDM project activity and exclusion of component project activities from/in programme of activities

305. At any time after the registration of a CDM project activity or inclusion of a CPA, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity may request the secretariat to de-register the project activity or exclude CPA in a registered PoA in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.
306. The coordinating/managing entity shall not re-include an excluded CPA in the registered CDM PoA.

13.13. Re- registration of de-registered CDM project activity and re-inclusion of excluded component project activities

[Option 1]

305. The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity may directly request to the secretariat to re-register the project activity or re-include the excluded CPA in accordance with the Project cycle procedure if:
- (a) The crediting period is fixed in the de-registered PDD or excluded CPA-DD; or
 - (b) The crediting period is renewable in the de-registered PDD or excluded CPA-DD and the project participants wish to re-register the project activity or the coordinating/managing entity wish to re-include the CPA within the same crediting period as when the project activity had been de-registered or the CPA had been excluded from the registered PoA.
306. The project participants shall update the PDD of the de-registered CDM project activity and the coordinating/managing entity shall update the CPA-DD of excluded CPA in accordance with section 13.9.1 above mutatis mutandis and submit to a DOE for validation for the cases not referred to in paragraph 305 above.
307. In updating the PDD, the project participants and the coordinating/managing entity shall not change the type of crediting period from the one determined in the initially registered PDD or CPA-DD.
308. For both cases referred to in paragraphs 305 and 306 above, the project participants shall obtain from the DNAs of all Parties involved in the project activity a written

statement confirming that the DNAs have no objection to the re-registration of the project activity.

309. The project participants and the coordinating/managing entity shall confirm that the proposed CDM project activity or CPA is not a CPA that has been excluded from a registered CDM PoA as a result of erroneous inclusion of the CPA.

[Option 2]

305. The project participants and the coordinating/managing entity wishing to re-register a de-registered CDM project activity or re-include an excluded CPA shall update the PDD or CPA-DD in accordance with section 13.9.1 above mutatis mutandis.

306. The project participants shall not change the type of crediting period from the one determined in the initially registered PDD. If the renewable crediting period type had been chosen in the initially registered PDD, the new crediting period of maximum seven years (maximum 20 years for A/R project activities) shall start at the time of re-registration.

307. The project participants shall obtain from the DNAs of all Parties involved in the project activity a written statement confirming that the DNAs have no objection to the re-registration of the project activity.

308. The project participants shall submit the updated PDD to a DOE for validation in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.

309. The project participants and the coordinating/managing entity shall confirm that the proposed CDM project activity or CPA is not a CPA that has been excluded from a registered CDM PoA as a result of erroneous inclusion of the CPA.

Appendix 1. Changes that do not require prior approval by the board

1. Corrections

1. Any corrections to project information¹ of a registered CDM project activity **or PoA** that do not affect the design of the project activity **or the PoA** do not require prior approval by the Board.

2. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodology or applied standardized baseline

2. If project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** have temporarily not monitored parameters related to baseline GHG emissions or are unable to produce evidence related to such monitoring, prior approval by the Board is not required if project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** report these parameters as zero.
3. If project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** have temporarily not monitored parameters related to project GHG emissions or are unable to produce evidence related to such monitoring, prior approval by the Board is not required if project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** estimate these parameters assuming that the source of the GHG emissions operated at maximum capacity for the full period of the missing data. In the case of project GHG emissions related to the consumption of electricity, the estimate shall include an addition of 10% to account for transmission and distribution losses.

3. Permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodology or applied standardized baseline

4. If the monitoring equipment actually installed has a lower accuracy level than the one stipulated in the applied methodology, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline and/or the registered monitoring plan, and the monitoring equipment is under the control of the project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity**, prior approval by the Board is not required if project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** adjust the value measured with the equipment as follows:
 - (a) If the parameter is used for calculating baseline GHG emissions, the difference between the accuracy level of the installed monitoring equipment and the accuracy prescribed by the applied methodology, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline and/or the registered monitoring plan is deducted from the measured value;²

¹ Such corrections may include typographical errors, location, names and numbers of components, etc.

² For example, if the accuracy level required by the monitoring plan is 0.2s and the accuracy level of the installed equipment is 0.5s, the measured value shall be adjusted as follows: adjusted value = measured value - measured value * 0.003.

- (b) If the parameter is used for calculating project GHG emissions, the difference between the accuracy level of the installed monitoring equipment and the accuracy prescribed by the applied methodology, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline and/or the registered monitoring plan is added to the measured value.³
5. Changes to the monitoring of the registered CDM project activity **or PoA** of a type listed below do not require prior approval by the Board:
- (a) Change of calibration frequency or practice for monitoring equipment not within the control of project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity**;
 - (b) Change of accuracy/type/model of meter(s) as per a power purchase agreement (PPA); or
 - (c) Change of location of meter(s) as per a power purchase agreement (PPA);
 - (d) Change of location of electricity meters if the transmission loss is taken into account;
 - (e) Change of location of substation not within the control of the project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity**;
 - (f) Change of calibration frequency or practice for monitoring equipment as per the applied methodology or national standard; or
 - (g) Change of frequency of monitoring certain parameters as per the applied methodology.
4. **Changes to the project design of a registered project activity **or programme design of a registered programme of activities****
6. Proposed or actual changes to the project design of a registered CDM project activity that do not adversely impact any of the following do not require prior approval by the Board:
- (a) The applicability and application of the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline under which the project activity has been registered;
 - (b) The additionality of the project activity;
 - (c) The scale of the project activity.

6_{bis} For PoAs, the use of a positive list for demonstrating additionality based on the latest approved version of the "Guidelines on the demonstration of additionality of small-scale project activities" or the "Guidelines on demonstrating additionality of microscale project activities" does not require prior approval.

³ For example, if the accuracy level required by the monitoring plan is 0.2s and the accuracy level of the installed equipment is 0.5s, the measured value shall be adjusted as follows: adjusted value = measured value + measured value * 0.003.

5. Types of changes specific to afforestation or reforestation project activities

7. Types of changes listed in the “Guidelines on accounting of specified types of changes in A/R CDM project activities from the description in registered project design document” do not require prior approval by the Board.

Document information

Version	Date	Description
08.0	11 November 2014	<p>Published within annex 9 to the annotated agenda of EB 81.</p> <p>Revision includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elaboration of rules for cases where various changes have occurred after the publication of the PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation; • Introduction of requirements for requesting withdrawal of published monitoring report; • Streamlined requirements for withdrawal and resubmission of request for issuance; • Introduction of requirements for combining the submission of post-registration changes and request for renewal of crediting period; • Addition of types of post-registration changes that do not require prior approval by the Board; • Requirements for requesting de-registration and re-registration process for project activities; • Changed requirements for global and local stakeholder consultation; • Incorporating critical information regarding the description of technologies and measures in the PDD guidelines; • Introduction of voluntary monitoring of sustainable development co-benefits; • Allowing the delayed validation of monitoring plan; • Introduction of requirements for voluntary exclusion and re-inclusion of CPAs; • Changes to the rules on PoAs (more flexible batched issuance requests, increased number of specific case CPAs that may be submitted at the time of request for registration or post-registration change).
07.0	1 June 2014	<p>EB 79, Annex 3</p> <p>The document title changed from “<i>Clean development mechanism project standard</i>” to “<i>CDM project standard</i>”. Revision also includes provisions on standardized baselines and batched issuance requests for a PoA.</p>
06.0	11 April 2014	Revision to incorporate the amendment to the requirements for carbon dioxide capture and storage in CDM-EB78-A03.
05.0	4 October 2013	<p>Revision to incorporate the amendment to the requirements for programme of activities in CDM-EB75-A04 which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To enable two issuance requests for the same monitoring period.
04.0	29 July 2013	<p>Revision to incorporate the amendment in CDM-EB74-A03 which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration of clarification in paragraph 48(a) of the meeting report of the seventy-third meeting of the Board;

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration of clarification CDM-EB73-A16-CLAR; • An option for proposing changes to CPAs of a registered PoA.
03.0	12 April 2013	Revision to paragraphs 24 and 25 to align with relevant provisions in the “Procedure: Development, revision and clarification of baseline and monitoring methodologies and methodological tools” (CDM-EB70-A36-PROC) to allow project participants to, through a DOE or directly, submit to the secretariat a request for revision or a request for clarification for any type of methodologies or methodological tools.
02.1	3 December 2012	Updated to include footnote numbers 18 and 19 and editorial changes to paragraphs 144(b) and 163(b) and footnote 15.
02.0	23 November 2012	EB 70, Annex 2 Revision to reflect revised requirements for PoAs.
01.0	25 November 2011	EB 65, Annex 5 Initial adoption. This document, along with the “Clean development mechanism validation and verification standard” and the “Clean development mechanism project cycle procedure”, supersedes and replaces the following documents on the date when these three documents above enter into force: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clean development mechanism validation and verification manual (version 01.2) • Procedures for requesting post-registration changes to the start date of the crediting period (version 02.0) • Procedures for modalities of communication between project participants and the Executive Board (version 01.0) • Procedures for registration of a programme of activities as a single CDM project activity and issuance of certified emission reductions for a programme of activities (version 04.1) • Procedures for renewal of the crediting period of a registered CDM project activity (version 06.0) • Procedures for notifying and requesting approval of changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD (version 01.0) • Procedures for revising monitoring plans in accordance with paragraph 57 of the modalities and procedures for the CDM (version 02.0) • Guidelines on the demonstration and assessment of prior consideration of the CDM (version 04.0) • Guidance related to monitoring requirements (EB23, paragraph 24) • Guidance related to project activity with more than one

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
		<p>component (EB28, paragraph 57)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance on application of the definition of the project boundary to A/R CDM project activities (version 01.0) • Guidance on A/R CDM project activities starting after 1 January 2000 (prompt start) (EB 21, paragraph 64) • Guidance on programme of activities (PoA) (EB35, paragraph 15) • Guidelines on assessment of different types of changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD (version 01.0) • Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements (version 01.0) • Clarification on elements of a written approval (version 01.0) • Clarifications on the consideration of national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances in baseline scenarios (version 02.0) • Clarifications on the treatment of national and/or sectoral policies and regulations (paragraph 45 (e) of the CDM Modalities and Procedures) in determining a baseline scenario (version 01.0) • Clarifications relating to bundling of small-scale CDM project activities (EB 20, paragraphs 60-62) • Clarification on demonstration of the eligibility of land (applicable for both large- and small-scale A/R CDM project activities) (EB 38, paragraph 28) • National and/or sectoral policies and circumstances in the baseline scenario for afforestation and reforestation project activities (EB23, annex 19) • Clarification regarding the “Procedures for registration of a programme of activities as a single CDM project activity and issuance of certified emission reductions for a programme of activities (version 01.0) • Clarifications on procedures and documentation which need to be used for the renewal of a crediting period (EB 20, annex 7)
<p>Decision Class: Regulatory Document Type: Standard Business Function: Issuance, Registration Keywords: programme of activities, project activities, requirements for programme of activities, requirements for project activities, standardized baselines</p>		

Appendix 3. Draft Standard. CDM validation and verification standard (version 07.008.0)

CDM-EB81-AA-A09

Revision of CDM project standard, validation and verification standard, and project cycle procedure

Version 04.0

CDM-EB81-AA-A09

Standard

CDM validation and verification standard

Version 08.0



United Nations
Framework Convention on
Climate Change

TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	128
1.1. Background.....	128
1.2. Objectives	128
2. SCOPE, APPLICABILITY AND ENTRY INTO FORCE	129
2.1. General.....	129
2.2. Application	129
2.3. Entry into force.....	129
3. NORMATIVE REFERENCES	129
4. TERMS AND DEFINITIONS	129
5. PRINCIPLES FOR VALIDATION AND VERIFICATION	130
5.1. Independence	130
5.2. Ethical conduct	130
5.3. Fair presentation.....	130
5.4. Due professional care	131
6. GENERAL VALIDATION AND VERIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.....	131
6.1. Sampling.....	132
6.1.1. Application of sampling to validation and verification work.....	132
7. GENERAL VALIDATION REQUIREMENTS ON REGISTRATION OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMME OF ACTIVITIES	132
7.1. Objectives of CDM validation.....	132
7.2. Validation approach	132
7.3. Means of validation	133
7.3.1.-bis. Standard auditing techniques.....	133
7.3.1. Corrective action requests, clarification requests, and forward action requests.....	133
7.4. General reporting requirement.....	134
7.5. Global stakeholder consultation.....	134
7.6. Approval.....	136
7.7. Authorization.....	138

7.8.	Contribution to sustainable development	138
7.9.	Modalities of communications	139
7.9.1.	General	139
7.9.2.	Modalities of communication statement	140
7.10.	Project or programme design document	140
7.11.	Description of project activity or programme of activities	140
7.12.	Application of selected baseline and monitoring methodology and selected standardized baseline	141
7.12.1.	General	141
7.12.2.	Applicability of selected baseline and monitoring methodology and selected standardized baseline to the project activity	142
7.12.3.	Deviation from an approved methodology	143
7.12.4.	Clarification on the applicability of an approved methodology, and an approved tool and/or standardized baseline	144
7.12.5.	Project boundary	145
7.12.6.	Establishment and description of B baseline scenario identification and description	145
7.12.7.	Algorithms and/or formulae used to determine emission reductions	148
7.12.8.	Demonstration of A additionality of a project activity	149
7.12.8 _{bis} .	Algorithms and/or formulae used to determine eEmission reductions	157
7.12.9.	Monitoring plan	159
7.12_{bis}.	Duration and crediting period	160
7.13.	Environmental impacts	161
7.14.	Local stakeholder consultation	161
7.15.	Validation status and outcomes, opinion and report	163
7.15.1.	Validation status and outcomes	163
7.15.2.	Validation opinion	163
7.15.3.	Validation report	164
8.	SPECIFIC VALIDATION REQUIREMENTS ON REGISTRATION OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMME OF ACTIVITIES	166
8.1.	Small-scale project activities	166

8.1.1.	Project activity type and eligibility	166
8.1.1_{bis}.	Bundling of project activity	167
8.1.2.	Debundling for project activity	168
8.1.3.	Demonstration of A additionality	168
8.1.4.	Environmental impacts	169
8.2.	Afforestation or reforestation project activities	169
8.2.1.	Project boundary	170
8.2.2.	Selection of carbon pools	170
8.2.3.	Eligibility of land	171
8.2.4.	Addressing non-permanence	171
8.2.5.	Timing of management activities, including harvesting cycles, and verifications	172
8.2.5_{bis}.	Establishment and description of baseline scenario	172
8.2.5_{ter}.	Emission reductions	172
8.2.6.	Socio-economic and environmental impacts	173
8.3.	Small-scale afforestation or reforestation project activities	173
8.4.	Carbon dioxide capture and storage project activities	174
8.4.1.	Participation requirements	174
8.4.2.	Selection and characterization of the geological storage site	175
8.4.3.	Risk and safety assessment	175
8.4.4.	Environmental and socioeconomic impact assessment	176
8.4.5.	Liability	177
8.4.6.	Requirements for financial provision	178
8.4.7.	Monitoring	179
8.4.8.	Project boundary	180
8.4.9.	Approval and authorization	181
8.5.	Programme of activities/ Component project activities	181
8.5.1_{ter}.	General	181
8.5.1_{bis}.	Description of programme of activities	182
8.5.1.	Coordinating/managing entity and participants in a PoA Management system	182

8.5.1 _{bis} .	Description of component project activities	183
8.5.2.	Component project activities design document.....	183
8.5.3.	Description of programme of activities and component project activities	183
8.5.3 _{bis} .	Eligibility criteria	183
8.5.3 _{ter} .	Application of selected baseline and monitoring methodologies and selected standardized baseline.....	184
8.5.4.	Application of multiple methodologies	184
8.5.5.	Boundary for programme of activities in terms of geographical area	184
8.5.6.	Start date of component project activity	184
8.5.7.	Prior consideration of the clean development mechanism.....	185
8.5.8.	Demonstration of additionality of programme of activities as a whole.....	185
8.5.9.	Eligibility criteria for inclusion of component project activities in programme of activities	185
8.5.10.	Crediting period of a PoA/CPA Duration and crediting period of programme of activities	185
8.5.11.	Monitoring plan for a PoA/CPA	186
8.5.12.	Environmental impacts analysis of a PoA	186
8.5.13.	Local stakeholder consultation.....	186
8.5.14.	Determination of occurrences of debundling under of small-scale component project activities programme of activities	187
8.5.15.	Inclusion or renewal of a crediting period of component project activities in programme of activities	187
8_{Bis}.	GENERAL VALIDATION REQUIREMENTS ON POST-REGISTRATION ACTIVITIES	187
8 _{bis} .1.	General	187
8 _{bis} .2.	Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, monitoring methodology or standardized baseline	189
8 _{bis} .3.	Corrections	190
8 _{bis} .4.	Changes to the start date of the crediting period	190
8 _{bis} .5.	Inclusion of a monitoring plan to a registered project activity and programme of activities	191
8 _{bis} .6.	Permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan, monitoring methodology or standardized baseline	191

8 _{bis} .7.	Changes to the project design of a registered project activity or programme design of a registered programme of activities	192
8_{TER}.	SPECIFIC VALIDATION REQUIREMENTS ON POST-REGISTRATION ACTIVITIES	196
8 _{ter} .1.	Afforestation and reforestation project activities	196
8 _{ter} .1.1.	Types of changes specific to afforestation or reforestation project activities	196
8 _{ter} .2.	Programme of activities	196
8 _{ter} .2.1.	Changes to programme design of programme of activities	196
8 _{ter} .2.2.	Changes to project design of generic component project activities or specific-case component project activities	198
8 _{ter} .2.3.	Inclusion or renewal of a crediting period of component project activities in programme of activities	199
8 _{ter} .2.4.	Changes to modalities of communication	199
9.	GENERAL VERIFICATION REQUIREMENTS	200
9.1.	Objective of CDM verification	200
9.2.	General v Verification approach	200
9.2.1 _{bis} .	General	200
9.2.1.	Quality of evidence	202
9.2.1 _{bis} .	Application of materiality	202
9.3.	Means of verification	205
9.3.1 _{bis} .	Standard auditing techniques	205
9.3.1.	Clarification requests, corrective action requests and forward action requests	206
9.4.	Verification of compliance	207
9.4.1 _{bis} .	Compliance of the monitoring report with the monitoring report form	208
9.4.1.	Compliance of the project or programme implementation with the registered project or programme design document	208
9.4.2.	Compliance of the registered monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s) and the standardized baseline	209
9.4.3.	Compliance of monitoring activities with the registered monitoring plan	210
9.4.4.	Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments	211

9.4.5.	Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions or net removals	212
9.5.	Post-registration changes	214
9.5.1.-bis.	General	214
9.5.1.	Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, monitoring methodology or standardized baseline	214
9.5.2.	Corrections	215
9.5.3.	Changes to the start date of the crediting period	216
9.5.4.	Permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan, monitoring methodology or standardized baseline	216
9.5.5.	Changes to the project design of a registered project activity	217
9.5.5-bis.	Types of changes specific to afforestation or reforestation project activities	220
9.6.	Verification status and verification report and certification report	220
9.6.1.-bis.	Verification status	220
9.6.1.	Verification and certification report	220
9.6.2.	Certification report	222
10.	SPECIFIC VERIFICATION REQUIREMENTS	223
10.1.-bis.	Small-scale project activities	223
10.1.	Afforestation or reforestation project activities	223
10.2.	Carbon dioxide capture and storage project activities	223
10.2.1.-bis.	General	223
10.2.1.	Request for issuance of certified emission reductions	224
10.3.	Programme of activities	225
10.3.1.-bis.	Changes to modalities of communication	225
10.3.1.	Post registration changes to programme of activities	225
10.3.2.	Request for issuance of certified emission reductions for a PoA	227
10.3.3.	Review of erroneous inclusion of component project activities	228
11.	GENERAL VALIDATION REQUIREMENTS ON RENEWAL OF CREDITING PERIOD OR RENEWAL OF PROGRAMME OF ACTIVITIES	228
12.	SPECIFIC VALIDATION REQUIREMENTS ON RENEWAL OF CREDITING PERIOD OR RENEWAL OF PROGRAMME OF ACTIVITIES	232

12.1.	Specific validation requirements for eCarbon dioxide capture and storage project activities	232
12.2.	Renewal of a crediting period of CPAs under a registered PoA Specific validation requirements for pProgramme of activities	233
12.2.1.	Renewal of programme of activities	233
12.2.2.	Renewal of crediting period of component project activities	233
13.	GENERAL VALIDATION REQUIREMENTS ON RE-REGISTRATION AND RE-INCLUSION	233
	[Option 1]	233
	[Option 2]	235
APPENDIX 1.	CALIBRATION	237

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

1. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (hereinafter referred to as the CMP), at its first session, established the basis of the regulatory framework for the clean development mechanism (hereinafter referred to as the CDM) to implement Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol through the following:
 - (a) Annex to decision 3/CMP.1: Modalities and procedures for a clean development mechanism;
 - (b) Annexes to decision 4/CMP.1, including annex II: Simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale clean development mechanism project activities;
 - (c) Annex to decision 5/CMP.1: Modalities and procedures for afforestation and reforestation project activities under the clean development mechanism;
 - (d) Annex to decision 6/CMP.1: Simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale afforestation and reforestation project activities under the clean development mechanism;
 - (e) Decision 7/CMP.1;
 - (f) Decision 10/CMP.7: Modalities and procedures for carbon dioxide capture and storage in geological formations as clean development mechanism project activities.
2. The CMP revised some of the provisions in these decisions through new decisions in subsequent sessions.
3. Pursuant to its mandate from the CMP to operationalize the CDM, the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism (hereinafter referred to as the Board) has adopted various standards (including methodologies, tools and standardized baselines), procedures, guidelines, clarifications and forms and revised them with a view to improving the CDM process.
4. At its fifty-ninth meeting, the Board adopted the “CDM management plan 2011”, whose objective 3(b) is: “Clarification, consolidation and enhancement of the consistencies of all the existing regulatory decisions of the board that relate to validation and verification of project activities.” One deliverable under this objective is to “develop a validation and verification standard for Designated Operational Entities”.

1.2. Objectives

5. The objectives of the “CDM validation and verification standard” (hereinafter referred to as this Standard) are to:
 - (a) Enhance consistency and clarity of minimum requirements for all types of CDM validation and verification activities;
 - (b) Improve the quality and consistency in the preparation, execution, and the reporting of validation and verification activities;

- (c) Enhance the overall efficiency and integrity in the CDM.

2. Scope, applicability and entry into force

2.1. General

6. This Standard is applicable to designated operational entities (DOEs) that are under contractual arrangements with project participants or coordinating/managing entities to validate and/or verify any CDM project activities or programmes of activities (PoAs) based on CDM requirements previously approved by the Board.

2.2. Application

7. Principles in chapter 5 and requirements in chapters 6, 7, and 8_{bis}, 9, 11 and 13 below apply to any type of CDM project activities and as applicable, to CDM PoAs. In addition, requirements in chapters 8, and 8_{ter}, 10 and 12 below specifically apply to small-scale (SSC) CDM project activities, large-scale afforestation/reforestation (A/R) CDM project activities, small-scale A/R CDM project activities, carbon dioxide capture and storage (CCS) CDM project activities and PoAs, where applicable.

~~8. The document information section at the end of this Standard lists all documents that are superseded by this Standard, the “CDM project standard” and the “CDM project cycle procedure”.~~

2.3. Entry into force

9. Version 08~~7~~.0 of this Standard enters into force on 25 June 2014-01 April 2015.

3. Normative references

10. The following referenced documents are indispensable for the application of this Standard:
- (a) “CDM accreditation standard”;
 - (b) “CDM project cycle procedure” (hereinafter referred to as the Project cycle procedure);
 - (c) “CDM project standard” (hereinafter referred to as the Project standard);
 - (d) “Glossary of CDM terms”.

4. Terms and definitions

11. In addition to the definitions contained in the Glossary of CDM terms, the following terms apply in this Standard:
- (a) “Shall” is used to indicate requirements to be followed;
 - (b) “Should” is used to indicate that among several possibilities, one course of action is recommended as particularly suitable;
 - (c) “May” is used to indicate what is permitted;

- (d) “Standardized baseline that standardizes additionality” is a standardized baseline established for a Party or a group of Parties to facilitate the determination of additionality (e.g. by providing a positive list of technologies, fuel or feedstock) for CDM project activities or PoAs, while providing assistance for assuring environmental integrity;
- (e) “Standardized baseline that standardizes baseline scenario” is a standardized baseline established for a Party or a group of Parties to facilitate the determination of the baseline scenario (e.g. by providing a description of the baseline scenario) for CDM project activities or PoAs, while providing assistance for assuring environmental integrity;
- (f) “Standardized baseline that standardizes baseline emissions” is a standardized baseline established for a Party or a group of Parties to facilitate the calculation of one or several sources of baseline emissions (e.g. by providing standardized values of parameters such as emission factors) for CDM project activities or PoAs, while providing assistance for assuring environmental integrity.

5. Principles for validation and verification

- 12. The following principles¹ guide the preparation, execution, and reporting of validation and verification activities.

5.1. Independence

- 13. Remain independent of the activity being validated or verified, and free from bias and conflict of interest. Maintain objectivity throughout the validation or verification to ensure that the findings and conclusions will be based on objective evidence generated during the validation or verification.

5.2. Ethical conduct

- 14. Demonstrate ethical conduct through trust, integrity, confidentiality and discretion throughout the validation or verification process.

5.3. Fair presentation

- 15. Reflect truthfully and accurately validation or verification activities, findings, conclusions and reports. Report significant obstacles encountered during the validation or verification process, as well as unresolved, diverging opinions among validators or verifiers, the responsible party (e.g. the secretariat/the Board) and the client (e.g. project participants).

¹ This text is taken from ISO 14064-3:2006 - Greenhouse gases - Part 3: Specification with guidance for the validation and verification of greenhouse gas assertions and is reproduced with the permission of the International Organization for Standardization, ISO. This Standard can be obtained from any ISO member from the website of the ISO Central Secretariat at the following address: www.iso.org. Copyright remains with ISO.

5.4. Due professional care

16. Exercise due professional care and judgment in accordance with the importance of the task performed and the confidence placed by clients and intended users. Have the necessary skills and competences to undertake the validation or verification.

6. General validation and verification requirements

17. The DOE shall select a competent team to perform the validation and verification of the CDM project activity, **PoA or component project activity (CPA)**.
18. In carrying out its validation and verification work, the DOE shall:
- (a) Follow this Standard and integrate its provisions into the DOE's own quality management systems;
 - (b) Apply the most recent decisions and guidance provided by the Board;
 - (c) Determine whether each CDM project activity, **PoA or CPA** meets all applicable CDM requirements, including those specified in the Project standard, relevant methodologies, tools, standardized baselines and guidelines;
 - (d) Assess the accuracy, conservativeness, relevance, completeness, consistency, and transparency of the information provided by project participants, **or the coordinating/managing entity**;²
 - (e) Determine whether information provided by the project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** is reliable and credible;³
 - (f) Apply consistent validation/verification criteria:
 - (i) To the requirements of the applicable approved methodology and, where applicable, the applicable approved standardized baseline throughout the crediting period(s);
 - (ii) Among CDM project activities **or PoAs** with similar characteristics such as a similar application of the approved methodology, the approved standardized baseline, use of technology, time period or region;
 - (iii) To expert judgments, over time and among CDM project activities, **PoAs or CPAs**.
 - (g) Base its findings and conclusions on objective evidence and conduct all validation and verification activities in accordance with CDM rules and procedures;
 - (h) Not omit evidence that is likely to alter the validation and verification opinion;

² Principles for each can be found in the Project standard.

³ Information is credible if it is authentic and is able to inspire belief or trust, and the willingness of persons to accept the quality of evidence. Information is reliable if the quality of evidence is accurate and credible and able to yield the same results on a repeated basis.

- (i) Present information in the validation and verification **and certification** reports in a factual, neutral and coherent manner and document all assumptions, provide references to background material, and identify changes made to documentation;
- (j) Safeguard the confidentiality of all information obtained or created during validation or verification.

6.1. Sampling

6.1.1. Application of sampling to validation and verification work

~~19. Where the DOE applies sampling as a part of its validation and verification activities, the DOE shall sample in accordance with the “Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities”.~~

7. General validation requirements on registration of project activities and programme of activities

7.1. Objectives of CDM validation

~~20. The DOE shall conduct a thorough and independent assessment of proposed CDM project activities or PoA and ~~or~~ CPA against the applicable CDM rules and requirements.~~

7.2. Validation approach

21. In carrying out its validation work, the DOE shall:

- (a) Determine whether the proposed CDM project activity ~~or PoA and ~~or~~ CPA~~ comply with the requirements of paragraph 37 of the CDM M&Ps (with the exception of paragraph 37 (c) for CCS CDM project activities), the applicability conditions of the selected methodology, and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline, and guidance issued by the Board;
- (b) Assess the claims and assumptions in the project design document (PDD) ~~or programme of activities design document (PoA-DD) and ~~or~~ component project activity design document (CPA-DD)~~. The evidence used in this assessment shall not be limited to that provided by the project participants ~~or the coordinating/managing entity~~.

~~21_{bis}. The DOE shall make publicly available the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD received from the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.~~

~~21_{ter}. The DOE shall request the secretariat to withdraw the published PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD in accordance with the Project cycle procedure, if the project participants or the coordinating/ managing entity requested the DOE to withdraw the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD before the submission of a request for registration of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA.~~

7.3. Means of validation

7.3.1^{-bis}. Standard auditing techniques

22. The DOE shall assess the information provided by the project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity**.
23. In assessing information, the DOE shall apply the means of validation specified throughout this Standard and where appropriate standard auditing techniques, including, but not limited to:
 - (a) Document review, involving:
 - (i) A review of data and information;
 - (ii) Cross checks between information provided in the PDD **or PoA-DD and of CPA-DD** and information from sources other than those used, if available, the DOE's sectoral or local expertise and, if necessary, independent background investigations;
 - (b) Follow-up actions (e.g. on-site inspection and telephone or email interviews), including:
 - (i) Interviews with relevant stakeholders in the host country, personnel with knowledge of the project design and implementation;
 - (ii) Cross checks between information provided by interviewed personnel (i.e. by checking sources or other interviews) to ensure that no relevant information has been omitted;
 - (c) Reference to available information relating to projects or technologies similar to the proposed CDM project activity **or PoA and of CPA** under validation;
 - (d) Review, based on the selected methodology and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline, of the appropriateness of formulae and accuracy of calculations.
 - (e) Sampling approach in accordance with the "Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities", including:**
 - (i) A random sampling for cases where the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity did not apply a sampling approach;**
 - (ii) An acceptance sampling or another sampling approach for cases where the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity applied a sampling approach.**
24. Where no specific means of validation is specified, the DOE shall apply the standard auditing techniques described in paragraph 23 above.

7.3.1. Corrective action requests, clarification requests, and forward action requests

25. During the validation of a proposed CDM project activity **or PoA and of CPA**, if the DOE identifies issues that require further elaboration, research or expansion in order to determine whether the project activity **or PoA and of CPA** meet the CDM requirements,

- and can achieve credible emission reductions, the DOE shall ensure that these issues are accurately identified, formulated, discussed and concluded in the validation report.
26. The DOE shall raise a corrective action request (CAR) if one of the following situations occurs:
 - (a) The project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** have made mistakes that will influence the ability of the proposed CDM project activity, **PoA or CPA** to achieve real, measurable, verifiable and additional emission reductions;
 - (b) The applicable CDM requirements have not been met;
 - (c) There is a risk that emission reductions cannot be monitored or calculated.
 27. The DOE shall raise a clarification request (CL) if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable CDM requirements have been met.
 28. The DOE shall raise a forward action request (FAR) during validation to identify issues related to project implementation that require review during the first verification of the proposed CDM project activity, **PoA or CPA**. The DOE shall not raise a FAR that relates to the CDM requirements for registration.
 29. The DOE shall resolve or “close out” CARs and CLs only if the project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** modify the project design, rectify the PDD, **PoA-DD or CPA-DD**, or provide additional explanations or evidence that satisfy the DOE’s concerns. If this is not done, the DOE shall not recommend the proposed CDM project activity **or PoA or CPA** for registration **and CPA for inclusion**.
 30. The DOE shall report on all CARs, CLs and FARs in its validation report. This reporting shall explain the issues raised, the responses provided by the project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity**, the means of validation of such responses and references to any resulting changes in the PDD, **PoA-DD or CPA-DD** or supporting annexes.

7.4. General reporting requirement

- ~~31. The DOE shall report the results of its assessment in a validation report.~~
- ~~32. The validation report shall include a positive validation opinion only if the proposed project activity complies with the applicable CDM requirements.~~
- ~~33. The DOE shall submit this validation report, along with the supporting documents, to the Board as part of the request for registration of a project activity as a proposed project activity.~~
- ~~34. If the validation report includes a negative validation opinion, the DOE shall provide the project participants with the report and inform the Board of the outcome.~~

7.5. Global stakeholder consultation

Validation requirement

- ~~34^{bis}. The DOE shall determine whether authentic and relevant comments in the global stakeholder consultation were taken due account in the PDD of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA-DD and CPA-DD of the proposed CDM PoA and CPA.~~

Means of validation

35. The DOE shall acknowledge receipt of ~~and take into account~~ all submitted comments on the PDD of the proposed CDM project activity ~~or on the PoA-DD and CPA-DD of the proposed CDM PoA and CPA.~~
- 35^{bis}. In case of doubt, the DOE shall determine the authenticity of the name and contact details of the individual or organization on whose behalf the comments are submitted.
- 35^{ter}. Once the DOE has determined which submitted comments are authentic, it shall contact the secretariat to make them publicly available.
- 35^{quater}. The DOE shall determine if the authentic comments are relevant to the following defined scope of comments;
- (a) The comment discusses issues specific to the proposed CDM project activity or PoA and/or CPA;
 - (b) The comment provides objective and verifiable information;
 - (c) The comment discusses issues only on additionality, sustainable development benefits and/or any impact on environment and local communities.
36. The DOE shall take ~~into due account of~~ all the comments ~~received during the validation of the proposed project activity.~~ that the DOE determined to be authentic and relevant in accordance with paragraph 35^{bis} and 35^{quater} above.
37. If comments indicate that the proposed CDM project activity ~~or PoA~~ **and/or CPA** does not comply with the CDM requirements and are not substantiated, then the DOE shall request ~~further a~~ clarification from the entity providing the comment. ~~However, the DOE is not required to enter into a dialogue with Parties, stakeholders or NGOs, that comment on the CDM requirements.~~ Upon receiving the clarification, the DOE shall determine whether or not further clarification request is required. If no additional information or substantiation is provided ~~in response to a request for clarification~~ within 14 days of the request for clarification, the DOE shall proceed to assess the comments as originally provided.
- 37^{bis}. The DOE shall determine whether changes to the PDD or PoA-DD ~~and/or CPA-DD~~ have been made after the publication of the PDD or PoA-DD ~~and CPA-DD~~ for global stakeholder consultation.
- 37^{ter}. ~~Any~~ DOE shall make the revised PDD or PoA-DD ~~and CPA-DD~~ publicly available for global stakeholder consultation in accordance with the Project cycle procedure if the DOE determines that:
- (a) All the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity that have a contractual relationship with the DOE have been replaced;
 - (b) ~~The environmental impact assessment or the national or local environmental permissions obtained for the project activity or PoA are no longer valid due to the changes~~ **Significant changes have been made to the project or programme design; or**

- (c) The approved baseline and monitoring methodology, the approved standardized baseline and/or the combination thereof applied in the PDD or PoA-DD has changed, unless, for the PoA-DD, the change only involves the removal and no addition of approved baseline and monitoring methodologies and/or approved standardized baseline and the removal of the approved baseline and monitoring methodologies and/or approved standardized baseline does not affect the physical design of and the end-use services provided by the CDM CPAs that apply the methodologies and, where applicable, the standardized baselines that remain (i.e. the methodologies and, where applicable, the standardized baselines that were not removed).

37^{quater}. If the DOE determines that changes have been made to the project or programme design, the DOE, in accordance with the Project cycle procedure, may seek a guidance from the Board on whether the changes are considered as significant to the extent that requires the global stakeholder consultation of the revised PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD in accordance with paragraph 37^{ter} (b) above.

Reporting requirement

38. The DOE shall report the details of the actions taken to:

- (a) Authenticate information on the submitters of the comments in case of doubt;
- (b) Determine the relevance of the authentic comments to the defined scope of comments;
- (c) Take due account of the authentic and relevant comments received during the validation process including the dates of the receipt, responses by the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity and responses by the DOE.

38^{bis}. If the DOE identifies changes to the PDD or PoA-DD and/or CPA-DD after the publication of the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, the DOE shall state its opinion on whether the publication of the revised PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD for global stakeholder consultation is necessary in accordance with paragraph 37^{ter} above.

7.6. Approval

Validation requirement

39. The DOE shall determine whether the designated national authority (DNA) of each Party indicated as being involved in the proposed CDM project activity or PoA in the PDD or PoA-DD has provided a written letter of approval.

Means of validation

40. The DOE shall determine whether each letter confirms that:

- (a) The Party is a Party to the Kyoto Protocol;
- (b) Participation is voluntary;
- (c) In the case of the host Party, the proposed CDM project activity or PoA contributes to the sustainable development of the country;

- (d) It refers to the precise **title of the** proposed CDM project activity-**title or PoA** in the PDD **or PoA-DD** being submitted for registration **(i.e. No difference shall be found between the title in the letter and that in the PDD or PoA-DD).**
41. The DOE shall determine whether the letter(s) of approval is unconditional with respect to 40 (a) to (d) above.
- 41^{bis}. The DOE shall determine whether the letter(s) of approval indicate(s) that a proposed CDM project activity or a proposed bundled **small-scale** CDM project activity has only one host Party, in which the project activity is located, as set out in the PDD.
42. The DOE shall determine whether the letter(s) of approval has been issued by the respective Party's DNA and is valid for the proposed CDM project activity **or PoA** under validation.⁴
43. If the DOE doubts the authenticity of the letter of approval, the DOE shall verify with the DNA that the letter of approval is authentic.

Reporting requirement

44. The DOE shall, for each Party involved:
- (a) Indicate whether a letter of approval has been received, referencing the letter itself and any supporting documentation;
 - (b) Indicate whether the DOE received this letter from the project participants **or coordinating/managing entity** or directly from the DNA;
 - (c) Indicate the means of validation employed to assess the authenticity if paragraph 43 above applies;
 - (d) Include a statement as to whether the letters are in accordance with paragraphs 40–43 above.
45. If a letter of approval refers to a specific version of the validation report and the DOE therefore is unable to submit this precise version of the validation report, the DOE shall select one of the following options:
- (a) Insert a statement in the validation report to indicate that the final letter of approval has not been received and that a request for registration will not be submitted until it has been received; or
 - (b) Update the validation report to reflect the receipt of the letter of approval. If this option is selected, the validation report major number shall remain unchanged and the minor number shall be increased. The DOE shall confirm in the validation report that this is the only change that has been made to the version referred to in the letter of approval.

⁴ A list of DNAs is available on the UNFCCC CDM website.

7.7. Authorization

Validation requirement

46. The DOE shall determine whether each project participant of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA has been authorized by at least one Party involved in a letter of approval.

- 46^{bis}. The DOE shall determine whether the coordinating/managing entity has been authorized by each host Party.

Means of validation

47. The DOE shall confirm that the project participants of the proposed CDM project activity or the coordinating/managing entity and project participants of the proposed CDM PoA are listed in tabular form in the PDD or PoA-DD and that this information is consistent with the information provided in the section that contains the contact information for project participants.
48. The DOE shall confirm that no entities other than those authorized as project participants of the proposed CDM project activity or the coordinating/managing entity and project participants of the proposed CDM PoA are included in these sections of the PDD or PoA-DD.
49. The DOE shall confirm that the approval of participation has been issued from the relevant DNA and if in doubt shall verify with the DNA that the approval of participation is valid for the proposed CDM project participants of the proposed CDM project activity or the coordinating/managing entity and project participants of the proposed CDM PoA.

Reporting requirement

50. The validation report shall, for each project participant of the proposed CDM project activity or for the coordinating/managing entity and each project participant of the proposed CDM PoA:
- (a) Indicate whether the participation has been authorized by a Party to the Kyoto Protocol;
 - (b) Describe the means of validation employed to support the conclusions.

7.8. Contribution to sustainable development

Validation requirement

51. The DOE shall confirm that the DNA has considered whether the proposed CDM project activity or PoA assists the host Party in achieving sustainable development.

Means of validation

52. The DOE shall determine whether the letter of approval by the DNA of the host Party confirms the contribution of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA to the sustainable development of the host Party.

Reporting requirement

53. The DOE shall state whether the host Party's DNA has confirmed the contribution of the proposed CDM project activity **or PoA** to the sustainable development of the host Party. This may be reported together with the DOE's assessment of the validity of the host Party's approval.

7.9. Modalities of communications**7.9.1. General*****Validation requirement***

54. The DOE shall validate the corporate identity of all project participants and focal points included in the Modalities of Communication (MoC) statement, as well as the personal identities, including specimen signatures and employment status, of their authorized signatories.

Means of validation

55. The DOE shall validate paragraph 54 above through:
- (a) Directly checking evidence for corporate, personal identity and other relevant documentation;
 - (b) Notarized documentation; or
 - (c) Written confirmation from the project participant or the coordinating/managing entity that submits to it the MoC statement that all corporate and personal details, including specimen signatures, are valid and accurate.
56. When the DOE validates identity by applying paragraph 55 (c) above, the DOE shall ensure that the MoC statement is received from a project participant with whom the DOE has a contractual relationship. For CDM PoAs, the DOE shall ensure that the MoC statement is received from the coordinating/managing entity.
57. When the DOE validates identity by applying paragraph 55 (c) above, the DOE shall ensure that the official who submits the MoC statement to the DOE and the official who signed the written confirmation (if a different person) is/are duly authorized to do so on behalf of the respective project participant or coordinating/managing entity.
58. If the DOE is unable to validate the requirements by applying paragraph 55 (a), (b) or (c) above then the DOE may perform further validation activities in order to confirm that the corporate and personal details, employment status and specimen signatures included in the MoC statement are valid and accurate and comply with the requirements of this section.

Reporting requirement

59. The DOE shall confirm in writing that it has performed due diligence on the MoC statement in accordance with the requirements established in this standard.

7.9.2. Modalities of communication statement***Validation requirement***

60. The DOE shall validate that the MoC statement has been correctly completed and duly authorized.

Means of validation

61. The DOE shall check that:
- (a) The **latest-valid** version of the form “Modalities of Communication statement” (F-CDM-MOC) has been used;
 - (b) The information required as per the F-CDM-MOC, including its annex 1, is correctly completed;
 - (c) The project participant’s authorized signatories signing the F-CDM-MOC correspond to the project participant’s authorized signatories included in F-CDM-MOC, annex 1.

Reporting requirement

62. The DOE shall confirm in writing that the MoC statement complies with all relevant forms and requirements.

7.10. Project **or programme design document*****Validation requirement***

63. The DOE shall determine whether the PDD **or** PoA-DD **and or** CPA-DD was **(were)** completed using the **latest-valid** version of the PDD **or** PoA-DD **and or** CPA-DD form appropriate to the type of the proposed CDM project activity **or** PoA **and or** CPA.

Reporting requirement

64. The DOE shall provide a statement regarding the compliance of the PDD **or** PoA-DD **and or** CPA-DD with relevant forms and **instructions therein guidance**.

7.11. Description of project activity **or programme of activities*****Validation requirement***

65. The DOE shall determine whether the description of the proposed CDM project **activity in the PDD or PoA and or CPA** in the **PDD PoA-DD and or CPA-DD** is accurate, complete, and provides an understanding of the proposed CDM project activity **or PoA and or CPA**.

Means of validation

66. Unless other means are specified in the methodology, the DOE shall conduct an on-site inspection for the following proposed CDM project activities **or CPAs** in the existing facilities or utilizing the existing equipment:
- (a) Proposed large-scale CDM project activities **or CPAs**;

- (b) Non-bundled proposed small-scale CDM project activities or **proposed small-scale CDM CPAs** with emission reductions exceeding 15,000 tonnes per year;
 - (c) Bundled proposed small-scale CDM project activities, each with emission reductions not exceeding 15,000 tonnes per year; in such cases the number of on-site inspections may, however, be based on sampling, if the sampling size is justified through statistical analysis in accordance with the “Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities”.
67. For other individual proposed small-scale CDM project activities **or CPAs** with emission reductions not exceeding 15,000 tonnes per year, the DOE should conduct an on-site inspection as appropriate. For proposed CDM project activities **or CPAs** for which the DOE does not undertake an on-site inspection this shall be justified. The DOE may apply a sampling approach in accordance with the “Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities”.
68. For all other proposed CDM project activities **or CPAs** not referred to in paragraphs 66–67, the DOE shall undertake the validation of project description by reviewing available designs and feasibility studies and should conduct comparison analysis with equivalent projects, as appropriate.
69. If the proposed CDM project activity **or CPA** involves the alteration of an existing installation or process, the DOE shall ensure that the project description states the differences resulting from the project activity **or CPA** compared to the pre-project situation.
- 69^{bis}.** The DOE shall confirm that the proposed CDM project activity or CPA is not a CPA that has been excluded from a registered CDM PoA as a result of erroneous inclusion of CPAs.^{4bis}

Reporting requirement

70. The DOE shall:
- (a) Describe the process undertaken to validate the accuracy and completeness of the project **or programme** description;
 - (b) Provide an opinion on the accuracy and completeness of the project **or programme** description;
 - (c) Provide a justification if it has not conducted an on-site inspection.

7.12. Application of selected baseline and monitoring methodology and selected standardized baseline

7.12.1. General

71. The DOE shall determine whether the baseline and monitoring methodologies and, where applicable, the standardized baseline selected by the project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** are the valid versions of those approved by the Board.

^{4bis} Erroneous inclusion of a CDM CPA into a PoA registered as a single CDM project activity (PoA) means that the CPA does not meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion as specified in the PoA-DD.

72. The DOE shall apply specific guidance and/or clarifications provided by the Board with respect to the approved methodology, any applicable tools, and/or the approved standardized baseline that is(are) selected by the project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity**.
73. The DOE shall determine whether the selected methodology and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline applies (apply) to the proposed CDM project activity **or PoA or CPA** and was correctly applied with respect to the following:
- (a) Project boundary;
 - (b) Baseline identification;
 - (c) Algorithms and/or formulae used to determine emission reductions;
 - (d) Additionality;
 - (e) Monitoring methodology.

7.12.2. Applicability of ~~selected baseline and monitoring~~ methodology and ~~selected standardized baseline to the project activity~~

Validation requirement

74. The DOE shall validate that the selected baseline and monitoring methodology and, where applicable, the standardized baseline is(are) applicable to the proposed CDM project activity **or PoA and CPA** and that the selected version(s) is(are) valid at the time of submission of the proposed CDM project activity **or PoA CPA** for registration.

Means of validation

75. The DOE shall determine whether the methodology and, where applicable, the standardized baseline is(are) correctly quoted and applied by comparing it(them) with the actual text of the **applicable valid** version of the methodology and, where applicable, of the standardized baseline,⁵ and relevant requirements in the Project standard and any other applicable standard or guideline.
76. If the PDD of a proposed project activity **or PoA-DD and CPA-DD** of **PoA and CPA** are based on a previous version(s) of a methodology and, where applicable, a standardized baseline and was(were) published for global stakeholder consultation but was(were) not submitted for registration within the grace period, the DOE shall request the project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** to provide a revised PDD **or PoA-DD and CPA-DD** in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.
77. The DOE shall request the project participants to provide a revised PDD **or PoA-DD and CPA-DD** in accordance with the Project cycle procedure if:
- (a) The PDD or PoA-DD **and CPA-DD** has been published for global stakeholder consultation when no applicable approved standardized baseline was valid;

⁵ An approved methodology and, where applicable, an approved standardized baseline applies to the proposed CDM project activity **or CPA** if the applicability conditions of the methodology and, where applicable, the standardized baseline are met.

- (b) An applicable approved standardized baseline whose selection is mandatory has become valid after the publication of the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD for global stakeholder consultation but before the submission of a request for registration of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA;
 - (c) The request for registration has not been submitted within 240 days after the standardized baseline became valid.
78. The DOE shall determine whether the proposed CDM project activity or PoA and CPA meet each of the applicability conditions of the approved methodology, any tool, other methodology component referred to therein and, where applicable, the approved standardized baseline. This shall be done by validating the documentation referred to in the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD and by verifying that the documentation content is correctly quoted and interpreted in the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD. If the DOE, based on local and sectoral knowledge, is aware that comparable information is available from credible sources other than that used in the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD, then the DOE shall cross-check the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD against other sources to confirm that the project activity or PoA and CPA meet the applicability conditions of the methodology and, where applicable, the standardized baseline.

Reporting requirement

79. For each applicability condition listed in the selected methodology and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline, the DOE shall describe the steps taken to assess the relevant information contained in the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD against these criteria. The DOE shall provide a validation opinion regarding the applicability of the selected methodology to the proposed CDM project activity or PoA and CPA.

7.12.3. Deviation from an approved methodology

80. The DOE may seek guidance from the Board on the acceptability of a deviation prior to the submission of a request for registration or publication of the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD of the proposed CDM project activity, if the DOE, when performing validation for a proposed CDM project activity or PoA, or upon request from the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity before the publication of the PDD or PoA-DD and

CPA-DD, finds that, due to a project- ~~or programme~~-specific⁶ issue implying that a revision of the methodology would not be required to address the issue, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity deviated from:

- (a) An approved baseline and monitoring methodology; or
 - (b) A section (or sections) in the selected methodology that is(are) not standardized by the selected standardized baseline, if the proposed CDM project activity ~~or PoA~~ uses an approved standardized baseline.
81. The DOE shall submit to the Board an assessment of the case including demonstration that the deviation does not require revision of an approved methodology, and shall include a description of the impact of the deviation on the emission reductions from the proposed CDM project activity ~~or PoA in accordance with the Project cycle procedure~~.
82. Alternatively, if the DOE considers that a revision of the methodology would be required to address the project ~~or programme~~ situation then the DOE shall request the project participants ~~or the coordinating/managing entity~~ to submit a request for revision in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.

7.12.4. Clarification on ~~the~~ applicability of ~~an approved~~ methodology, ~~and an approved tool~~ and/or standardized baseline

83. If the DOE cannot make a determination regarding the applicability of the selected methodology, ~~or the approved tool~~ and/or the selected standardized baseline to the proposed CDM project activity ~~or PoA~~, then the DOE shall request clarification of the methodology, ~~the tool~~ and/or the standardized baseline ~~in accordance with the Project cycle procedure~~. The DOE shall conduct an assessment to ensure that the request is not submitted with the intention of revising an approved methodology, ~~an approved tool~~ and/or an approved standardized baseline to expand its applicability.

⁶ Examples of project- ~~or programme~~-specific issues ~~may~~ include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. The methodology requires measurements using instrumentation of certain specifications or using a certain method. The project ~~proponents~~-participants ~~or the coordinating/managing entity~~ of the proposed CDM project activity ~~or PoA~~ identify a difficulty in acquiring the specified instrumentation or difficulty in implementing the measurement method; however, they can achieve comparable accuracy of measured parameters using an alternative instrumentation or measurement method;
2. A proposed CDM project activity ~~or CPA PoA~~ does not have access to the data sources specified by the methodology for a certain parameter; a different source of data can be accessed by the project activity ~~or CPA PoA~~ to estimate the parameter with equal reliability and accuracy;
3. A minor deviation is sought for a project- ~~or programme~~-specific situation, which is well-justified and conservative. For example: a methodology requires limiting production in the project scenario between +/- 5% of rated capacity, if the historical baseline is to be applied. Due to government restrictions, ~~the project proponents~~ the plant has never been operated ~~the plant~~ at its rated capacity but at a capacity which is much below its rated capacity (20% below the rated capacity). A deviation can be presented specifying conservative approaches to calculate emission reduction in such a project- ~~or programme~~-specific case;
4. A conservative estimation technique or default factor suggested addressing uncertainties related to project- ~~or programme~~-specific situations, which are not addressed in the methodology. For example, a well-justified conservative uncertainty factor proposed to be used in equations of baseline emissions to address uncertainties in the real-life situation during the crediting period.

7.12.5. Project boundary***Validation requirement***

84. The DOE shall determine whether all main GHG emission sources, the physical delineation of the proposed project activity **or PoA and CPA**, and other relevant project and baseline emission sources covered in the selected methodology and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline are included within the project boundary for the purpose of calculating project and baseline emissions for the proposed CDM project activity **or CPA**.

Means of validation

85. The DOE shall confirm the project boundary based on documented evidence and shall corroborate it by an on-site inspection where required.
86. If the methodology allows the project participants **or coordinating/managing entity** to choose whether a source or gas is to be included within the project boundary, the DOE shall determine whether the project participants **or coordinating/managing entity** have justified that choice. The DOE shall determine whether the justification provided is reasonable, based on an assessment of supporting documented evidence provided by the project participants **or coordinating/managing entity** and corroborated by observations if required.
87. For the proposed CDM project activities **or CPAs** that have both A/R and non-A/R components, in order to avoid double counting of emission sources, the DOE shall confirm that the emissions associated with the A/R activity will be accounted for and documented by the A/R CDM project activity **or CPAs**.

Reporting requirement

88. The DOE shall describe how the validation of the project boundary has been performed, by detailing the documentation assessed (e.g. a commissioning report) and by describing its observations during any on-site inspection undertaken (i.e. observations of the physical site or equipment used in the process).
89. The DOE shall state whether the identified boundary and the selected sources and gases are justified for the proposed CDM project activity **or PoA and CPA**. Should the DOE identify emission sources that will be affected by the implementation of the project activity **or CPA** and which are expected to contribute more than 1% of the overall expected average annual emissions reductions, and are not addressed by the selected methodology and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline, the DOE shall request clarification of, revision to, or deviation from the methodology and, where applicable, the standardized baseline, as appropriate.

7.12.6. Establishment and description of baseline scenario identification—and description***Validation requirement***

90. The DOE shall determine whether the baseline identified for the proposed CDM project activity **or PoA and CPA** is the scenario that reasonably represents the anthropogenic

emissions by sources of GHGs that would occur in the absence of the project activity **or PoA and CPA**.

91. The following applies to a proposed CDM project activity **or generic CPA and specific-case CPA** using an approved standardized baseline that standardizes the baseline scenario instead of paragraph 90 above: The DOE shall determine whether the baseline scenario for the proposed CDM project activity **or generic CPA and specific-case CPA** described in the PDD **or PoA-DD and CPA-DD** is the scenario identified by the selected standardized baseline.

Means of validation

92. The DOE shall determine whether any procedure contained in the methodology to identify the most reasonable baseline scenario has been correctly applied. If the selected methodology requires the use of tools (such as the “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality” and the “Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality”) to establish the baseline scenario, the DOE shall consult the methodology on the application of these tools. In such cases, the specific guidance in the methodology shall supersede the corresponding requirements of the tool.
93. If the methodology requires several alternative scenarios to be considered in the identification of the most plausible baseline scenario, the DOE shall, based on financial expertise and local and sectoral knowledge, determine whether all scenarios that are considered by the project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** and any scenarios that are supplementary to those required by the methodology, are realistic and credible in the context of the proposed CDM project activity **or PoA and CPA** and that no alternative scenario has been excluded.
94. The DOE shall determine whether the most plausible baseline scenario identified is reasonable by validating the assumptions, calculations and rationales used in the PDD **or PoA-DD and CPA-DD**. It shall determine whether documents and sources referred to in the **PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD** are correctly quoted and interpreted. The DOE shall cross-check the information provided in the PDD **or PoA-DD and CPA-DD** with other verifiable and credible sources, such as local expert opinion, if available.
95. The DOE shall determine whether the PDD **or PoA-DD and CPA-DD** provide a description of the identified baseline scenario, including a description of the technology that would be employed and/or the activities that would take place in the absence of the proposed CDM project activity **or PoA and CPA**.
96. The DOE shall determine whether, drawing on its knowledge of the sector and/or advice from local experts, that all applicable CDM requirements have been taken into account in the identification of the baseline scenario for the proposed CDM project activity **or PoA and CPA**, as well as relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances, such as sectoral reform initiatives, local fuel availability, power sector expansion plans, and the economic situation in the project sector. Two (2) types of national and/or sectoral policies have to be taken into account:
- (a) National and/or sectoral policies or regulations that give comparative advantages to more emissions-intensive technologies or fuels over less emissions-intensive technologies or fuels, otherwise known as policies that increase GHG emissions, and are called type E+. For this type of national and/or sectoral policies or

regulations, only those that have been implemented before adoption of the Kyoto Protocol by the COP (decision 1/CP.3, 11 December 1997) shall be taken into account when identifying a baseline scenario. If such national and/or sectoral policies were implemented since the adoption of the Kyoto Protocol, the baseline scenario shall refer to a hypothetical situation without the national and/or sectoral policies or regulations being in place;

- (b) National and/or sectoral policies or regulations that give comparative advantages to less emissions-intensive technologies over more emissions-intensive technologies (e.g. public subsidies to promote the diffusion of renewable energy or to finance energy efficiency programmes), otherwise known as policies that decrease GHG emissions, are called type E-. For this type of national and/or sectoral policies or regulations, those that have been implemented since the adoption by the COP of the CDM M&P (decision 17/CP.7, 11 November 2001) need not be taken into account in identifying a baseline scenario (i.e. the baseline scenario could refer to a hypothetical situation without the national and/or sectoral policies or regulations being in place).
97. The following applies to a proposed CDM project activity **or generic CPA and specific-case CPA** using an approved standardized baseline that standardizes the baseline scenario instead of paragraphs 92–96 above: The DOE shall determine whether the description of the identified baseline scenario in the PDD **or PoA-DD and CPA-DD** is in accordance with the selected standardized baseline.

Reporting requirement

98. The DOE shall describe the steps taken to assess the requirements and provide an opinion as to whether:
- (a) All the assumptions and data used by the project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** are listed in the PDD **or PoA-DD and CPA-DD**, including their references and sources;
 - (b) All documentation used is relevant for establishing the baseline scenario and correctly quoted and interpreted in the PDD **or PoA-DD and CPA-DD**;
 - (c) Assumptions and data used in the identification of the baseline scenario are justified appropriately, supported by evidence and can be deemed reasonable;
 - (d) Relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances are considered and listed in the PDD **or PoA-DD and CPA-DD**;
 - (e) The approved baseline methodology has been correctly applied to identify the most plausible baseline scenario and the identified baseline scenario reasonably represents what would occur in the absence of the proposed CDM project activity **or PoA and CPA**.
99. The DOE shall describe other steps taken and sources of information used to cross-check the information contained in the PDD **or PoA-DD and CPA-DD**.
100. The following applies to a proposed CDM project activity **or generic CPA and specific-case CPA** using an approved standardized baseline that standardizes the baseline scenario instead of paragraphs 98 and 99 above: The DOE shall provide an opinion as

to whether the description of the identified baseline scenario in the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD is in accordance with the selected standardized baseline.

7.12.7. Algorithms and/or formulae used to determine emission reductions

7.12.7.1. Validation requirement

101. The DOE shall determine whether the steps taken and the equations and parameters applied in the PDD to calculate project emissions, baseline emissions, leakage and emission reductions comply with the requirements of the selected methodology, including applicable tool(s) and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline.

7.12.7.2. Means of validation

102. Where the methodology and, where applicable, the standardized baseline allows for selection between options for equations or parameters, the DOE shall determine whether adequate justification has been provided (based on the choice of the baseline scenario, context of the proposed project activity and other evidence provided) and that the correct equations and parameters have been used, in accordance with the selected methodology⁷ including applicable tool(s) and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline.

103. The DOE shall verify the justification given in the PDD for the choice of data and parameters used in the equations. If data and parameters will not be monitored throughout the crediting period of the proposed project activity but have already been determined and will remain fixed throughout the crediting period, the DOE shall determine whether all data sources and assumptions are appropriate and calculations are correct as applicable to the proposed project activity, and will result in an accurate or otherwise conservative estimate of the emission reductions. If data and parameters will be monitored or estimated on implementation and hence become available only after validation of the project activity, the DOE shall determine whether the estimates provided in the PDD for these data and parameters are reasonable.

7.12.7.3. Reporting requirement

104. The DOE shall describe the steps taken to assess the requirements and provide an opinion as to whether:

- (a) All assumptions and data used by the project participants are listed in the PDD, including their references and sources;
- (b) All documentation used by project participants as the basis for assumptions and source of data is correctly quoted and interpreted in the PDD;
- (c) All values used in the PDD are considered reasonable in the context of the proposed project activity;

⁷ For project activities that have both A/R and non A/R components, in order to avoid double counting of emission sources, the emissions associated with A/R activity shall be accounted for and clearly documented by the A/R CDM project activity (see EB 25 report paragraphs 38 and 48).

~~(d) The baseline methodology, any applicable tool(s) and, where applicable, the standardized baseline have been applied correctly to calculate project emissions, baseline emissions, leakage and emission reductions;~~

~~(e) All estimates of the baseline emissions can be replicated using the data and parameter values provided in the PDD.~~

~~105. The DOE shall describe how it has verified the data and parameters used in the equations, including references to any other data sources used.~~

7.12.8. Demonstration of Additionality of a project activity

7.12.8.1. General

Validation requirement

106. The DOE shall determine whether the proposed CDM project activity is additional as demonstrated in the PDD⁸.

Means of validation

107. The DOE shall assess and verify the reliability and credibility of all data, rationales, assumptions, justifications and documentation provided by the project participants to support the demonstration of additionality. This requires the DOE to critically assess the evidence presented, using local knowledge and sectoral and financial expertise.
108. If required by the applicable approved methodology, the DOE shall consider tools and guidelines provided by the Board to demonstrate the additionality of proposed CDM project activities. The DOE shall also consider specific complementary or alternative requirements included in the methodology for demonstrating the additionality of the proposed CDM project activity.
109. The following applies to a proposed CDM project activity using an approved standardized baseline that standardizes additionality instead of paragraphs 107 and 108 above and 124–137 below: The DOE shall assess whether the proposed CDM project activity meets the additionality criteria (e.g. positive lists of technologies) in the selected standardized baseline.

⁸ In accordance with decision 3/CMP.1, annex, paragraph 43, “A CDM project activity is additional if anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases by sources are reduced below those that would have occurred in the absence of the registered CDM project activity.” Note that for proposed A/R CDM project activities, “An afforestation or reforestation project activity under the CDM is additional if the actual net greenhouse gas removals by sinks are increased above the sum of the changes in carbon stocks in the carbon pools within the project boundary that would have occurred in the absence of the registered CDM afforestation or reforestation project activity” (see decision 5/CMP.1, annex, paragraph 18). While specific elements of the assessment of additionality are discussed in further detail below, not all elements discussed below will be applicable to all proposed CDM project activities.

Reporting requirement

110. The DOE shall describe all steps taken, and sources of information used to cross-check the information contained in the PDD. The DOE shall describe how it has determined that the evidence assessed is credible, where appropriate.

7.12.8.2. Assessment Demonstration of prior consideration of the clean development mechanism

Validation requirement

111. The DOE shall determine whether CDM benefits were considered necessary in the decision to undertake the project as a proposed CDM project activity if the starting date of the proposed CDM project activity is prior to the start of validation, which is the date of publication of the PDD for global stakeholder consultation.

Means of validation

112. The DOE shall determine whether the start date of the proposed CDM project activity, reported in the PDD, is the earliest date at which either the implementation or construction or real action of a project activity begins.⁹ For project activities that require construction, retrofit or other modifications, the date of commissioning cannot be considered the project activity start date. The DOE shall determine whether it is a project activity with a start date:
- (a) On or after 2 August 2008; or
 - (b) Before 2 August 2008.
113. For a proposed CDM project activity with a start date on or after 2 August 2008, for which a PDD has not been published for global stakeholder consultation ~~or a new methodology has not been proposed to the Board~~ before the project activity start date, the DOE shall confirm by referring to the list of prior consideration notifications from the UNFCCC website and communication between the project ~~proponent participants~~, the secretariat and the host Party DNA, ~~if the DNA exists~~, regarding the commencement of a new project activity.¹⁰ ~~If such notification has not been provided by the project participants within 180 days of the project activity start date in accordance with the Project cycle procedure~~, the DOE shall determine that the CDM was not seriously considered in the decision to implement the project activity.
114. For a proposed CDM project activity with a start date before 2 August 2008, for which the start date is prior to the date of publication of the PDD for global stakeholder consultation, the DOE shall assess the project participant's prior consideration of the CDM. Specifically, the DOE shall assess whether the project participants:
- (a) Had an awareness of the CDM prior to the project activity start date, and that the benefits of the CDM were a decisive factor in the decision to proceed with the project. Evidence to support this could include, inter alia, minutes and/or notes

⁹ See the "Glossary of CDM terms" for additional information related to the start dates of other types of proposed CDM project activities and PoAs.

¹⁰ See EB 48, annex 62, "Prior consideration of the CDM form".

related to the consideration of the decision by the Board of Directors, or equivalent, of the project participants, to undertake the project as a proposed CDM project activity;

(b) Demonstrated that real and continuing actions were taken to secure CDM status for the project in parallel with its implementation in accordance with relevant provisions related to the supporting evidence in the Project standard. Evidence to support this could include one or more of the following: contracts with consultants for CDM/PDD/methodology/standardized baseline services, draft versions of PDDs and underlying documents such as letters of authorization, and if available, letter of intent, emission reduction purchase agreements (ERPA) term sheets, ERPAs or other documentation related to the potential sale of the certified emission reductions (CERs) (including correspondence with multilateral financial institutions or carbon funds), evidence of agreements or negotiations with a DOE for validation services, submission of a new methodology or standardized baseline or requests for clarification or revision of existing methodologies or standardized baselines to the Board, publication in a newspaper, interviews with the DNA, and earlier correspondence on the project with the DNA or the secretariat.

115. Assessment of real and continuing actions shall be conducted by the DOE and should focus on real documented evidence as indicated in paragraph 114(b) above, including an assessment by the DOE of the authenticity of the evidence. The DOE shall assess letters, e-mail exchanges and other documented communications submitted by the project participants to substantiate the above information, and these shall be considered as evidence only after the DOE has assessed the reliability and authenticity of such communications, inter alia through cross-checking (e.g. interviews).
116. In validating proposed CDM project activities where:
 - (a) There is less than two years of a gap between the documented evidence, the DOE shall conclude that continuing and real actions were taken to secure CDM status for the project activity;
 - (b) The gap between documented evidence is greater than two years and less than three years, the DOE may determine that continuing and real actions were taken to secure CDM status for the project activity and shall justify any positive or negative validation opinion based on the context of the evidence and information assessed;
 - (c) The gap between documented evidence is greater than three years, the DOE shall conclude that continuing and real actions were not taken to secure CDM status for the project activity.
117. If evidence to support the serious prior consideration of the CDM as indicated above is not available, the DOE shall determine that the CDM was not considered in the decision to implement the project activity.

Reporting requirement

118. The validation report shall:
 - (a) Describe the validation of the project activity start date provided in the PDD;

- (b) Describe the evidence for prior consideration of the CDM (if necessary) that was assessed and the process of cross-checking the evidence, including the real and continuing action;
- (c) Provide a validation opinion regarding whether the proposed CDM project activity complies with the applicable requirements related to the prior consideration of the CDM.

7.12.8.3. Identification of alternatives

119. The requirements contained in paragraphs 120–123 below are not applicable to a proposed CDM project activity using an approved standardized baseline that standardizes the baseline scenario.

Validation requirement

120. Where the baseline scenario is not prescribed in the approved methodology, the DOE shall assess the list of identified credible alternatives to the proposed CDM project activity in the PDD selected to determine the most realistic baseline scenario.

Means of validation

121. The DOE shall assess the list of alternatives given in the PDD and to determine whether:
- (a) The list of alternatives includes as one of the options that the project activity is undertaken without being registered as a proposed CDM project activity;
 - (b) The list contains all plausible alternatives that the DOE, on the basis of its local and sectoral knowledge, considers to be viable means of supplying the comparable outputs or services that are to be supplied by the proposed CDM project activity;
 - (c) The alternatives comply with all applicable and enforced legislation.
122. Where the baseline scenario is prescribed in the approved methodology, no further analysis is required.

Reporting requirement

123. The DOE shall describe whether it considers the listed alternatives to be credible and complete.

7.12.8.4. Investment analysis

Validation requirement

124. If investment analysis has been used to demonstrate the additionality of the proposed CDM project activity, the DOE shall determine whether the proposed CDM project activity would not be:
- (a) The most economically or financially attractive alternative; or
 - (b) Economically or financially feasible without the revenue from the sale of CERs.

Means of validation

125. The DOE shall apply **the latest-valid version of** the “Guidelines on the assessment of investment analysis” as provided by the Board and with other relevant provisions.
126. The DOE shall determine whether the proposed CDM project activity is not the most economically or financially attractive alternative, or that it is not economically or financially feasible without CDM:¹¹
- (a) The proposed CDM project activity would produce no financial or economic benefits other than CDM-related income. The DOE shall determine whether the documented costs associated with the proposed CDM project activity and the alternatives identified demonstrate that there is at least one alternative which is less costly than the proposed CDM project activity;
 - (b) The proposed CDM project activity is less economically or financially attractive than at least one other credible and realistic alternative;
 - (c) The financial returns of the proposed CDM project activity would be insufficient to justify the required investment.
127. To verify the accuracy of financial calculations carried out for any investment analysis, the DOE shall:
- (a) Determine the suitability of the financial indicator selected by the project participants and conduct a thorough assessment of all parameters and assumptions used in calculating such financial indicators, and determine the accuracy and suitability of these parameters using available evidence and applying its expertise in relevant accounting practices;
 - (b) Cross-check the parameters against third-party or publicly available sources, such as invoices or price indices;
 - (c) Review, as appropriate, feasibility reports, public announcements and annual financial reports related to the proposed CDM project activity and the project participants;
 - (d) Assess the correctness of computations carried out and documented by the project participants; and
 - (e) Assess, where applicable, the sensitivity analysis by the project participants to determine under what conditions variations in the result would occur, and the likelihood of these conditions.
128. To confirm the suitability of any benchmark applied in the investment analysis, the DOE shall:
- (a) Determine whether the type of benchmark applied is suitable for the type of financial indicator presented;

¹¹ It should be noted **the latest-valid version of** the “Guidelines on the assessment of investment analysis”, and the requirements of specific methodologies may preclude the use of one of these options in certain scenarios.

- (b) Ensure that any risk premiums applied in determining the benchmark reflect the risks associated with the project type or activity;
 - (c) Determine whether it is reasonable to assume that no investment would be made at a rate of return lower than the benchmark.
129. Where the project participants rely on values from Feasibility Study Reports (FSR) that are approved by national authorities for proposed CDM project activities, the DOE shall determine whether:
- (a) The FSR is the basis for the decision to proceed with the investment in the project, i.e. that the period of time between the finalization of the FSR and the investment decision is sufficiently short that it is unlikely in the context of the underlying project activity that the input values would have materially changed;
 - (b) The values used in the PDD and associated annexes are fully consistent with the FSR, and where inconsistencies occur the DOE shall assess the appropriateness of the values;
 - (c) The input values from the FSR are valid and applicable at the time of investment decision. The DOE shall confirm this on the basis of its specific local and sectoral expertise and by cross-checking or other appropriate means.

Reporting requirement

130. The DOE shall:
- (a) Describe in detail how the parameters used in any financial calculations, including those taken from the FSR, if applicable, have been validated;
 - (b) Describe how the suitability of any benchmark applied has been assessed;
 - (c) Confirm whether the underlying assumptions are appropriate and the financial calculations are correct.

7.12.8.5. Barrier analysis***Validation requirement***

131. If barrier analysis¹² was used to demonstrate the additionality of the proposed CDM project activity, the DOE shall determine whether the proposed CDM project activity faces barriers that:
- (a) Prevent the implementation of this type of proposed CDM project activity;¹³
 - (b) Do not prevent the implementation of at least one of the alternatives.

¹² Barriers are issues in project implementation that could prevent a potential investor from pursuing the implementation of the proposed CDM project activity. The identified barriers are only sufficient grounds for demonstration of additionality if they would prevent potential project **proponents participants** from carrying out the proposed CDM project activity undertaken without being registered as a CDM project activity.

¹³ See the **latest valid version of** "Guidelines for objective demonstration and assessment of barriers".

Means of validation

132. The DOE shall determine whether issues that have a direct impact¹⁴ on the financial returns of the proposed CDM project activity are not considered barriers and shall be assessed by investment analysis. This does not refer to either:
- (a) Risk related barriers, for example risk of technical failure, that could have negative effects on financial performance; or
 - (b) Barriers related to the unavailability of sources of finance for the project activity.
133. The DOE shall apply a two-step process to assessing the barrier analysis performed, as follows:
- (a) *Determine whether the barriers are real:* The DOE shall assess the available evidence and/or conduct interviews with relevant individuals (including members of industry associations, government officials or local experts if necessary) to determine whether the barriers listed in the PDD exist. The DOE shall determine whether the existence of barriers is substantiated by independent sources of data such as relevant national legislation, surveys of local conditions and national or international statistics. If the existence of a barrier is substantiated only by the opinions of the project participants, the DOE shall not consider this barrier to be adequately substantiated. If the DOE considers, on the basis of its sectoral or local expertise, that a barrier is not real or is not supported by sufficient evidence, it shall raise a CAR to have reference to this barrier removed from the project documentation;
 - (b) *Determine whether the barriers prevent the implementation of the proposed CDM project activity but not the implementation of at least one of the possible alternatives:* Since not all barriers present an insurmountable hurdle to a project activity being implemented, the DOE shall apply its local and sectoral expertise to judge whether a barrier or set of barriers would prevent the implementation of the proposed CDM project activity and would not equally prevent implementation of at least one of the possible alternatives, in particular the identified baseline scenario.

Reporting requirement

134. The DOE shall:
- (a) Provide an assessment of each barrier listed in the PDD, which describes how it has undertaken validation of the barrier;
 - (b) Provide an overall determination of the credibility of the barrier analysis performed.

¹⁴ Defined in this context as those issues whose impacts can be expressed in monetary terms with reasonable certainty.

7.12.8.6. Common practice analysis***Validation requirement***

135. For proposed large-scale CDM project activities, unless the proposed project type is first-of-its-kind as determined in accordance with the relevant guidelines, the DOE shall assess whether the project participants have conducted a common practice analysis.¹⁵

Means of validation

136. The DOE shall use official sources and its local and sectoral expertise to:
- (a) Assess whether the geographical scope (e.g. the defined region) of the common practice analysis is appropriate for the assessment of common practice related to the project activity's technology or industry type. For certain technologies, the relevant region for assessment will be local and for others it may be transnational/global. If a region other than the entire host country is chosen, the DOE shall assess the explanation of why this region is more appropriate;
 - (b) Determine to what extent similar and operational projects (e.g. using similar technology or practice), other than CDM project activities,¹⁶ have been undertaken in the defined region;
 - (c) Assess, if similar and operational projects, other than CDM project activities, are already "widely observed and commonly carried out" in the defined region, whether there are essential distinctions between the proposed CDM project activity and the other similar activities.

Reporting requirement

137. The DOE shall:
- (a) Describe how the geographical scope of the common practice analysis has been validated, considering the technology or industry type to which the proposed CDM project activity belongs;
 - (b) Describe how it has undertaken an assessment of the existence of similar projects;
 - (c) Describe how it has assessed the essential distinctions between the proposed CDM project activity and any similar projects that are widely observed and commonly carried out;
 - (d) Confirm whether the proposed CDM project activity is not common practice.

¹⁵ This is a test to complement the investment analysis (step 2 of the additionality tool) or barrier analysis (step 3 of the additionality tool) to confirm that the proposed CDM project activity is not widely observed and commonly carried out in the region.

¹⁶ Registered CDM project activities and proposed CDM project activities that have been published on the UNFCCC website for global stakeholder consultation as part of the validation processes.

7.12.8^{bis} Algorithms and/or formulae used to determine emission reductions***Validation requirement***

1. The DOE shall determine whether the steps taken and the equations and parameters applied in the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD to calculate project emissions, baseline emissions, leakage and emission reductions comply with the requirements of the selected methodology including applicable tool(s) and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline and the “Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities”.

Means of validation

2. Where the methodology and, where applicable, the standardized baseline allows for selection between options for equations or parameters, the DOE shall determine whether adequate justification has been provided (based on the choice of the baseline scenario, context of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA and CPA and other evidence provided) and that the correct equations and parameters have been used, in accordance with the methodology selected^{16bis} including applicable tool(s) and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline.
3. The DOE shall verify the justification given in the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD for the choice of data and parameters used in the equations.
 - (a) **Data and parameters fixed ex ante:** If data and parameters will not be monitored throughout the crediting period of the proposed CDM project activity or CPA but have already been determined and will remain fixed throughout the crediting period, the DOE shall determine whether all data sources and assumptions are appropriate and calculations are correct as applicable to the proposed CDM project activity or PoA and CPA, and will result in an accurate or otherwise conservative estimate of the emission reductions. If the selected methodology requires that any of these data and parameters be determined in accordance with the “Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities”, the DOE shall determine whether the sampling efforts were undertaken in accordance with the “Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities”.
 - (b) **Data and parameters to be monitored:** If data and parameters will be monitored or estimated on implementation and hence become available only after validation of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA and CPA, the DOE shall determine whether the estimates provided in the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD for these data and parameters are reasonable. If the selected methodology requires that any of these estimates be determined in accordance with the “Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities”, the DOE shall determine whether the sampling efforts were undertaken in accordance with the “Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities”.

^{16bis} For proposed CDM project activities or CPAs that have both A/R and non-A/R components, in order to avoid double counting of emission sources, the emissions associated with A/R activity shall be accounted for and clearly documented by the proposed A/R CDM project activity or CPA (see EB 25 report paragraphs 38 and 48).

4. The DOE shall determine whether the global warming potentials (GWPs) were correctly applied in the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD in accordance with relevant requirements in the Project standard.

Reporting requirement

5. The DOE shall describe the steps taken to assess the requirements and provide an opinion as to whether:
- (a) All assumptions and data used by the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity are listed in the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD, including their references and sources;
 - (b) All documentation used by the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity as the basis for assumptions and source of data is correctly quoted and interpreted in the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD;
 - (c) All values used in the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD including GWPs are considered reasonable in the context of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA and CPA;
 - (d) The baseline methodology, any corresponding tool(s) and, where applicable, the standardized baseline have been applied correctly to calculate project emissions, baseline emissions, leakage and emission reductions;
 - (e) All estimates of the baseline emissions can be replicated using the data and parameter values provided in the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD;
 - (f) The sampling efforts were undertaken in accordance with the “Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities”, where the selected methodology requires that the data and parameters be determined in accordance with the “Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities”.
6. The DOE shall describe how it has verified the data and parameters used in the equations, including references to any other data sources used.

7.12.9. Monitoring plan

7.12.9.1. General

137^{bis}. If the project participants or coordinating/managing entity has included a monitoring plan in the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD for validation for registration of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA and CPA, the DOE shall apply the requirements in section 7.12.9.2 below.

137^{ter}. If the project participants or coordinating/managing entity has chosen to delay the submission of the monitoring plan for the proposed CDM project activity or PoA and CPA, the DOE shall apply the requirements in section 7.12.9.3 below.

7.12.9.2. Validation of monitoring plan

Validation requirement

138. The DOE shall determine whether the description of the monitoring plan included in the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD complies with ~~is based on~~ the approved monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s) and, where applicable, the approved standardized baseline and, where applicable, "Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities".

Means of validation

139. The DOE shall apply a ~~two-three-step~~ process to meet the above requirement:

- (a) To assess compliance of the monitoring plan with the approved methodology including applicable tool(s) and, where applicable, the approved standardized baseline, the DOE shall:
 - (i) Identify the list of parameters required by the selected methodology including applicable tool(s) and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline by means of document review;
 - (ii) Confirm that the description of the monitoring plan contains all necessary parameters, that they are described and that the means of monitoring described in the plan complies with the requirements of the methodology including applicable tool(s) and, where applicable, the standardized baseline;
- (b) To assess the ~~implementation feasibility~~ of the plan the DOE shall, by means of review of the documented procedures, interviews with relevant personnel, project plans and any on-site inspection of the proposed CDM project activity ~~site~~ or CPA ~~site~~, assess whether:
 - (i) The monitoring arrangements described in the monitoring plan are feasible within the project design;
 - (ii) The means of implementation of the monitoring plan, including the data management and quality assurance and quality control procedures, are sufficient to ensure that the emission reductions achieved by/resulting from

the proposed CDM project activity or PoA and CPA can be reported ex post and verified.

- (c) To determine whether the proposed sampling plan provides parameter value estimates in an unbiased and reliable manner, where the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity applied a sampling approach to determine data and parameters, the DOE shall assess the proposed sampling plan in accordance with the “Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities”.

Reporting requirement

140. The DOE shall:

- (a) State its opinion on the compliance of the described monitoring plan with the requirements of the methodology including applicable tool(s), the standardized baseline and, where applicable, the “Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities”;
- (b) Describe the steps undertaken to assess whether the monitoring arrangements described in the monitoring plan are feasible within the project design;
- (c) State its opinion on the project participants’ or coordinating/managing entity’s ability to implement the described monitoring plan.

7.12.9.3. Delayed validation of monitoring plan

Validation requirement

140_{bis}. The DOE shall confirm whether the project participants or coordinating/managing entity has chosen to delay the submission of the monitoring plan for the proposed CDM project activity or PoA and CPA.

Means of validation

140_{ter}. The DOE shall determine whether the relevant sections for the monitoring plan in the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD do not contain the information related to the monitoring plan and clearly state that the delayed submission of the monitoring plan has been chosen by the project participants or coordinating/managing entity.

Reporting requirement

140_{quater}. The DOE shall document the decision taken by the project participants or coordinating/managing entity to delay the submission of the monitoring plan.

7.12_{bis}. Duration and crediting period

Validation requirement

1. The DOE shall determine whether the project participants or coordinating/managing entity defined the followings on the duration and crediting period of the proposed CDM project activity or CPA in accordance with relevant requirements in the Project standard:

- (a) Start date of the proposed CDM project activity or CPA;

- (b) Expected operational lifetime;
- (c) Type and duration of the crediting period;
- (d) Start date of the crediting period.

Means of validation

- 2. The DOE shall assess the information contained in the PDD or CPA-DD by means of a document review, use of official sources and its local and sectoral expertise, interviews with relevant personnel and/or on-site inspection(s).

Reporting requirement

- 3. The DOE shall describe the steps taken to assess, and state its opinion on, the compliance of the information contained in the PDD or CPA-DD with the relevant requirements in the Project standard.

7.13. Environmental impacts

Validation requirement

- 141. The DOE shall determine whether the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity conducted an analysis of the environmental impacts of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA and/or CPA, including transboundary impacts, and whether those impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity or by the host Party.
- 142. The DOE shall also determine whether the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity conducted an environmental impact assessment, if considered significant by the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity or required to do so by the host Party, in accordance with the host Party's procedures.

Means of validation

- 143. The DOE shall assess the above requirements by means of a document review and/or using local official sources and expertise.

Reporting requirement

- 144. The DOE shall indicate whether the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity have undertaken an analysis of environmental impacts and, if considered significant by the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity or required by the host Party, an environmental impact assessment in accordance with procedures as required by the host Party.

7.14. Local stakeholder consultation

Validation requirement

- 145. The DOE shall determine whether the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity have completed a local stakeholder consultation process and that due steps were

taken to engage stakeholders and solicit comments for the proposed CDM project activity or PoA and/or CPA.

Means of validation

146. The DOE shall, by means of document review and interviews with local stakeholders and/or the DNA as appropriate, determine whether:

- (a) Comments have been invited from local stakeholders that are relevant for the proposed CDM project activity or PoA and/or CPA;
- (b) The summary of the comments received, as provided in the PDD or PoA-DD and/or CPA-DD, is complete;
- (c) The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity have taken due account of all comments received, and have described this process in the PDD or PoA-DD and/or CPA-DD;
- (d) The consultation process had started and complied with, if any, applicable national regulations and completed before:
 - (i) The start date of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA and/or CPA as defined in the "Glossary: CDM terms";
 - (ii) The submission of the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD to the DOE for validation.

146^{bis}. If the DOE used interviews with local stakeholders and/or the DNA as a means of validation in paragraph 146 above, and if the DOE received no response from the local stakeholders and/or the DNA provided no response to DOE's request for the interview within 14 days of the request for response, the DOE may proceed with the information available.

146^{ter}. The DOE, when validating the letter of approval for the proposed CDM project activity or PoA from the host Party, shall request the DNA to forward any complaints received by the DNA from the local stakeholders after the completion of the local stakeholder consultation in accordance with the Project cycle procedure. If the DOE receives such complaints from the DNA, it shall promptly forward them to the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity and thereafter determine whether the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity have duly taken them into account. The DOE may proceed with the validation with the complaints received within 14 days of the request for forwarding, if any.

146^{quater}. The DOE shall determine whether changes to the PDD or PoA-DD and/or CPA-DD are made after the invitation of comments from the local stakeholders. If the DOE identifies such changes, the DOE shall assess whether:

- (a) The comments received through the local stakeholder consultation are still valid after the changes;
- (b) The scope of the engaged local stakeholders is still valid and therefore comments from additional or different local stakeholders are not required.

Reporting requirement

147. The DOE shall:

- (a) Describe the steps taken to assess the adequacy of the local stakeholder consultation;
- (b) Provide an opinion on the adequacy of the local stakeholder consultation;
- (c) Provide an opinion on whether the complaints referred to in paragraph 146^{ter} above have been duly taken into account, **if any**;
- (d) Provide an opinion on the validity of the comments received through the local stakeholder consultation **and the scope of the engaged local stakeholders** in cases referred to in paragraph 146^{quater} above.

7.15. Validation status and outcomes, opinion and report**7.15.1. Validation status and outcomes**

148. ~~For each proposed project activity~~ The DOE shall provide an update of the status of its validation activity, ~~unless the project activity has been submitted for registration in accordance with the Project cycle procedure 180 days subsequent to the end of the period for the submission of public comments.~~

149. ~~This status update shall indicate one of the following conditions:~~

- ~~(a) The validation contract has been terminated — in which case a reason for this termination shall be provided to the Board and secretariat on a confidential basis; or~~
- ~~(b) A negative validation opinion has been issued; or~~
- ~~(c) The DOE has raised one or more corrective action requests or clarification requests, to which no response has been received — in which case the DOE shall provide a summary of the issues raised and update or reconfirm the status of its validation activities at three (3) month intervals thereafter; or~~
- ~~(d) The DOE has finalized a positive validation opinion with the exception of the receipt of a valid letter of approval from one or more Parties involved — in which case the DOE shall indicate which Party/Parties involved; or~~
- ~~(e) Validation activities are on going and no corrective action or clarification requests have yet been sent to the project participants; in which case the DOE shall provide an explanation for the length of time taken and update or reconfirm the status of its validation activities on three (3) month intervals thereafter.~~

7.15.2. Validation opinion

150. The DOE shall include a statement of the likelihood of the proposed CDM project activity **or PoA and CPA** achieving the anticipated emission reductions stated in the PDD **or PoA-DD and CPA-DD.**

151. The DOE shall inform the project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** of the validation outcome. Notification to the project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** shall include:
- (a) A confirmation of validation and date of submission of the validation report to the Board; or
 - (b) An explanation of reasons for non-acceptance if the proposed CDM project activity, **PoA or CPA**, as documented, is determined not to fulfil the requirements for validation.
152. The DOE shall provide either:
- (a) A positive validation opinion in its validation report that is submitted as a request for registration **if the DOE determines that the proposed CDM project activity, PoA or CPA complies with the applicable CDM requirements**; or
 - (b) A negative validation opinion in its validation report explaining the reason for its opinion if the DOE determines that the proposed CDM project activity, **PoA or CPA** does not fulfil the applicable CDM requirements^{16ter}.
153. The DOE shall include the following in its opinion:
- (a) A summary of the validation methodology and process used and the validation criteria applied;
 - (b) A description of project components or issues not covered by the validation process;
 - (c) A summary of the validation conclusions;
 - (d) A statement on the validation of the expected emission reductions;
 - (e) A statement as to whether the proposed CDM project activity, **PoA or CPA** meets the stated criteria.

7.15.3. Validation report

- ~~154. The DOE shall include the final validation opinion in the validation report. In its validation report, the DOE shall:~~
- ~~(a) State its conclusions regarding the proposed project activity's conformity with applicable CDM requirements;~~
 - ~~(b) Give an overview of the validation activities carried out in order to arrive at the final validation conclusions and opinion;~~
 - ~~(c) Include the results of the dialogue between the DOE and the project participants, as well as any adjustments made to the project design following stakeholder~~

^{16ter}

This does not cover the case in which the project participants **of a proposed CDM project activity or the coordinating/managing entity** failed to inform the secretariat, or informed it but not within the required timeframe, of the progress of the **proposed CDM project activity or PoA** every subsequent two years after the initial notification of prior consideration of the CDM in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.

~~consultation. It shall reflect the responses to CARs and CLs, and discussions on and revisions to project documentation.~~

154^{bis}. The DOE contracted to conduct validation for registration of the proposed CDM project activity shall prepare a validation report for registration of the project activity using the valid version of the validation report form for registration of CDM project activities, taking into account the grace period of the form if it has been revised.

154^{ter}. The DOE contracted to conduct validation for registration of the proposed CDM PoA shall prepare a validation report for registration of the PoA and a validation report(s) for inclusion of the CPAs using the valid version of the validation report form for registration of CDM PoAs and the validation report form for inclusion of CDM CPAs, taking into account the grace period of the form if it has been revised.

154^{quater}. When completing the validation report form for registration of CDM project activities or PoAs or the validation report form for inclusion of CDM CPAs, the DOE shall follow the instructions therein.

154^{bisquinque}. The DOE shall report the results of its assessment in the validation report.

~~154^{sexies}. The DOE shall submit the validation report, along with the supporting documents, to the Board as part of the request for registration of a project activity or PoA as a CDM project activity or PoA.~~

155. In its validation report, the DOE shall provide the following:

(a) A summary of the validation process and its conclusions;

(a)^{bis} Results of the dialogue between the DOE and the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, as well as any adjustments made to the project ~~or programme~~ design following stakeholder consultation. It shall reflect the responses to CARs and CLs, identification of FARs, and discussions on and revisions to project ~~or programme~~ documentation;

(b) All its applied approaches, ~~“findings and conclusions as to requirements set out in sections 7.5 to 7.14 above, especially on baseline selection, additionality, emission factors and monitoring”;~~

(b)^{bis} A validation opinion;

~~(c) Information on the global stakeholder consultation carried out by the DOE prior to submitting the project for validation, including dates and how comments received have been taken into consideration by the DOE;~~

(d) A list of ~~on-site inspection, interviewees, and documents reviewed and sampling approach used by the DOE. Where the DOE applied a sampling approach to the on-site inspection, the DOE shall include a description of how the sample size was determined and field check was carried out;~~

(e) Details of the validation team, technical experts, internal technical reviewers involved, together with their roles in the validation activity and details of who conducted the on-site inspection;

(f) Information on quality control within the team and in the validation process;

- (g) Appointment certificates or curricula vitae of the DOE's validation team members, technical experts and internal technical reviewers for the proposed CDM project activity, PoA or CPA.

155^{bis}. The DOE shall submit the validation report, along with the supporting documents, to the Board as part of the request for registration of a project activity or PoA as a CDM project activity or PoA in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.

155^{terbis}. If the DNA has forwarded complaints from local stakeholders to the DOE during the validation in accordance with the paragraph 146^{ter} above, the DOE shall, once the request for registration is published on the UNFCCC CDM website, inform the DNA and the complainants of the publication of the validation report.

155^{quater}. The DOE shall request the secretariat to withdraw the request for registration of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA in accordance with the Project cycle procedure, if the project participants or the coordinating/ managing entity requested the DOE to withdraw the request for registration or if the DOE has revised its validation report based on new insights or information.

8. Specific validation requirements on registration of project activities and programme of activities

156. For certain specific validation activities such as proposed small-scale CDM project activities, afforestation and reforestation CDM project activities, carbon dioxide capture and storage CDM project activities and CDM programmes of activities, the DOE shall comply with the general validation requirements set out in the sections above as well as those that follow, including the simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale project activities, the modalities and procedures for afforestation and reforestation project activities,¹⁷ the modalities and procedures for carbon dioxide capture and storage in geological formations as clean development mechanism project activities¹⁸, and the "Standard: Demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of multiple methodologies for programmes of activities".

8.1. Small-scale project activities

8.1.1. Project activity type and eligibility

Validation requirement

157. The DOE shall determine whether the proposed CDM project activity meets the small-scale eligibility requirements.¹⁹

¹⁷ See decision 5/CMP.1, annex.

¹⁸ See decision 10/CMP.7, annex.

¹⁹ See the simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale CDM project activities presented under decision 4/CMP.1, annex II.

Means of validation

158. For a proposed CDM project activity that is within the small-scale project activity threshold but applies a large-scale approved methodology, the DOE shall determine whether this project activity follows the modalities and procedures for large-scale project activities.
159. The DOE shall determine whether:
- (a) The proposed CDM project activity qualifies within the thresholds of the three possible types of small-scale project activities. It may include more than one component; for example, a type III methane recovery component activity and a type I electricity component activity;²⁰
 - (b) The proposed CDM project activity conforms to one or more of the approved small-scale methodologies applied in conjunction with the general guidelines to SSC CDM methodologies;²¹
 - ~~(c) The proposed small-scale CDM project activity is not a debundled component of a large-scale project²² activity.~~

Reporting requirement

160. The DOE shall indicate whether the proposed CDM project activity meets the eligibility criteria for small-scale project activities.

8.1.1_{bis} Bundling of project activity***Validation requirement***

1. The DOE shall determine whether the bundle of proposed small-scale CDM project activities is designed in accordance with the applicable requirements in the “General principles for bundling” if project participants bring together more than one proposed small-scale CDM project activities as a bundle.
2. A single DOE may validate the bundle of proposed small-scale CDM project activities.

Means of validation

3. The DOE shall assess the compliance with the applicable requirements in the “General principles for bundling” by means of a document review, interview with relevant personnel and/or any on-site inspection of the project sites.

Reporting requirement

4. The DOE shall:

²⁰ See EB 28 report, paragraphs 56 and 57, for guidance on size limits for the components.

²¹ See EB 54 report, paragraph 37 and the latest valid version of “General guidelines to SSC methodologies” for further clarification.

²² ~~See Appendix C of the simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale CDM project activities and the “Guidelines on assessment of de-bundling for SSC project activities”.~~

- (a) Report its opinion on the compliance of the bundle of proposed small-scale CDM project activities with the applicable requirements in the “General principles for bundling”;
- (b) Describe the steps taken to assess the compliance.

8.1.2. Debundling for project activity

Validation requirement

161. The DOE shall determine whether the proposed small-scale CDM project activity is not a debundled component of a large-scale CDM project activity in accordance with the “Guidelines on assessment of debundling for SSC project activities”.²³

Means of validation

162. The DOE shall determine the proposed small-scale CDM project activity to be a debundled component of a large-scale CDM project activity if there is a registered small-scale CDM project activity or an application to register another proposed small-scale CDM project activity.
163. The DOE shall, where appropriate, take into account specific debundling requirements for Type I project activities and small-scale transport project activities.

Reporting requirement

164. The DOE shall report its conclusion and specific details on how it assessed whether the proposed small-scale CDM project activities are not a debundled component of a large scale activity.

8.1.3. Demonstration of Additionality

Validation requirement

165. The DOE shall determine whether the proposed SSG small-scale CDM project activity is additional in accordance with CDM requirements applicable for small-scale CDM project activities.
166. Paragraph 106 above applies to a proposed small-scale CDM project activity using an approved standardized baseline that standardizes additionality instead of paragraph 165 above.

Means of validation

167. The DOE shall refer to the “Guidelines on the demonstration of additionality of small-scale project activities”, ~~specific requirements on demonstration of additionality for proposed small-scale CDM project activities~~²⁴ and the “Non-binding best practice

²³ If the proposed small-scale CDM project activity is deemed to be a debundled component but the total size of such an activity combined with the previous registered small-scale CDM project activity does not exceed the limits for small-scale project activities then the project activity can qualify to use simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale project activities.

²⁴ — See Attachment A to Appendix B of 4/CMP.1, annex II.

examples to demonstrate additionality for SSC project activities” or any applicable additionality tool.

168. In the case of Type I project activities up to 5 MW (or an appropriate equivalent) that employ renewable energy as their primary technology, Type II energy efficiency project activities that aim to achieve energy savings at a scale of no more than 20 GWh per year (or an appropriate equivalent), and Type III project activities that aim to achieve emissions reductions at a scale of no more than 20 kt CO₂e per year, instead of paragraphs 120 - 137, the DOE shall assess the relevant criteria to establish the automatic additionality for these project activities in accordance with the “Guideline: Demonstrating additionality of microscale project activities”.²⁵
169. Paragraph 109 above applies to a proposed small-scale CDM project activity using an approved standardized baseline that standardizes additionality instead of paragraphs 167 and 168 above.

Reporting requirement

170. The DOE shall describe all steps taken, and sources of information used to cross-check the information contained in the PDD.

8.1.4. Environmental impacts

Validation requirement

- 170^{bis}. The following applies to a proposed small-scale CDM project activity instead of paragraphs 141 and 142 above: The DOE shall determine whether the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity conducted an analysis of the environmental impacts of the proposed small-scale CDM project activity, if required by the host Party.

Reporting requirement

- 170^{ter}. The following applies to a proposed small-scale CDM project activity instead of paragraph 144 above: The DOE shall indicate whether the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity have undertaken an analysis of environmental impacts if required by the host Party.

8.2. Afforestation or reforestation project activities

171. The DOE shall determine whether specific requirements as defined in the modalities and procedures for A/R project activities have been followed, including:
- (a) Project boundary for proposed A/R CDM project activities;
 - (b) Selection of carbon pools;
 - (c) Eligibility of land;
 - (d) Approach proposed to address non-permanence;

²⁵ – See the latest “Guidelines for demonstrating additionality of microscale project activities”.

- (e) Timing of management activities, including harvesting cycles, and verifications;
- (f) Socio-economic and environmental impacts, including impacts on biodiversity and natural ecosystems.

8.2.1. Project boundary

Validation requirement

171^{bis}. Paragraphs 172 - 175 below apply to a proposed A/R CDM project activity instead of paragraphs 84 - 89 above.

172. The DOE shall confirm whether the PDD contains a description of the project boundary that delineates discrete areas of land planned for the proposed A/R CDM project activity under the control of the project participants.²⁶

Means of validation

173. The DOE shall, through document review and/or interviews, determine whether the project participants for all areas of land planned for the proposed A/R CDM project activity:
- (a) Have already established the control over afforestation or reforestation activities; or
 - (b) Has the control over afforestation or reforestation
174. The DOE shall confirm that the control has included at minimum the exclusive right, defined in a way acceptable under the legal system of the host Party, to perform the A/R activity with the aim of achieving net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks. If the total number of documents to be reviewed and persons/entities to be interviewed is not less than 10, then the DOE may apply a sampling approach.

Reporting requirement

175. The DOE shall describe the documentation assessed and/or oral statements delivered by persons interviewed (if any) and determine their acceptability under the legal system of the host Party. If the DOE has applied a sampling approach, it shall also describe how many sites have been assessed and how these sites were selected.

8.2.2. Selection of carbon pools

Validation requirement

176. The DOE shall determine whether the carbon pools to be considered in the proposed A/R CDM project activity were selected in accordance with the requirements of the selected methodology.

²⁶ The proposed A/R CDM project activity may contain more than one discrete area of land.

Means of validation

177. The DOE shall confirm that information has been provided to justify the exclusion of certain carbon pools if the methodology allows for such an option. In doing so, the DOE shall confirm that all documents referred to in the PDD are correctly quoted and interpreted. If relevant, the DOE shall cross-check the information provided in the PDD with other available information from public sources or local experts.

Reporting requirement

178. If the methodology allows for the option to exclude certain pools and this option is selected by project participants, the DOE shall provide a statement as to whether the selection of carbon pools complies with the selected methodology, and whether the exclusion is justified.

8.2.3. Eligibility of land***Validation requirement***

179. The DOE shall confirm that the land within the planned project boundary is eligible for a proposed A/R CDM project activity.

Means of validation

180. The DOE shall validate the above requirement based on a review of information that reliably discriminates between forest and non-forest land according to the particular thresholds adopted by the host Party (exemplary sources are listed in the above-mentioned procedures) and an on-site inspection.

Reporting requirement

181. The DOE shall describe how the validation of the eligibility of the land has been performed, by detailing the data sources assessed and by describing its observations during the on-site inspection. The DOE shall provide a statement as to whether the entire land within the project boundary is eligible for a proposed A/R CDM project activity.

8.2.4. Addressing non-permanence***Validation requirement***

182. The DOE shall confirm that the project participants specified the approach selected to address non-permanence.

Means of validation

183. The DOE shall review the PDD to ensure an approach to address non-permanence is selected in accordance with the relevant provisions in the modalities and procedures for afforestation and reforestation project activities.

Reporting requirement

184. The DOE shall confirm whether the approach selected by the project participants to address non-permanence has been specified in the PDD.

8.2.5. Timing of management activities, including harvesting cycles, and verifications***Validation requirement***

185. The DOE shall determine whether the PDD describes the planned management activities, including harvesting cycles, and verifications such that a systematic coincidence of verification and peaks in carbon stocks would be avoided.

Means of validation

186. The DOE shall review the forest management plan and the monitoring plan for the proposed A/R CDM project activity to confirm that a systematic coincidence of verification and peaks in carbon stocks is avoided.

Reporting requirement

187. The DOE shall describe how the project participants have ensured that a systematic coincidence of verification and peaks in carbon stocks would be avoided.

8.2.5_{bis}. Establishment and description of baseline scenario

1. The following applies to a proposed A/R CDM project activity instead of paragraphs 90 and 95 above: The DOE shall determine whether the baseline identified for the proposed A/R CDM project activity is the scenario for each stratum of the proposed A/R CDM project activity, including the land-use would occur in the absence of the proposed A/R CDM project activity.
2. The following applies to a proposed A/R CDM project activity instead of paragraph 96 above: The DOE shall determine whether, drawing on its knowledge of the sector and/or advice from local experts, that all applicable CDM requirements have been taken into account in the identification of the baseline scenario for the proposed A/R CDM project activity, as well as relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances, such as historical land use practices, without creating perverse incentives that may impact host Parties' contributions to the ultimate objective of the Convention in the following manner: national and/or sectoral land-use policies or regulations, which give comparative advantages to afforestation/reforestation activities and have been implemented since the adoption by the COP of the CDM M&Ps (decision 17/CP.7, 11 November 2001), need not be taken into account in developing a baseline scenario (i.e. the baseline scenario could refer to a hypothetical situation without the national and/or sectoral policies or regulations being in place).

8.2.5_{ter}. Emission reductions

1. The following applies to a proposed A/R CDM project activity instead of paragraph 1 of section 7.12.8_{bis}. above: The DOE shall determine whether the steps taken and the equations and parameters applied in the PDD to calculate baseline net GHG removals by sinks, actual net GHG removals by sinks, leakage, and net anthropogenic GHG

removals by sinks comply with the requirements of the selected methodology including applicable tool(s) and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline.

2. The following applies to a proposed A/R CDM project activity instead of paragraph 5(f) of section 7.12.8^{bis} above: The sampling efforts were undertaken in accordance with the selected methodology including applicable tool(s), if the project participants applied the sampling approach to determine data and parameters in accordance with the selected methodology including applicable tool(s).

8.2.6. Socio-economic and environmental impacts

Validation requirement

- 187^{bis}. Paragraphs 188 - 192 below apply to a proposed A/R CDM project activity instead of paragraphs 141 - 144 above.

188. The DOE shall validate the documentation received from the project participants on its analysis of the socio-economic and environmental impacts, including impacts on biodiversity and natural ecosystems, and impacts outside the project boundary of the proposed A/R CDM project activity.

Means of validation

189. The DOE shall confirm the above requirement by means of a document review and/or using local official sources and expertise.
190. If the above-mentioned analysis leads to the conclusion that a negative impact that may be considered significant by the project participants or the host Party has been detected, then the DOE shall determine whether a socio-economic impact assessment and/or an environmental impact assessment has been undertaken in accordance with relevant host Party regulations, and the outcome of such impact assessment is summarized in the PDD.

Reporting requirement

191. The DOE shall confirm whether the project participants have undertaken an analysis of the socio-economic and environmental impacts and, if considered significant by the project participants or the host Party, a socio-economic impact assessment and/or an environmental impact assessment in accordance with relevant host Party regulations.
192. The DOE shall also note whether the outcome of such impact assessment has been summarized in the PDD and whether a description of the planned monitoring and remedial measures to address the negative impacts has been included in the PDD.

8.3. Small-scale afforestation or reforestation project activities

193. The DOE shall determine whether:

- (a) The proposed CDM project activity complies with the ~~thresholds definition and limit~~ for the small-scale A/R project activities;²⁷

²⁷ See decision 9/CMP.3, which revised decision 5/CMP.1, annex, paragraph 1(i).

- (b) The proposed CDM project activity complies with one of the types of small-scale A/R project activities defined in appendix B of the annex to decision 6/CMP.1 and qualifies to apply one of the approved simplified baseline and monitoring methodologies for small-scale afforestation and reforestation project activities;
- (c) The proposed CDM project activity is not a debundled component of a large-scale A/R CDM project activity, in accordance with the rules defined in appendix C of the annex to decision 6/CMP.1;
- (d) The proposed CDM project activity has been developed or implemented by low-income communities and individuals as confirmed by the host Party.²⁸

8.4. Carbon dioxide capture and storage project activities

194. The DOE shall determine whether specific requirements as defined in the modalities and procedures for CCS project activities have been followed, including:
- (a) Participation requirements for proposed CCS CDM project activities;
 - (b) Selection and characterization of the geological storage site;
 - (c) Risk and safety assessment;
 - (d) Environmental and socioeconomic impact assessment;
 - (e) Liability;
 - (f) Requirements for financial provision;
 - (g) Monitoring for proposed CCS CDM project activities;
 - (h) Project boundary for proposed CCS CDM project activities;
 - (i) Authorization for proposed CCS CDM project activities.

8.4.1. Participation requirements

Validation requirement

195. The DOE shall determine whether the participation requirements as set out in section "Participation requirements of host Party for CCS project activities" of the Project cycle procedure are satisfied.

Means of validation

196. The DOE shall determine whether:
- (a) The host Party has submitted the expression of its agreement to the UNFCCC secretariat to allow the implementation of CCS project activities on its territory;
 - (b) The host Party has established laws and/or regulations which meet the requirements set out in section "Participation requirements of host Party for CCS project activities" of the Project cycle procedure.

²⁸ See decision 5/CMP.1, annex paragraph 1(i).

Reporting requirement

197. The DOE shall describe how the host Party's laws and/or regulations meet the requirements set out in section "Laws and regulations of host Party for CCS project activities" of the Project cycle procedure.

8.4.2. Selection and characterization of the geological storage site

Validation requirement

198. The DOE shall determine whether:
- (a) The geological storage site has been characterized and selected in accordance with section "Selection and characterization of the geological storage site" of the Project standard; and
 - (b) The conditions set out in section "Selection and characterization of the geological storage site" of the Project standard have been fulfilled.

Means of validation

199. The DOE shall, determine whether:
- (a) The selection and characterization of the geological storage site fulfils the requirements set out in section "Selection and characterization of the geological storage site" of the Project standard;
 - (b) All the steps mentioned in section "Selection and characterization of the geological storage site" of the Project standard have been performed for the project activity;
 - (c) Relevant information is used for the selection and characterization of the geological storage site, in accordance with section "Selection and characterization of the geological storage site" of the Project standard.

Reporting requirement

200. The DOE shall describe all the steps taken, and sources of information used to validate the PDD. The DOE shall describe how it has determined that the evidence assessed is credible, where appropriate.
201. The DOE shall also describe how the requirements set out in section "Selection and characterization of the geological storage site" of the Project standard have been fulfilled.

8.4.3. Risk and safety assessment

Validation requirement

202. The DOE shall determine whether the risk and safety assessment has been carried out:
- (a) In accordance with the laws and regulations of the host Party, as applicable; and

- (b) The provisions set out in section “Risk and safety assessment” of the Project standard.

Means of validation

203. The DOE shall determine whether:

- (a) The risk and safety assessment has been carried out in accordance with the laws and regulations of the host Party;
- (b) All the requirements set out in section “Risk and safety assessment” of the Project standard have been met for the proposed CCS CDM project activity;
- (c) The five steps for assessing the potential risk of the proposed CCS CDM project activity, as set out in section “Risk and safety assessment” of the Project standard, have been followed.

Reporting requirement

204. The DOE shall indicate whether the project participants have undertaken a risk and safety assessment in accordance with the laws and regulations as required by the host Party.

205. The DOE shall describe how the requirements set out in section “Risk and safety assessment” of the Project standard have been fulfilled.

8.4.4. Environmental and socioeconomic impact assessment

Validation requirement

206. The DOE shall confirm that the environmental and socioeconomic impact assessment has been carried out:

- (a) In accordance with the laws and regulations of the host Party, as applicable; and
- (b) In accordance with the provisions set out in section “Environmental and socioeconomic impact assessments” of the Project standard.

207. The DOE shall determine whether the results of the assessments referred to in paragraphs 202 and 206 above confirm the technical and environmental viability of the proposed CCS CDM project activity.

Means of validation

208. The DOE shall:

- (a) Determine whether the environmental and socioeconomic impact assessment has been carried out as per the requirements mentioned in the paragraphs above;
- (b) Determine whether the results of the risk and safety assessment and environmental and socioeconomic impact assessment confirm the technical and environmental viability of the proposed CCS CDM project activity.

Reporting requirement

209. The DOE shall:

- (a) Describe how the environmental and socioeconomic impact assessment complies with the laws and regulations of the host Party;
- (b) Describe how it has assessed the requirements set out in section “Environmental and socioeconomic impact assessments” of the Project standard are met for the proposed CCS CDM project activity;
- (c) Describe how it has validated the compliance of the detailed description of the planned monitoring and remedial measures to address any environmental and socioeconomic impacts identified in accordance with the procedures as required by the host Party;
- (d) State whether the results of the assessments confirm the technical and environmental viability of the proposed CCS CDM project activity.

8.4.5. Liability

Validation requirement

210. The DOE shall determine whether the allocation and transfer of liability have been agreed:

- (a) In accordance with the laws and regulations of the host Party, as applicable; and
- (b) In accordance with the requirements set out in section “Liability” of the Project standard.

Means of validation

211. The DOE shall determine whether, in accordance with the requirements mentioned above:

- (a) The allocation and transfer of liability has been agreed;
- (b) The proposed allocation and transfer of liability is feasible and implementable.

Reporting requirement

212. The DOE shall:

- (a) Describe how the proposed allocation and transfer of liability complies with the requirements mentioned in section “Liability” in the Project standard;
- (b) Describe how it assessed whether the allocation and transfer of liability is feasible and implementable;
- (c) Confirm that the obligation of liability shall reside with the project participant(s) during the operational phase and any time thereafter until a transfer of liability to the host Party has been effected.

8.4.6. Requirements for financial provision

Validation requirement

213. The DOE shall determine whether financial provisions have been put in place by the project participants in accordance with the requirements set out in section “Requirements for financial provision” of the Project standard.

Means of validation

214. The DOE shall:
- (a) Confirm that the project participants have established financial provisions in accordance with the requirements mentioned above;
 - (b) Confirm that the financial provision is sufficient to cover all aspects defined in section “Requirements for financial provision” of the Project standard;
 - (c) Confirm that the type and amount of financial provision is described in the PDD;
 - (d) Confirm that the financial provision shall, in accordance with the laws and regulations of the host Party, be transferable to the host Party upon fulfilment of all obligations of the project participants in accordance with the CCS-related requirements in the Project standard and the laws and regulations of the host Party, or upon insolvency of the project participants.

Reporting requirement

215. The DOE shall:
- (a) Describe the steps taken to assess the relevant information contained in the PDD against the criteria set out in section “Requirements for financial provision” of the Project standard;
 - (b) Describe how the financial provision is sufficient to cover all aspects defined in section “Requirements for financial provision” of the Project standard;
 - (c) Describe the type and amount of the financial provision;
 - (d) Describe the sources of information used to confirm how the financial provision shall be transferred to the host Party, upon fulfilment of all obligations of the project participants in accordance with CCS-related requirements in the Project standard and the laws and regulations of the host Party, or upon insolvency of the project participants;
 - (e) Confirm that the financial provision is guaranteed to be transferable to the host Party upon insolvency of the project participant(s).

8.4.7. Monitoring

Validation requirements

216. The following applies instead of paragraph in sub-section “General” in sub-section “Monitoring plan” in section “Design requirements for all project types” of the Project standard:
217. The DOE shall confirm that the provisions in the PDD for monitoring, including the monitoring plan, are in accordance with the selected methodology, the requirements set out in section “Monitoring” of the Project standard and all other applicable CDM rules and requirements.

Means of validation

218. The DOE shall apply a two-step process to meet the requirement mentioned in paragraph 217 above:
- (a) In order to assess the compliance of the monitoring plan with the CCS modalities and procedures, the DOE shall:
 - (i) Identify the list of parameters, information, provisions for history matching and numerical models used to characterize the geological storage site required as set out in section “Monitoring” of the Project standard by means of a document review;
 - (ii) Confirm that the description of the monitoring plan contains all necessary parameters, information, provisions for history matching and numerical models used to characterize the geological storage site and that the means of monitoring described in the plan complies with the requirements of section “Monitoring” of the Project standard;
 - (b) In order to assess the implementation of the plan the DOE shall, by means of reviewing the documented procedure, interviewing relevant personnel, reviewing project plans and any on-site inspection of the proposed project activity site, determine whether:
 - (i) The monitoring arrangements described in the monitoring plan are feasible within the project design;
 - (ii) The means of implementation of the monitoring plan, including the data management and quality assurance and quality control procedures, are sufficient to ensure that the monitoring plan is in accordance with section “Monitoring” of the Project standard and in all other CDM rules and requirements and the parameters can be reported ex post and verified.
219. The DOE shall use official sources and its local and sectoral expertise to confirm that the project participants have provided the description and analysis of the environmental conditions in the area of geological storage site prior to any storage of carbon dioxide in accordance with paragraph 218 above.

Reporting requirement

220. The DOE shall:

- (a) State its opinion on the compliance of the described monitoring plan with the requirements of section “Monitoring” of the Project standard;
- (b) Describe the steps taken to assess whether the monitoring arrangements described in the monitoring plan are feasible within the project design;
- (c) State its opinion on the project participants’ ability to implement the described monitoring plan;
- (d) State its opinion on the description and analysis of environmental conditions in the area of the geological storage site prior to any storage of carbon dioxide.

8.4.8. Project boundary***Validation requirement***

221. The DOE shall confirm that the PDD description of the project boundary of a proposed CCS CDM project activity includes all above-ground components, including, where applicable, the following:

- (a) The installation where the carbon dioxide is captured;
- (b) Any treatment facilities;
- (c) Transportation equipment, including pipelines and booster stations along a pipeline, or offloading facilities in the case of transportation by ship, rail or road tanker;
- (d) Any reception facilities or holding tanks at the injection site;
- (e) The injection facility;
- (f) Subsurface components, including the geological storage site and all potential sources of seepage, as determined during the characterization and selection of the geological storage site.

222. The DOE shall also confirm that the project boundary of a proposed CCS CDM project activity also encompasses the vertical and lateral limits of the carbon dioxide geological storage site that are expected when the carbon dioxide plume stabilizes over the long term during the closure phase and the post-closure phase.

Means of validation

223. The DOE shall confirm the project boundary based on the documented evidence and shall corroborate it by an on-site inspection.

224. The DOE shall confirm that the project boundary covers all the relevant elements in accordance with section “Project boundary” of the Project standard.

Reporting requirement

225. The DOE shall describe how the validation of the project boundary has been performed, by detailing the documentation assessed (e.g. an engineering design report) and by describing its observations during the on-site inspection undertaken (i.e. observations of the physical site or equipment used in the process).

8.4.9. Approval and authorization***Validation requirement***

226. The DOE shall determine whether the project participants have received written confirmation by the DNA of the host Party of the following:
- (a) That the right to store carbon dioxide in, and gain access to, the proposed geological storage site has been conferred to the relevant project participants;
 - (b) That the host Party agrees to the financial provision, in accordance with section “Requirements for financial provision” of the Project standard, described in the project design document;
 - (c) That the host Party accepts the allocation of liability as proposed in the project design document and the transfer of liability referred to in section “Liability” of the Project standard;
 - (d) Whether the host Party accepts the obligation to address a net reversal of storage in the situation referred to in section “Addressing non-permanence in CCS project activities” of the Project cycle procedure.

Means of validation

227. The DOE shall confirm that the approval of participation has been issued from the relevant DNA and covers all the points mentioned in paragraph 226 above. If the DOE is in doubt, it shall verify with the DNA that the approval is valid for the proposed CDM project participants.

Reporting requirement

228. The validation report shall, for each participant:
- (a) Indicate whether the participation has been authorized by a host Party mentioning all the conditions as specified in the paragraph above;
 - (b) Describe the means of validation employed to support the conclusions.

8.5. Programme of activities/Component project activities******8.5.1^{ter} General**

229. The Board has provided guidance and procedures for registering a PoA as a single project activity. ~~In validating a proposed CDM PoA and any CPAs proposed to be included in the PoA, the DOE shall, in general, apply the relevant means of validation and reporting requirements described in this Standard. However, there are a number of~~ This section 8.5 presents validation requirements unique to PoAs. ~~for which additional~~

~~instructions are provided below.~~ In validating a proposed CDM PoA and any CPAs proposed to be included in the PoA, the DOE shall, based on the type of the PoA and CPAs being validated, apply the relevant requirements in sections 5, 6, 7 and 8.5 and, where applicable, section 8.1, 8.2, 8.3 or 8.4 above. ~~the precise extent of validation required in each of these areas will need to be determined by the DOE based on the type of PoA being validated.~~

8.5.1^{bis}. Description of programme of activities

~~229^{bis}.~~ The DOE shall assess the PoA-DD that is submitted by the coordinating/managing entity and shall confirm:

- (a) The framework developed for the implementation of the proposed CDM PoA, and defining a proposed CDM CPA under the PoA;
- (b) The policy/measure or stated goal that the proposed CDM PoA seeks to promote;
- (c) That the proposed CDM PoA is a voluntary action by the coordinating/managing entity.

~~229^{ter}.~~ The DOE shall assess the boundary of the proposed CDM PoA within which all proposed CDM CPAs included in the PoA will be implemented.

~~229^{quater}.~~ The DOE shall determine whether, in establishing the boundary of the proposed CDM PoA, the project participants have taken into consideration all applicable national and/or sectoral policies and regulations within that chosen boundary.

~~229^{quinque}.~~ The DOE shall confirm that a generic CPA-DD has been prepared for each technology/measure, each methodology and each combination thereof, or that technologies/measures have been combined in one generic CPA-DD in accordance with subject to the relevant requirements-provisions in the Project standard paragraph 198 and 198 bis of the PS.

~~229^{sexies}.~~ The DOE shall also confirm that for proposed CDM PoAs applying more than one technology/measure or more than one methodology, at least one specific-case CPA-DD but no more than five specific case CPA-DDs for each generic CPA-DD has been completed. In cases where not all specific-case CPA-DDs covering all generic CPA-DDs can be provided at the time of the publication of the PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, at least one specific-case CPA-DD but no more than five specific case CPA-DDs corresponding to any of the generic CPA-DDs shall be provided at the time of the publication of the PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation. In this case, at least one specific-case CPA-DD but no more than five specific case CPA-DDs shall be provided for each of the remaining generic CPA-DDs at the time of request for registration of the PoA or after the registration of the PoA. In the latter case, the specific-case CPA-DD shall be validated and submitted for approval by the Board in accordance with section paragraph 4^{bis}(a) of section 8^{ter} below. ~~the post-registration change process as defined in section 6.2 of in the Project cycle procedure.~~

8.5.1. Coordinating/managing entity and participants in a PoA Management system

230. The DOE shall assess the management system described in the PoA-DD in accordance with the “Standard for demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of multiple methodologies for programme of activities”.

8.5.1_{bis} Description of component project activities

230_{bis}. The DOE shall assess a specific-case CPA-DD(s) that is(are) submitted by the coordinating/managing entity and shall confirm that each proposed CDM CPA has:

- (a) Only one host Party;
- (b) Its geographic reference or other means of identification;
- (c) A CPA implementer(s), an entity(ies)/ individual(s) responsible for its operation;
- (d) Been neither registered as a CDM project activity nor included in another registered CDM PoA.

8.5.2. Component project activities design document

231. The DOE shall assess any proposed CDM CPA that the coordinating/managing entity wishes to include in the proposed CDM PoA, to determine whether it complies with **all applicable requirements of the PoA (including** the eligibility criteria) specified in the PoA-DD. The means of validation to determine the compliance with this requirement will be specific to the PoA.
232. The DOE should consider a desk review of the documentation sufficient to determine the compliance in certain instances and also consider follow-up interviews and/or on-site inspections necessary for other types of proposed CDM PoAs.
233. If the proposed CDM PoA is implemented in more than one host Party, the DOE shall confirm whether the coordinating/managing entity has submitted **at least** one specific-case CPA-DD for each host Party.

8.5.3. Description of programme of activities and component project activities

~~234. The DOE shall assess the PoA-DD and the PoA specific-case CPA-DD that are submitted by the coordinating/managing entity and shall confirm:~~

- ~~(a) The framework developed for the implementation of the proposed CDM PoA, and defining a proposed CDM CPA under the PoA;~~
- ~~(b) The policy/measure or stated goal that the proposed CDM PoA seeks to promote;~~
- ~~(c) That the proposed CDM PoA is a voluntary action by the coordinating/managing entity;~~
- ~~(d) That the proposed specific CDM CPA is neither registered as a CDM project activity nor included in another registered CDM PoA.~~

8.5.3_{bis} Eligibility criteria

234_{bis}. The DOE shall assess the eligibility criteria for inclusion of a proposed CDM CPA in the proposed CDM PoA in accordance with the "Standard for demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of multiple methodologies for programme of activities".

8.5.3_{ter}. Application of selected baseline and monitoring methodologies and selected standardized baseline

8.5.4. Application of multiple methodologies

8.5.3_{ter}.1. Application of multiple methodologies

235. The DOE shall assess the application of multiple methodologies in accordance with the “Standard for demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of multiple methodologies for programme of activities”.

~~235_{bis}. The DOE shall confirm that a generic CPA DD has been prepared for each technology/measure, each methodology and each combination thereof, or that technologies/measures have been combined in one generic CPA DD in accordance with subject to the relevant provisions in the Project standard paragraph 198 and 198 bis of the PS.~~

~~235_{ter}. The DOE shall also confirm that for proposed CDM PoAs applying more than one technology/measure or more than one methodology, at least one specific case CPA DD for each generic CPA DD has been completed. In cases where not all specific case CPA DDs covering all generic CPA DDs are can be provided at the time of the publication of the PoA DD for global stakeholder consultation, at least one specific case CPA DD corresponding to any of the generic CPA DDs shall be provided at the time of the publication of the PoA DD for global stakeholder consultation. In this case, one specific case CPA DD shall be provided for each of the remaining generic CPA DDs at the time of request for registration of the PoA or after the registration of the PoA. In the latter case, the specific case CPA DD shall be provided for approval by the Board in accordance with the relevant requirements related to the post registration change process as defined in section 6.2 of in the Project cycle procedure.~~

8.5.5. Boundary for programme of activities in terms of geographical area

~~236. The DOE shall assess the boundary of the proposed CDM PoA within which all proposed CDM CPAs included in the PoA will be implemented.~~

~~237. The DOE shall determine whether, in establishing the boundary of the proposed CDM PoA, the project participants have taken into consideration all applicable national and/or sectoral policies and regulations within that chosen boundary.~~

8.5.6. Start date of component project activity

~~238. The DOE shall confirm that the start date of any proposed CDM CPA is on or after the start date of the proposed CDM PoA. Exceptions apply to proposed A/R CDM CPAs, i.e. the exceptions indicated for proposed A/R CDM project activities under paragraph 136(c) in relevant requirements in the Project standard also apply to proposed A/R CDM CPAs. Any A/R project activity that started after 1 January 2000 but has not been registered as a CDM project activity may be included as a CDM CPA in an A/R CDM PoA after 31 December 2005 as long as the first verification of the A/R CPA occurs after the date of inclusion of this CPA, and the A/R CPA can accrue temporary certified emission reductions (tCERs) or long-term certified emission reductions (lCERs) as of the starting date.~~

8.5.7. Prior consideration of the clean development mechanism

239. If the coordinating/managing entity, for the purpose of determining the start date of the proposed CDM PoA, has chosen to notify the DNA(s) of the host Party(ies) of the PoA and the secretariat in writing of the intention to seek CDM status of the PoA, the DOE shall assess prior consideration of the CDM for the PoA applying the provisions of paragraph 113 above *mutatis mutandis*.

8.5.8. Demonstration of additionality of programme of activities as a whole

8.5.3_{ter}.2 Demonstration of additionality of programme of activities as a whole

240. The DOE shall assess the additionality of a proposed CDM PoA in accordance with the “Standard for demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of multiple methodologies for programme of activities”.

240_{bis}. Paragraphs 111 - 118 above do not apply to a proposed CDM PoA. However, if the coordinating/managing entity, for the purpose of determining the start date of the proposed CDM PoA, has chosen to notify the DNA(s) of the host Party(ies) of the PoA and the secretariat in writing of the intention to seek CDM status of the PoA, the DOE shall confirm whether the start date indicated in the PoA-DD is the date of the notification of the intention by referring to the list of prior consideration notifications from the UNFCCC website and communication between the coordinating/managing entity, the secretariat and the host Party DNA, if the DNA exists. *assess prior consideration of the CDM for the PoA applying the provisions of paragraph 113 above mutatis mutandis.*

8.5.9. Eligibility criteria for inclusion of component project activities in programme of activities

241. The DOE shall assess the eligibility criteria for inclusion of a proposed CDM CPA in the proposed CDM PoA in accordance with the “Standard for demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of multiple methodologies for programme of activities”.

8.5.10. Crediting period of a PoA/CPA Duration and crediting period of programme of activities

8.5.10.1. Duration of programme of activities

242. The DOE shall determine whether the **start date and duration length** of a proposed CDM PoA complies with the **relevant provisions related to specific design requirements on duration of programme of activities and component project activities set out in the Project standard, i.e. that it does not exceed 60 years for an A/R PoA and 28 years for any other PoA.**

8.5.10.2. Duration of component project activities

242_{bis}. The DOE shall confirm that the start date of any proposed CDM CPA is on or after the start date of the proposed CDM PoA. Exceptions apply to proposed A/R CDM CPAs, i.e. the exceptions indicated for proposed A/R CDM project activities under paragraph 136(c) in relevant requirements in the Project standard also apply to proposed A/R CDM CPAs. Any A/R project activity that started after 1 January 2000 but has not been registered as

a CDM project activity may be included as a CDM CPA in an A/R CDM PoA after 31 December 2005 as long as the first verification of the A/R CPA occurs after the date of inclusion of this CPA, and the A/R CPA can accrue temporary certified emission reductions (tCERs) or long-term certified emission reductions (ICERs) as of the starting date.

8.5.11. Monitoring plan for a PoA/CPA

~~243. The DOE shall determine whether the monitoring plan for a CPA is in accordance with the approved monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s) and, where applicable, the approved standardized baseline.~~

8.5.12. Environmental impacts analysis of a PoA

~~244. The DOE shall determine whether an analysis of the environmental impacts of the PoA was undertaken as per the requirements of the CDM modalities and procedures.~~

245. The DOE shall determine whether the analysis of the environmental impacts and, if considered significant by the coordinating/managing entity or the host Party, the environmental impact assessment was(were) carried out for the whole PoA and/or at the CPA level. If the analysis and, if applicable, the assessment was(were) not undertaken for the proposed CDM PoA but conducted at the CPA level, the DOE shall determine whether the analysis of the environmental impacts and, if applicable, the environmental impact assessment was(were) conducted as described in the PoA-DD and the specific-case CPA-DD.

245_{bis}. The following applies to a proposed CDM PoA that includes only small-scale non-A/R CPAs instead of paragraphs 170_{bis}, 170_{ter} and 245 above: The DOE shall determine whether the analysis of the environmental impacts was, if required by the host Party(ies), carried out for the proposed CDM PoA and whether a summary of the analysis and references to the documentation was provided.

8.5.13. Local stakeholder consultation

246. The DOE shall determine whether the local stakeholder consultation process was carried out for the whole PoA and/or at the CPA level. If comments by local stakeholders were invited with regard to the whole proposed CDM PoA, the DOE shall determine how these comments were invited; whether the summary of the comments received is complete and how due account was taken of all comments received.

247. If the local stakeholder consultation is conducted at the CPA level, the DOE shall determine whether it is in accordance with the level of consultation specified by the coordinating/managing entity and whether the local stakeholder comments were taken into account and described in the PoA-DD and the specific-case CPA-DD.

8.5.14. ~~Determination of occurrences of a~~ Debundling ~~under~~ of small-scale component project activities ~~programme of activities~~²⁹

248. The DOE shall ascertain that the proposed small-scale CDM CPA ~~of a PoA~~ is not a debundled component of a large-scale CDM project activity in accordance with the “Guidelines on assessment of debundling for SSC project activities”.

8.5.15. ~~Inclusion or renewal of a crediting period of component project activities in~~ programme of activities

- ~~249. The DOE shall assess the proposed CDM CPA and the specific case CPA DD against the latest version of the CDM PoA to determine whether the CPA meets the requirements of the PoA.~~

8_{bis}. General validation requirements on post-registration activities**8_{bis}.1. General**

1. The DOE contracted by project participants ~~or a coordinating/managing entity~~ to validate the post-registration changes ~~referred to in sections 8_{bis}.2. – 8_{bis}.7. and 8_{ter}.1. – 8_{ter}.2.2. below or the post-registration inclusion of CPAs referred to in section 8_{ter}.2.3. below~~ shall be accredited to the validation function for the specific CDM sectoral scope.
- ~~1_{bis}. The DOE shall apply the requirements in section 7.3 above mutatis mutandis to validate the information provided by the project participants or the coordinating/ managing entity.~~
2. The DOE shall determine whether the ~~post-registration~~ changes do not require prior approval by the Board in accordance with appendix 1 of the Project standard.
3. ~~Where the changes are identified by or submitted to the DOE contracted to conduct the verification and certification, the DOE shall determine whether the changes are solely of a type(s) listed in appendix 1 of the Project standard and If the DOE determines that the proposed or actual post-registration changes to the registered CDM project activity or PoA and/or CPA comply with the relevant CDM requirements, the DOE shall issue a positive validation opinion and submit a request for approval of changes either prior to or together with the request for issuance in accordance with relevant requirements related to changes to the registered CDM project activity or PoA in the Project cycle procedure.~~
 - ~~(a) In such cases, the DOE shall submit the changes as part of the request for issuance in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.~~
 - ~~(b) In all other cases, the DOE shall submit the changes via the request for approval of post registration changes process of the Project cycle procedure.~~

²⁹ If each of the independent subsystems/measures (e.g. biogas digester, solar home system) included in the proposed CDM CPA ~~of a PoA~~ is no larger than 1% of the small-scale thresholds defined by the methodology applied, i.e. 150 kW installed capacity or 0.6 GWh annual energy savings or 0.6 ktCO₂e annual emission reductions, then that CPA ~~of the PoA~~ is exempted from the de-bundling check, i.e. is considered as not being a debundled component of a large-scale activity.

4. If the DOE determines that the proposed or actual post-registration changes to the registered CDM project activity **or PoA and/or CPA** do not comply with the relevant CDM requirements, the DOE shall issue a negative validation opinion **or should request guidance from the Board.**
- 4_{bis}. If the DOE determines that the first or non-first proposed specific-case CDM CPA(s), which is(are) submitted for the inclusion in the registered CDM PoA, complies with the latest version of the registered CDM PoA and the applicable requirements in accordance with section 8_{ter}.2.3. below, it shall:
 - (a) For the first proposed specific-case CDM CPA(s), issue a positive validation opinion and submit a request for approval of changes in accordance with relevant requirements in the Project cycle procedure; or
 - (a) For the non-first proposed specific-case CDM CPA, include the CPA into the PoA in accordance with the relevant requirements in the Project cycle procedure.
5. ~~Where the changes are submitted to a DOE prior to the commencement of verification, the DOE shall submit the changes via the request for approval of post registration changes process of the Project cycle procedure.~~
6. For the validation of the post-registration changes or the inclusion of a CPA(s), the DOE shall prepare a validation report for post-registration changes or a validation report(s) for the inclusion of CPAs using the valid version of the applicable validation report form for post-registration changes or of the validation report form for the inclusion of CPAs, taking into account the grace period of the form if it has been revised.
7. When completing the validation report form for post-registration changes or the validation report for the inclusion of CPAs, the DOE shall follow the instructions therein.
8. The DOE shall determine whether:
 - (a) The revised PDD or revised PoA-DD (with its revised generic CPA-DD part) and specific-case CPA-DD, which was(were) submitted for the request for approval of changes (both track-change and clean versions), was(were) completed using the valid version of the applicable PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD form; or
 - (b) The specific-case CPA-DD, which was submitted for the validation on the inclusion of the CPA, was completed using the valid version of the applicable CPA-DD form.
9. If the project participants or coordinating/managing entity used the later valid version of the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD form for the revised PDD or revised PoA-DD and specific-case CPA-DD than the version of the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD form of the registered PDD or PoA-DD and specific-case CPA-DD, the DOE shall determine whether information transferred to the later valid version of the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD form is materially the same as that in the registered PDD or PoA-DD and specific-case CPA-DD.
10. In its validation report for post-registration changes or validation report(s) for the inclusion of CPAs, the DOE shall:
 - (a) Provide all its applied approaches, findings and conclusion on:

- (i) The compliance of the revised PDD, the revised PoA-DD and specific-case CPA-DD (for post-registration changes), or the specific-case CPA-DD (for inclusion of CPAs) with the valid version of the applicable form(s) and instructions therein, as applicable;
 - (ii) Information transferred to the latter valid version of the PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD form is materially the same as that in the registered PDD or PoA-DD and specific-case CPA-DD, as applicable;
 - (iii) The requirements relevant to the proposed or actual post-registration changes in sections 8_{bis}.2. – 8_{bis}.7. and 8_{ter}.1. – 8_{ter}.2.2. below or to the proposed inclusion of a CPA(s) in section 8_{ter}.2.3. below, as applicable;
- (b) Report on all items listed in paragraph 155 above except sub-paragraph 155(b) above.

8_{bis}.2. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, monitoring methodology or standardized baseline

~~Verification~~ Validation requirement

11. The DOE shall determine whether there are deviations from the monitoring plan in the registered PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD, or the monitoring plan in an approved revised PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD (hereinafter referred to as the registered monitoring plan), the applied methodology and/or the applied standardized baseline, and, if there are, determine whether the deviations comply with the relevant requirements in the Project standard.

Means of ~~verification~~ validation

12. If the DOE identifies that the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity have deviated from the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology, and/or the applied standardized baseline, and where the provisions of appendix 1 of the Project standard do not apply, the DOE shall seek prior approval from the Board with respect to the acceptability of the deviations in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.
13. The DOE shall determine whether the deviation is likely to lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions. In cases where the DOE considers that the deviation will lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions, the DOE shall request the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity to apply conservative assumptions or discount factors to the calculations to the extent required to ensure that emission reductions will not be over-estimated as a result of the deviation.
14. For cases where a deviation from the registered monitoring plan may be applicable to the monitoring period under verification, and part of the subsequent monitoring period, the DOE shall determine the exact period to which the deviation applies.

Reporting requirement

15. Where the deviation is identified during verification, the DOE shall state its opinion on whether the deviation complies with the relevant requirements related to the temporary deviation from the registered monitoring plan, monitoring methodology or standardized

baseline in the Project standard. indicate in the verification report how the monitoring report reflects the application of the approved guidance from the Board regarding the deviation from the provisions of the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology and/or the applied standardized baseline.

16. Where the deviation is identified prior to verification, the DOE shall state its opinion on whether the deviation reflects the application of the approved guidance from the Board regarding the deviation from the provisions of the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology and/or the applied standardized baseline and as per the applicable provisions of the Project standard.

8_{bis}.3. Corrections

~~Verification~~ Validation requirement

17. The DOE shall determine that any corrections to project or programme information or parameters fixed at validation, as described in the registered PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD, made by project participants or the coordinating/managing entity in a revised PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD comply with the relevant requirements in the Project standard.

Means of verification validation

18. If the DOE identifies that the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity have made corrections to project or programme information or parameters fixed determined at validation, the DOE shall determine whether:
- (a) The corrected information is an accurate reflection of actual project or programme information; and/or
 - (b) The corrected parameters are in accordance with the applied methodology, the registered monitoring plan and/or the applied standardized baseline.

Reporting requirement

19. The DOE shall state how the corrected information accurately reflects the actual project or programme information and/or how the corrected parameters reflect the application of the applied methodology, the registered monitoring plan and/or the applied standardized baseline.

8_{bis}.4. Changes to the start date of the crediting period

~~Verification~~ Validation requirement

20. If the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity wish to change the start date of the crediting period of the registered CDM project activity or included CPA in accordance with section 13.8 relevant requirements in the Project standard, the DOE shall determine whether the proposed changes result in a less conservative baseline.

Reporting requirement

21. The DOE shall state its opinion on whether the change complies with indicate if the relevant requirements related to the changes to the start date of the crediting period in

the Project standard have been met and shall submit a request for post registration changes in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.

8_{bis}.5. Inclusion of a monitoring plan to a registered project activity and programme of activities

Validation requirement

22. The DOE shall determine whether there is a monitoring plan that has been proposed to be included to the registered PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD for which the delayed submission of the monitoring plan was chosen by the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity at the time of the registration of the project activity or PoA or post-registration inclusion of CPAs, and, if there is, determine whether the monitoring plan complies with the relevant requirements in the Project standard.

Means of validation

23. The DOE shall confirm that the registered PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD does not contain the information related to the monitoring plan and states the decision of the project participants or coordinating/managing entity to delay the submission of the monitoring plan.

24. The DOE shall follow the relevant requirements related to validation of the monitoring plan in section 7.12.9.2 above to validate the monitoring plan in the revised PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD.

Reporting requirement

25. The DOE shall follow the relevant requirements related to validation of the monitoring plan in section 7.12.9.2 above to report on the validation of the monitoring plan in the revised PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD.

8_{bis}.6. Permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan, monitoring methodology or standardized baseline

~~Verification~~ Validation requirement

26. The DOE shall determine whether there are permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology and/or the standardized baseline, and, if there are, determine whether the permanent changes comply with the relevant requirements in the Project standard.

Means of ~~verification~~ validation

27. The DOE shall determine whether the changes to the registered monitoring plan described in the revised registered PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD proposed by the project participants are in compliance with the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline and do not reduce the level of accuracy of the monitoring compared with the requirements contained in the registered monitoring plan.

28. In cases where the proposed changes refer to a later valid version of the applied methodology and/or the applied standardized baseline in the registered PDD, PoA-DD or

CPA-DD, the DOE shall determine whether the application of **all the requirements in** any later **valid** version of the applied methodology, **any applicable tool(s)** and/or the applied standardized baseline does not impact the conservativeness of the monitoring and verification process, including the related emission reduction calculations.

~~29. If the DOE identifies that the project participants are unable to implement the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD and it will not be possible to monitor the registered CDM project activity in accordance with a monitoring plan that would comply with the applied methodology, any applicable tool(s), and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline or the relevant provisions of appendix 1 of the Project standard, the DOE shall request guidance from the Board concerning the acceptability of the permanent changes in accordance with the section on post registration changes in the Project cycle procedure.~~

30. The DOE shall determine whether the permanent changes are likely to lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions. In cases where the DOE considers that the permanent changes will lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions, the DOE shall request the project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** to apply conservative assumptions or discount factors to the calculations to the extent required to ensure that emission reductions will not be over-estimated as a result of the permanent change.

Reporting requirement

~~31. Where permanent changes are identified during verification, the DOE shall state its opinion on whether the permanent changes comply with the relevant requirements related to indicate in the verification report how the revised PDD reflects the application of the guidance from the Board regarding the permanent changes from the provisions of the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology and/or the applied standardized baseline in the Project standard.~~

~~32. Where permanent changes are identified prior to verification, the DOE shall state its assessment opinion on whether the permanent changes reflect the application of the approved guidance from the Board regarding the deviation from the provisions of the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology and/or the standardized baseline.~~

8_{bis}.7. Changes to the project design of a registered project activity **or programme design of a registered programme of activities**

Verification Validation requirement

33. The DOE shall determine whether there are proposed or actual changes to the project design of a registered CDM project activity **or an included CDM CPA or to the programme design of a registered CDM PoA**, and, if there are, determine whether the changes comply with the relevant requirements in the Project standard.

Means of ~~verification~~ validation

~~34. If the DOE identifies that the project design in the implementation or operation of the project activity does not conform with the description contained in the registered PDD or the relevant provisions of appendix 1 of the Project standard, the DOE shall request guidance from the Board concerning the acceptability of the proposed or actual changes~~

~~in accordance with the section on post registration changes in the Project cycle procedure.~~

35. In case of actual changes, the DOE shall, by means of an on-site inspection and review of the submitted revised PDD, **PoA-DD or CPA-DD** by the project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity**, which describes the nature and extent of the actual changes, determine whether this description accurately reflects the implementation, operation and monitoring of the modified CDM project activity, **PoA or CPA**.
36. The DOE shall conduct an on-site inspection to assess the impacts of the actual changes on the compliance of the monitoring plan, the level of accuracy of the monitoring activity, the applied monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s) and/or, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline.
37. The DOE shall, by means of reviewing the revised PDD, **PoA-DD or CPA-DD** against applicable additionality and methodological requirements, determine whether the proposed or actual changes would adversely affect the conclusions of the validation report of the registered PDD, **PoA-DD or CPA-DD** with regard to:
 - (a) Additionality of the registered CDM project activity **or PoA**;
 - (b) Scale of the registered CDM project activity **or included CDM CPA**;
 - (c) Applicability and application of the approved baseline methodology and, where applicable, the approved standardized baseline under which the **registered** CDM project activity, **PoA or CPA** has been registered **or included**; or
 - (d) The compliance of the monitoring plan with the applied monitoring methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline;
 - (e) The eligibility criteria of the registered CDM PoA.**
38. If the proposed or actual changes affect the additionality of the registered CDM project activity, then the DOE shall confirm that, if:
 - (a) Investment analysis **has been used to demonstrate additionality**, project participants have only modified the key parameters in the original spreadsheet calculations affected by the proposed or actual changes to the project activity;
 - (b) Only barriers have been claimed to demonstrate additionality, project participants have demonstrated that the barriers are still valid under the new circumstances.
39. The following applies to a registered CDM project activity using an approved standardized baseline that standardizes additionality instead of paragraph **38 of section 8_{bis} above**: If the proposed or actual changes affect the additionality of the project activity, then the DOE shall confirm that the project activity complies with the positive list of the applied standardized baseline in the registered PDD.
40. The DOE shall confirm that the applied methodology including applied tools and/or the applied standardized baseline do not impact on the conservativeness of the monitoring and verification process and the related emission reduction calculations in cases where:
 - (a) The proposed or actual changes impact on the implementation of the registered CDM project activity **or PoA or the included CDM CPA**;

- (b) The original methodology and/or the original standardized baseline would no longer be applicable; and
 - (c) The project participant **or the coordinating/managing entity** applies **all the requirements in:**
 - (i) **Any** later **valid** version of the methodology and/or the standardized baseline; or
 - (ii) Another methodology and/or another standardized baseline that is(are) applicable to the registered CDM project activity **or PoA**.
41. The DOE shall assess whether the revised PDD, **PoA-DD or CPA-DD** complies with **all the requirements in:**
- (a) The applied methodology, tools and/or standardized baseline;
 - (b) Any later **valid** version of the methodology and/or the standardized baseline; or
 - (c) ~~The requirements of a~~ another methodology and/or another standardized baseline that is(are) applicable to the registered CDM project activity **or PoA**.

Reporting requirement

42. ~~Where the proposed or actual changes are identified during verification, the DOE shall state its opinion on whether the proposed or actual changes comply with the relevant requirements in the Project standard related to the changes to the project design of a registered CDM project activity or an included CDM CPA or to the programme design of a registered CDM PoA. how the revised PDD reflects the application of the approved guidance from the Board regarding the proposed or actual changes from the provisions of the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology and/or the applied standardized baseline and as per the applicable provisions of the Project standard.~~
43. ~~Where the permanent changes are identified prior to verification, the DOE shall state its assessment opinion on whether the permanent changes reflect the application of the approved guidance from the Board regarding the deviation from the provisions of the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology and/or the applied standardized baseline and as per the applicable provisions of the Project standard.~~
44. The DOE shall provide its opinion containing:
- (a) A description of the proposed or actual changes as compared to the description in the registered PDD, **PoA-DD or CPA-DD**;
 - (b) An assessment on when the changes occurred, reasons for these changes taking place, whether the changes would have been known prior to registration of the registered CDM project activity **or PoA or to inclusion of the CDM CPA**, and how the changes would impact on the overall operation/ability of the project activity, **PoA or CPA** to deliver emission reductions as stated in the PDD, **PoA-DD or CPA-DD**;

- (c) An assessment regarding whether the changes would adversely affect the conclusions of the validation report of the registered PDD, **PoA-DD or CPA-DD** with regard to:
 - (i) Additionality of the registered CDM project activity **or PoA**;
 - (ii) Scale of the registered CDM project activity **or included CDM CPA**;
 - (iii) Applicability and application of approved baseline methodology and, where applicable, the approved standardized baseline under which the project activity, **PoA or CPA** has been registered **or included** or of the later **valid** version of the applied methodology and/or the applied standardized baseline;
 - (iv) The compliance of the monitoring plan with the applied monitoring methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline; or
 - (v) The level of accuracy of the monitoring compared with the requirements contained in the registered monitoring plan.
45. In validating the revised PDD, **PoA-DD or CPA-DD** containing the proposed or actual changes, and in preparing the **validation** opinion, the DOE shall include information on how:
- (a) The proposed revisions ensure that the level of accuracy and completeness^{29bis} in the monitoring and verification process is not reduced as a result of the revision. The DOE shall, using objective evidence, assess the accuracy and completeness of each proposed revision to the **registered** monitoring plan, including the frequency of measurements, the quality of monitoring equipment (e.g. calibration requirements, the quality assurance and quality control procedures);
 - (b) The proposed revisions comply with the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline. In cases where the proposed revision refers to a later **valid** version of the applied methodology and/or the applied standardized baseline, the DOE shall confirm that this application does not compromise the conservativeness in the monitoring and verification process and of the emission reduction calculations;
 - (c) The findings of previous verification **and certification** reports, if any, have been taken into account.

46. If the DOE determines that the proposed or actual changes to the project activity comply with the requirements in the Project standard, the DOE shall submit the documents to the Board following the Project cycle procedure for post registration changes.

47. If the DOE determines that the proposed or actual changes to the project activity do not comply with the requirements in the Project standard, the DOE shall issue a negative validation assessment opinion or should request guidance from the Board.

^{29bis}

Completeness refers to inclusion of all relevant information for assessment of GHG emissions reductions and the information supporting the methods applied as required. For example, if the DOE identifies an on-site generator for emergency use which was not included in the **registered** monitoring plan during the verification process, the monitoring of fuel consumption of this generator should be included in the monitoring plan via this procedure.

8_{ter}. Specific validation requirements on post-registration activities

8_{ter}.1. Afforestation and reforestation project activities

8_{ter}.1.1. Types of changes specific to afforestation or reforestation project activities

Verification-Validation requirement

1. The DOE shall determine whether there are types of changes specific to registered afforestation or reforestation CDM project activities, and, if there are, determine whether the changes comply with the relevant requirements in the Project standard.

Means of verification validation

2. In case of actual changes, the DOE shall, by means of an on-site inspection(s), interview with relevant personnel and/or desk review of the revised PDD submitted by the project participants, which describes the nature and extent of the actual changes, determine whether this description accurately reflects the implementation, operation or monitoring of the modified registered CDM project activity.

Reporting requirement

3. In case of actual changes, the DOE shall determine whether the changes in the revised PDD are complete and accurate reflection of actual project information.
4. Where the changes are identified during verification, the DOE shall state indicate in the verification report how the changes in the revised PDD do not require prior approval by the Board in accordance with relevant requirements in appendix 1 of the Project standard.
5. Where the changes are identified prior to verification, the DOE shall state its opinion on whether the changes do not require prior approval by the Board in accordance with a relevant requirement in appendix 1 of the Project standard.

8_{ter}.2. Programme of activities

8_{ter}.2.1. Changes to programme design of programme of activities

8_{ter}.2.1.1. General

6. The DOE shall determine whether the programme design of the registered CDM PoA has been amended post-registration only for one of or more than one of the following purposes:
 - (a) To expand the geographic coverage or to include additional host Parties;
 - (b) To update revise the eligibility criteria for the inclusion of CDM CPAs;
 - (c) To remove methodologies and/or standardized baselines from the registered CDM PoA; and/or
 - (d) To change or add technologies/measures.

7. Paragraphs 35 and 36 of section 8_{bis} above do not apply to sections 8_{ter-2.1.2.}, 8_{ter-2.1.3.} and 8_{ter-2.1.4} below.

8_{ter-2.1.2.} Expansion of geographic coverage or inclusion of additional host Parties

8. If the registered CDM PoA has been amended to expand the geographic coverage or to include additional host Parties, then the DOE shall assess and confirm that:
- (a) The **existing** registered PoA-DD has been revised to reflect the changes, in particular the eligibility criteria for inclusion of CDM CPAs;
 - (b) The baseline established in the PoA-DD is applicable to the expanded PoA boundary;
 - (c) In the case of inclusion of additional host Parties:
 - (i) **Each** DNAs of the new host Parties issued **a** letters of approval in accordance with relevant requirements in sections 7.6, 7.7 and 7.8 above for the PoA and a letters of authorization for the coordinating/managing entity where the amended PoA boundary includes additional host Parties;
 - (ii) **At least One** specific-case CPA-DD for each **new** host Party has been submitted and it meets the eligibility criteria specified in the PoA-DD;

8_{ter-2.1.3.} Revisions to eligibility criteria for inclusion of component project activities

9. If the registered CDM PoA has been amended to **update-revise** the eligibility criteria for the inclusion of CPAs, then the DOE shall assess and confirm that:
- (a) The **update revision** of the eligibility criteria complies with provisions and conditions set out in **the Project standard and** the “Standard for demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of multiple methodologies for programme of activities”;
 - (b) The **updated revised** eligibility criteria meet the requirements of the methodologies and, where applicable, the standardized baselines that are applied in the PoA;
 - (c) The registered PoA-DD is revised appropriately to reflect the **updated revised** eligibility criteria for inclusion of CDM CPAs.

8_{ter-2.1.4.} Removal of methodologies and/or standardized baselines

10. If the registered CDM PoA has been amended to remove approved baseline and monitoring methodologies and/or standardized baselines, then the DOE shall assess and confirm that:
- (a) The change only involves the removal and no addition of methodologies and/or standardized baselines;
 - (b) The removal of the methodologies and/or standardized baselines does not affect the physical design of and the end-use service provided by the CDM CPAs that apply the approved methodologies **and/or, where applicable,** standardized

baseline that remain (i.e. the methodologies ~~and/or~~, where applicable, standardized baselines that were not removed).

8_{ter}-2.1.5. Change or addition of technologies/ measures

11. The DOE shall determine whether the registered PoA has been amended post-registration to change the programme design due to the change or addition of technologies/measures with or without modification or addition of applied methodologies in the registered PoA-DD. Where the programme design has been changed, the DOE shall assess and confirm that the changes:

- (a) Allow a shift to more efficient less GHG-intensive or at least equivalent technologies/measures; or
- (b) Introduce complementary measures/technologies involving mass and/or energy transfer to/from the originally registered technology/measure (e.g. addition or change of Type I methodologies in a registered PoA primarily applying Type III methodologies).

12. The DOE shall determine whether the changes do not cover the addition of technologies/measures and methodologies that are not related to the technologies and methodologies included in the originally registered PoA.

8_{ter}-2.2. Changes to project design of generic component project activities or specific-case component project activities

8_{ter}-2.2.1. Modification to or addition of technologies/ measures

13. The DOE shall determine whether the registered generic CPA and ~~the included~~ specific-case CPA have been amended post-registration to change the project design due to modifications to or addition of technologies/measures. Where the project design has been changed, the DOE shall assess and confirm that:

- (a) The applicability conditions of the applied methodologies including applied tools and, where applicable, the applied standardized baselines cover the modified or added technologies/measures (i.e. the modified or added technologies/measure are applicable under the applied methodologies including applied tools and, where applicable, the applied standardized baselines);
- (b) The modified or added technologies/measures were **either:**
 - (i) Already included in the originally registered PoA-DD and the eligibility criteria for these technologies/measures had been specified in the originally registered PoA-DD **or**
 - (ii) **Subsequently included in the revised PoA-DD following the submission by the coordinating/managing entity and approval by the Board of a request for approval of changes post-registration changes in accordance with the Project cycle procedure;**
- (c) The ~~amendments~~ **modification or addition** complies with all the applicable requirements, including those set out in the Project standard, the “Standard for demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of

multiple methodologies for programme of activities”, the applied methodologies and, where applicable, the applied standardized baselines.

8_{ter}-2.3. Inclusion or renewal of a crediting period of component project activities in programme of activities

14. The DOE shall assess whether the proposed specific-case CDM CPA complies with the latest version of the registered CDM PoA (with its generic CPA-DD part), including the eligibility criteria for inclusion of the CPA in the PoA, and the applicable requirements if:

(a) The first specific-case CDM CPA(s) (i.e. at least one but no more than five specific-case CDM CPA(s)) has(have) been proposed to be included to the generic CPA of the registered CDM PoA for which no proposed specific-case CPA-DD was submitted at the time of request for registration of the PoA; The DOE shall determine whether the registered CDM PoA has been amended post-registration to add specific-case CPA-DDs to the PoA. Where specific-case CPA-DDs were added, the DOE shall assess and confirm that the specific-case CPA-DDs that were added correspond to generic CPA-DDs specified in the latest version of the registered CDM PoA for which specific case CPA-DDs had not been submitted at the time of request for registration of the PoA.

(b) The completed specific-case CPA-DD of the non-first proposed specific-case CDM CPA, which is not the first proposed specific-case CDM CPA(s) referred to in sub-paragraph (a) above, has been forwarded to the DOE for the inclusion of the CPA in the registered CDM PoA in accordance with the relevant requirements in the Project cycle procedure. The DOE shall assess the proposed CDM and the specific case CPA-DD against the latest version of the CDM PoA to determine whether the CPA meets the requirements of the PoA.

15. If the coordinating/managing entity has chosen to delay the submission of the monitoring plan for the first or non-first proposed specific-case CDM CPA(s), the DOE shall apply, mutatis mutandis, the relevant requirements in section 7.12.9.2 above to validate the section for the monitoring plan in the specific-case CPA-DD(s) when assessing the compliance in paragraph 14 of section 8_{ter} above.

8_{ter}-2.4. Changes to modalities of communication

16. Section 8_{bis}-1. above does not apply to the changes to modalities of communication except paragraph 1_{bis} of section 8_{bis}-1. above.

17. If, subsequent to the registration of the CDM PoA, the coordinating/managing entity has changed, then the DOE undertaking the next inclusion of a proposed CDM CPA, the DOE that submits the next request for issuance or the DOE that submits the next post-registration change request, whichever is earlier, shall submit a validation opinion regarding the compliance of the new coordinating/managing entity with the requirements in the Project standard to the UNFCCC secretariat in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.

(a) — New letter(s) of authorization from each respective host Party stating the change in coordinating/managing entity;

(b) A confirmation from the new coordinating/managing entity that the PoA will be developed and implemented with the same set framework as originally described in the CDM PoA-DD; and

(c) A validation opinion regarding the compliance of the new coordinating/managing entity with the requirements of the PoA management system as specified in the "Standard for demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of multiple methodologies for programme of activities".

18. Notwithstanding the case referred to in paragraph 17 of section 8^{ter.} above, the DOE contracted by the incoming coordinating/managing entity shall submit the validation opinion to the UNFCCC secretariat in accordance with the Project cycle procedure if the coordinating/managing entity wishes to submit the validation opinion before the next inclusion of a proposed CDM CPA, the next request for issuance or the next post-registration change request.

9. General verification requirements

9.1. Objective of CDM verification

250. The DOE shall conduct a thorough, independent assessment of the registered CDM project activities or PoA and CPA.

9.2. General^v Verification approach

9.2.1^{bis.} General

251. In carrying out its verification work, the DOE shall determine whether the registered CDM project activity or PoA and CPA comply with the requirements of paragraph 62 of the CDM modalities and procedures.

251^{bis.} If the DOE has performed a validation activity (including the renewal of crediting period or PoA, inclusion of a proposed CDM CPA in a registered CDM PoA, re-registration of a de-registered CDM project activity and re-inclusion of an excluded CDM CPA) for the registered CDM project activity or PoA and wishes to perform a verification for the same project activity or PoA, it shall obtain the authorization to do so from the Board in accordance with the Project cycle procedure. However, the same DOE may perform a verification without obtaining the authorization from the Board to do so for:

(a) A registered small-scale CDM project activity and a registered small-scale A/R CDM project activity for which it has performed the validation activity;

(b) Any registered CDM project activity or PoA for which it has performed an assessment the validation of post-registration changes. under both cases referred to in paragraphs 294 and 294^{bis.} below.

251^{ter.} The DOE shall make publicly available the monitoring report received from the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity in accordance with the Project cycle procedure except when the host Party's DNA withdraws its approval of the registered CDM project activities or PoAs and/or its authorization of project participants in accordance with the "Procedure: Process for dealing with letters from DNAs that withdraw approval/authorization".

252. The DOE shall ensure that only verification activities undertaken after the publication of the monitoring report on the UNFCCC CDM website shall be used as a basis for the DOE to conclude their verification and submit a request for issuance of CERs to the Board.³⁰
253. ~~The DOE shall make publicly available the monitoring report received from the project participants in accordance with the Project cycle procedure. Unless the Board has agreed to grant an exception, a DOE shall not perform verification functions on a project activity for which it has performed the function of validation/registration.~~³¹
254. The DOE shall assess both quantitative and qualitative information on emission reductions provided in the project **or programme** documentation.³²
255. The DOE shall assess and determine whether the implementation and operation of the registered CDM project activity **or PoA and CPA**, and the steps taken to report emission reductions comply with the CDM criteria and relevant guidance provided by the Board. This assessment shall involve a review of relevant documentation as well as, **as appropriate**, an on-site inspection(s). **For an on-site inspection(s), the DOE may apply a sampling approach in accordance with the "Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities".**
256. The DOE shall assess whether the data collection system meets the requirements of the **registered** monitoring plan as per the applied methodology including applicable tool(s) and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline.
257. In addition to the monitoring documentation the DOE shall review:
- (a) The registered PDD **or PoA-DD and CPA-DD** ~~and the monitoring plan~~, including ~~the registered monitoring plan any approved revised monitoring plan~~ and/or the changes from the registered PDD, **PoA-DD or CPA-DD**, and the corresponding validation opinion;
 - (b) The validation report;
 - (c) Previous verification **and certification** reports, if any;
 - (d) The applied monitoring methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline;
 - ~~(e) The monitoring report to verify that it is as per the standardized format;~~³³

³⁰ See EB 60 report, paragraph 101.

³¹ ~~For small-scale CDM project activities, the same DOE may undertake validation, and verification and certification.~~

³² Quantitative information comprises the reported numbers in the monitoring report. Qualitative information comprises information on internal management controls, calculation procedures, procedures for transfer of data, frequency of the monitoring reports, and review and internal audit of calculations.

³³ ~~See EB 54 report, annex 34, where the CDM Executive Board has provided a standardized format for the monitoring report to improve consistency in reporting of the implementation and monitoring of the project activity by project participants.~~

- (f) Any other information and references relevant to the project activity's emission reductions or net removals of the registered CDM project activity or included CDM CPA (e.g. IPCC reports, data on electricity generation in the national grid or laboratory analysis and national regulations).

258. In addition to reviewing the monitoring documentation, the DOE shall determine whether the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity have addressed the FARs identified during validation or previous verification(s).

258_{bis}. The DOE shall request the secretariat to withdraw the published monitoring report in accordance with the Project cycle procedure, if the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity requested the DOE to do so before the submission of a request for issuance.

9.2.1. Quality of evidence

259. When verifying the reported emission reductions, the DOE shall confirm that there is an audit trail that contains the evidence and records that validate or invalidate the stated figures. It shall include the source documents that form the basis for assumptions and other information underlying the GHG data.

260. When assessing the audit trail, the DOE shall:

- (a) Address whether there is sufficient evidence available, both in terms of frequency (time period between evidence) and coverage (in covering the full monitoring period);
- (b) Address the source and nature of the evidence (external or internal, oral or documented);
- (c) Cross-check the monitoring report against other sources such as comparable information, where available, from sources other than those used in the monitoring report to determine whether the stated figures are correct.

261. The DOE shall only certify emission reductions that are based on verifiable evidence.

9.2.1_{bis}. Application of materiality

9.2.1_{bis}.1. General

1. The concept of materiality is applicable to the verification of all types of registered CDM project activities. It is not applicable to:

- (a) The verification of registered CDM PoAs;
- (b) Uncertainties related to measurement;
- (c) Addressing temporary deviations and permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan, or applied methodology or standardized baseline, regardless of whether corresponding emission reductions or removals are above or below materiality thresholds.

2. A DOE planning and conducting a verification using the concept of materiality shall achieve a reasonable level of assurance that the reported emission reductions is free

from material errors, omissions or misstatements in accordance with paragraphs 3–4~~5~~
14 of section 9.2.1^{bis} below.^{33bis}

3. An omission, misstatement, or erroneous reporting of information is material if it might lead, at an aggregated level, to an overestimation of the total emission reductions or removals achieved by a registered CDM project activity equal to or higher than the following thresholds:
 - (a) 0.5 per cent of the emission reductions or removals for registered CDM project activities achieving a total emission reduction or removal of equal to or more than 500,000 tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year;^{33ter}
 - (b) 1 per cent of the emission reductions or removals for registered CDM project activities achieving a total emission reduction or removal between 300,000 and 500,000 tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year;
 - (c) 2 per cent of the emission reductions or removals for registered large-scale CDM project activities achieving a total emission reduction or removal of 300,000 tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year or less;
 - (d) 5 per cent of the emission reductions or removals for registered small-scale CDM project activities other than registered CDM project activities covered under subparagraph (e) below;
 - (e) 10 per cent of the emission reductions or removals for the type of registered CDM project activities referred to in decision 3/CMP.6, paragraph 38 (referred to as microscale project activities).
4. Recognizing that circumstances may exist that could cause the information reported by project participants to be materially misstated, the DOE should plan and perform verifications with an attitude of professional scepticism and rely on their professional judgement while applying the concept of materiality.
5. The application of materiality and reasonable level of assurance imply that some data or information may not be checked. However, the DOE should design their verification and sampling plans to detect all material errors, omissions or misstatements, and any unchecked data or information should not contain any material errors, omissions or misstatements. A DOE's verification opinion applies to 100 per cent of the data and information even if the DOE may not have checked the entire data set and information.
6. Applying materiality does not mean that identified errors are not corrected; if an error, omission or misstatement is identified by the DOE, regardless of whether it is material or not, the DOE shall request project participants to address it.

9.2.1^{bis}.2. Consideration of materiality in planning the verification

7. The DOE should:

^{33bis} For additional guidance and examples of the application of materiality in the verification, refer to the "Guideline: Application of materiality in verifications".

^{33ter} A year refers to a period of 12 consecutive months.

- (a) Identify the materiality threshold in paragraph 3 of section 9.2.1^{bis} above that corresponds to the amount of emission reductions or removals the specific type of registered CDM project activity will achieve;
 - (b) Understand the environment in which the registered CDM project activity operates, the sources of project emissions within the project boundary and the leakage, the monitoring activities, the equipment used to monitor or measure activity data, the origin and application of data used to calculate or measure the emissions, data flow, the internal quality control system, and the overall organization with respect to monitoring and reporting^{33quater};
 - (c) Conduct a risk assessment to identify and assess the risks of individual or aggregated material errors, omissions or misstatements that may occur within the threshold based on elements in ~~paragraph 7 of section 9.2.1^{bis}~~ and subparagraphs (a) and (b) above;
 - (d) Design verification plans, audit procedures^{33quinque} and sampling plans whose type, timing^{33sexies} and extent are based on and are responsive to the assessed risks of material errors, omissions or misstatements.
8. The materiality thresholds apply to the total emission reductions or removals actually achieved. When planning a verification, the DOE should apply the applicable materiality threshold to the reported total emission reductions or removals. If, as a result of the verification, the initial reported total emission reductions or removals is revised, the DOE should reapply the materiality threshold to the revised total emission reductions or removals and, if needed, make adjustments to its verification plans and sampling plans.

9.2.1^{bis}.3. Consideration of materiality in conducting the verification

9. The DOE should:
- (a) Apply verification plans, audit procedures and sampling plans;
 - (b) Assess potential errors, omissions and misstatements against the materiality threshold to determine whether they are material individually or in aggregate and whether further audit procedures are needed.
10. If an error, omission or misstatement is detected, the DOE should be aware that it may not be an isolated occurrence and may be a systemic reoccurring error. For example, other errors may exist if the DOE identifies that the error, omission or misstatement arose from a breakdown in the project participants' internal quality control and quality assurance system.
11. In cases where an immaterial error, omission or misstatement is detected, the DOE should determine whether additional audit procedures should be conducted in order to

^{33quater} Adapted from European Union. 2007. *Commission Decision of 18 July 2007 establishing guidelines for the monitoring and reporting of greenhouse gas emissions pursuant to Directive 2003/87/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council.*

^{33quinque} In accordance with paragraphs 262 and 263 below.

^{33sexies} For example, timing may refer to the specific time intervals for which the DOE may draw its samples.

reach a reasonable level of assurance that the claimed emission reductions or removals are free from material error, omission or misstatement.

12. In cases where a material error, omission or misstatement is detected, the DOE may, depending on the circumstances of the error, immediately request project participants to address it, or conduct additional audit procedures to confirm or determine the context and magnitude of the error, omission or misstatement and then request project participants to address it.
13. In both paragraphs ~~42~~–11 and ~~43~~–12 of section 9.2.1_{bis} above, any errors, omissions or misstatements, material or immaterial, are to be addressed.
14. If further audit procedures are necessary, the DOE may consider whether the overall verification plans and sampling plans need to be revised.

9.3. Means of verification

9.3.1_{bis}. Standard auditing techniques

262. The DOE shall apply standard auditing techniques to assess the quality of the information, including but not limited to:

- (a) Desk review, involving:
 - (i) A review of the data and information presented to verify their completeness;
 - (ii) A review of the **registered** monitoring plan, the monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s) and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline, paying particular attention to the frequency of measurements, the quality of metering equipment including calibration requirements, and the quality assurance and quality control procedures;
 - (iii) An evaluation of data management and the quality assurance and quality control system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of emission reductions;
- (b) On-site inspection, involving:
 - (i) An assessment of the implementation and operation of the registered CDM project activity **or included CDM CPA** as per the registered PDD **or CPA-DD** or any approved revised PDD **or CPA-DD**;
 - (ii) A review of information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters;
 - (iii) Interviews with relevant personnel to determine whether the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the **registered** monitoring plan **in the PDD**;
 - (iv) A cross check between information provided in the monitoring report and data from other sources such as plant logbooks, inventories, purchase records or similar data sources;

- (v) A check of the monitoring equipment including calibration performance and observations of monitoring practices against the requirements of the PDD or CPA-DD, the applied methodology including applicable tool(s), and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline;
- (vi) A review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and emission reductions;
- (vii) An identification of quality control and quality assurance procedures in place to prevent or identify and correct any errors or omissions in the reported monitoring parameters.

(c) Sampling approach in accordance with the “Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities”, including:

- (i) A random sampling for cases where the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity did not apply a sampling approach;
- (ii) An acceptance sampling or another sampling approach for cases where the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity applied a sampling approach.

263. Where no specific means of verification is specified, the DOE should apply the standard auditing techniques described in paragraph 262 above.

9.3.1. Clarification requests, corrective action requests and forward action requests

264. The DOE shall identify, discuss and conclude in the verification and certification report issues related to the monitoring, implementation and operations of the registered CDM project activity or PoA and CPA that could impair the capacity of the registered CDM project activity or PoA and CPA to achieve emission reductions or influence the monitoring and reporting of emission reductions.

265. The DOE shall raise a CAR if one of the following situations occur:

- (a) Non-compliance with the registered monitoring plan, the methodology or the standardized baseline are found in monitoring and reporting and has not been sufficiently documented by the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, or if the evidence provided to prove conformity is insufficient;
- (b) Modifications to the implementation, operation and monitoring of the registered CDM project activity, PoA or CPA has not been sufficiently documented by the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity;
- (c) Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data or calculations of emission reductions that will impact the quantity of emission reductions;
- (d) Issues identified in a FAR during validation to be verified during verification or previous verification(s) have not been resolved by the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity.

266. The DOE shall raise a CL if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable CDM requirements have been met.

267. All CARs and CLs raised by the DOE during verification shall be resolved prior to submitting a request for issuance.
268. The DOE shall raise a FAR during verification for actions if the monitoring and reporting require attention and/or adjustment for the next verification period.
269. The DOE shall report on all CARs, CLs and FARs in its verification and certification report. This reporting shall be undertaken in a transparent manner that allows the reader to understand the issue raised, the responses provided by the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, the means of verification of such responses and references to any resulting changes in the monitoring report or supporting annexes.

9.4. Verification of compliance

~~270. Based on the applicable requirements of paragraph 62 of the CDM modalities and procedures, the DOE shall:~~

- ~~(a) Determine whether the registered CDM project activity has been implemented and operated as per the registered PDD or any approved revised PDD, and that all physical features (technology, project equipment, and monitoring and metering equipment) of the project activity are in place;~~
- ~~(b) Determine whether the monitoring report and other supporting documents provided are complete in accordance with the latest applicable valid applicable version of the completeness checklist for requests for issuance of CERs, verifiable, and in accordance with applicable CDM requirements;~~
- ~~(c) Determine whether actual monitoring systems and procedures comply with the monitoring systems and procedures described in the monitoring plan, any revised approved monitoring plan, the approved methodology including applicable tool(s) and/or, where applicable, the approved standardized baseline;~~
- ~~(d) Evaluate the data recorded and stored as per the monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s) and, where applicable, the standardized baseline.~~

9.4.1^{-bis}. Compliance of the monitoring report with the monitoring report form***Verification requirement***

270^{bis}. The DOE shall determine whether the monitoring report was completed using the valid version of the applicable monitoring report form^{33septies}, taking into account the grace period of the form if it has been revised.

Reporting requirement

270^{ter}. The DOE shall provide a statement regarding the compliance of the monitoring report with the relevant form and instructions therein.

9.4.1. Compliance of the project **or programme implementation with the registered project **or programme** design document*****Verification requirement***

271. The DOE shall identify any concerns related to the conformity of the actual project **or programme** activity and its operation with the registered project design document **or programme design document** and determine whether:³⁴

- (a) The implementation and operation of the registered CDM project activity **or PoA and CPA** has been conducted in accordance with the description contained in the registered PDD **or PoA-DD and CPA-DD**; or
- (b) Any deviation or the proposed or actual changes in the implementation or operation of the registered CDM project activity **or PoA and CPA** comply with the requirements of the Project standard.

Means of verification

272. The DOE shall, by means of an on-site inspection, assess that all physical features (**technology, project equipment, and monitoring and metering equipment**) of the registered CDM project activity **or included CDM CPA** in the registered PDD **or CPA-DD** are in place and that the project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** have operated the project activity **or PoA and CPA** as per the registered PDD **or PoA-DD and CPA-DD** or any approved revised PDD **or PoA-DD and CPA-DD**. If an on-site inspection is not conducted, the DOE shall justify the rationale of the decision.

Reporting requirement

273. For each monitoring period, the DOE shall report:

- (a) The implementation status of the registered CDM project activity **or PoA and CPA**. For registered CDM project activities **or included CDM CPAs** that consist of more than one site, the DOE shall describe the status of implementation and

^{33septies} See EB 54 report, annex 34, where the CDM Executive Board has provided a standardized format for the monitoring report to improve consistency in reporting of the implementation and monitoring of the registered CDM project activity by project participants.

³⁴ See decision 3/CMP.1, annex, paragraph 62(g).

starting date of operation for each site. For registered CDM project activities **or included CDM CPAs** with phased implementation, the DOE shall state the progress of the **proposed** project activity **or CPA** achieved in each phase under verification. If the phased implementation is delayed, the DOE shall describe the reasons and present the expected implementation dates;

- (b) The actual operation of the registered CDM project activity **or included CDM CPA**;
- (c) Information (data and variables) provided in the monitoring report that is different from that stated in the registered PDD **or PoA-DD and CPA-DD** or any approved revised PDD **or PoA-DD and CPA-DD**, and has caused an increase in estimates of the emission reductions in the current monitoring period or is highly likely to increase the estimates of emission reductions in the future monitoring periods.³⁵
- (d) An opinion on the cause of any increase in the actual GHG emission reductions achieved by the registered non-A/R CDM project activity or included non-A/R CDM CPA in the current monitoring period that was reported in monitoring report;
- (e) An opinion on the sustainable development co-benefits of the registered CDM project activity or PoA, if the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity provided monitoring information thereof.

9.4.2. Compliance of the **registered** monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s) and the standardized baseline

Verification requirement

274. The DOE shall determine whether the **registered** monitoring plan **of the registered CDM project activity** is in accordance with the applied methodology including applicable tool(s) and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline.

Means of verification

- ~~275. The DOE shall determine whether the project implementation is in accordance with the provisions of the registered PDD and/or an approved revised PDD.~~
276. For monitoring aspects that are not specified in the methodology and, where applicable, the standardized baseline, particularly in the case of small-scale methodologies (e.g. additional monitoring parameters, monitoring frequency and calibration frequency), the DOE should bring to the attention of the Board issues which may enhance the level of accuracy and completeness of the **registered** monitoring plan.

Reporting requirement

277. The DOE shall provide a statement whether the **registered** monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology and, where applicable, the approved

³⁵ Discrepancies may include higher water availability than expected in the PDD **or CPA-DD**, which may increase the electricity output from a hydropower plant, or a higher plant load factor owing to higher bagasse availability during the crushing season, which increases the production of steam and electricity.

standardized baseline that is(are) applied in the registered **PDD CDM project activity or CPA-DD** or an approved revised PDD **or CPA-DD**.

9.4.3. Compliance of monitoring activities with the registered monitoring plan

Verification requirement

278. The DOE shall determine whether the monitoring of parameters related to the GHG emissions reductions in the registered CDM project activity **or included CDM CPA** has been implemented in accordance with the **registered monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD³⁶ or any accepted revised monitoring plan (hereinafter referred to as a registered monitoring plan)**.

Means of verification

279. The DOE shall determine whether:

- (a) The **registered** monitoring plan has been properly implemented and followed by the project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity**;
- (b) All parameters stated in the **registered** monitoring plan and relevant Board decisions³⁷ have been monitored and updated as applicable, including:
 - (i) Project emission parameters;
 - (ii) Baseline emission parameters;
 - (iii) Leakage parameters;
 - (iv) Management and operational system: the responsibilities and authorities for monitoring and reporting are in accordance with the responsibilities and authorities stated in the **registered** monitoring plan;
- (c) The equipment used for monitoring is in accordance with section 9.4.4 below and is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the **registered** monitoring plan, the applied methodology, the applied standardized baseline, the Board guidance, local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification;
- (d) Monitoring results are consistently recorded as per approved frequency;
- (e) Quality assurance and quality control procedures have been applied in accordance with the **registered** monitoring plan **or the revised monitoring plan**.

279_{bis}. Where the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity applied a sampling approach to determine data and parameters monitored, the DOE shall assess the compliance of the sampling efforts and surveys with the validated sampling plan in

³⁶ In accordance with decision 3/CMP.1, annex, paragraph 56: "Project participants shall implement the monitoring plan contained in the registered project design document".

³⁷ For example, a decision at the thirty-fifth meeting of the CDM Executive Board provides clarification for the registered CDM project activities that apply the approved methodology AM0001. This asks the DOE to check the value of "w" based on the past one year period during verification, which was not clearly stated in the approved methodology.

accordance with the “Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities”.

Reporting requirement

280. The DOE shall state whether monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the registered monitoring plan ~~contained in the registered PDD, approved revised or the accepted revised monitoring plan.~~
281. The DOE shall list each parameter required by the registered monitoring plan and state how it verified the information flow (from data generation, aggregation, to recording, calculation and reporting) for these parameters including the values in the monitoring reports.

9.4.4. Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments

Verification requirement

282. The DOE shall determine whether the calibration of those measuring equipment that have an impact on the claimed emission reductions is conducted by the project participants ~~or the coordinating/managing entity~~ at a frequency specified in the applied monitoring methodology, the applied standardized baseline and/or the registered monitoring plan.

Means of verification

283. If, during verification of a certain monitoring period, the DOE identifies that the calibration has been delayed and the calibration has been implemented after the monitoring period in consideration (i.e. the results of delayed calibration are available), ~~referring to the illustrative examples in Appendix 1 below,~~ the DOE may conclude its verification, provided the following conservative approach is adopted in the calculation of emission reductions:
- (a) Applying the maximum permissible error³⁸ of the instrument to the measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration, if the results of the delayed calibration do not show any errors in the measuring equipment, or if the error is smaller than the maximum permissible error; or
 - (b) Applying the error identified in the delayed calibration test, if the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the measuring equipment.
284. The DOE shall confirm that the error has been applied:
- (a) In a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed emission reductions;
 - (b) For all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.

³⁸ The maximum permissible errors of all the measuring instruments are specified by the respective manufacturers as part of their technical specifications.

285. In cases where the results of the delayed calibration are not available, or the calibration has not been conducted at the time of verification, the DOE, prior to finalizing verification, shall request the project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** to conduct the required calibration and shall determine whether the project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** have calculated the emission reductions conservatively using the approach mentioned in paragraph 283 above.
286. In cases where the DOE determines that it is not possible for the project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** to conduct the calibration at a frequency specified by either the applied methodology, the applied standardized baseline, guidance provided by the Board, and/or the registered monitoring plan due to reasons beyond the control of project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity**,³⁹ the DOE, shall follow the requirements for post-registration changes in section **8_{bis} above**.
287. In cases where neither the applied monitoring methodology, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline nor the **registered** monitoring plan specify any requirements for calibration frequency for measuring equipment, the DOE shall determine whether the equipment is calibrated either in accordance with the specifications of the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification. If neither local/national standards nor the manufacturer's specification are available, international standards may be used. Refer to appendix 1 for an illustrative example to apply the above requirements.

Reporting requirement

288. The DOE shall report whether the calibration is conducted at the frequency as specified by the methodology, the standardized baseline and/or the **registered** monitoring plan **of the registered PDD and/or the approved revised monitoring plan**.

9.4.5. Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions **or net removals**

Verification requirement

289. The DOE shall assess the data and calculations of GHG emission reductions **or net anthropogenic GHG removals** achieved by/resulting from the registered CDM project activity **or included CDM CPA** by the application of the selected methodology and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline.

Means of verification

290. The DOE shall determine whether:
- (a) A complete set of data for the specified monitoring period is available. If only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, the DOE shall either raise a CAR for the project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** to comply with the requirements of appendix 1 of the Project standard or submit a request for deviation prior to submitting the request for issuance, if appropriate;

³⁹ For example, due to the contractual terms between the project participant **or the coordinating/managing entity** and purchasing/selling entities.

- (b) Information provided in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with other sources such as plant logbooks, inventories, purchase records, laboratory analysis;
- (c) Calculations of baseline GHG emissions or baseline net GHG removals, and project activity GHG emissions or actual net GHG removals and leakage GHG emissions, have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline;
- (d) Any assumptions used in emission or removal calculations have been justified;
- (e) Appropriate emission factor,⁴⁰ IPCC default values, GWPs^{40bis} and other reference values have been correctly applied;
- (f) For a registered CDM project activity or an included CDM CPA using an approved standardized baseline that standardizes baseline emissions, the standardized value(s) of the parameter(s) was(were) applied using the correct version of the applied standardized baseline in accordance with the Project standard;
- (g) The pro-rata approach was correctly applied to the calculations of GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals in accordance with the Project standard, if the monitoring period starts before 31 December 2012 and ends anytime thereafter;
- (h) The first day when CERs are being claimed is correctly specified in accordance with the Project cycle procedure, if the current monitoring period covers the first day of the renewed crediting period.

Reporting requirement

291. The verification and certification report shall contain:

- (a) An indication of whether data were not available because activity levels or non-activity parameters were not monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan as well as any actions taken by the DOE to ensure that the most conservative assumption theoretically possible has been made;
- (b) A description of how the DOE cross-checked reported data;

⁴⁰ The Board emphasized that in order to ensure an accurate determination of the ex post grid emission factor during the issuance stage, the project participants should endeavour to use the data vintage for year (y) in which the project generation occurs and report it in the monitoring report submitted to the DOE for verification. If, at the time of the submission of the monitoring report to the DOE, the data vintage from year (y) is not available and data from year (y-1) or (y-2) is being used, the DOE shall, during verification, assess whether more recent data has become publicly available and shall, if appropriate, raise a Corrective Action Request to project participants to incorporate the more recent data into the calculation of grid emission factor.

^{40bis} See decision 4/CMP.7. for GWPs for the calculation of emission reductions and removal enhancements achieved by the registered CDM project activities and PoAs in the second commitment period (from 1 January 2013).

- (c) A confirmation that appropriate methods and formulae for calculating baseline GHG emissions or baseline net GHG removals, project GHG emissions or actual net GHG removals and leakage GHG emissions have been followed; and
- (d) An opinion as to whether assumptions, emission factors and default values that were applied in the calculations have been justified.
- (e) A confirmation that the pro-rata approach was correctly applied to the calculations of GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals, where applicable;
- (f) A confirmation that the first day in which CERs are being claimed has been correctly specified, where applicable.

9.5. Post-registration changes

9.5.1. General

292. The DOE contracted by project participants to validate the post-registration changes shall be accredited to the validation function for the specific CDM sectoral scope.

293. The DOE shall determine whether the changes do not require prior approval by the Board in accordance with appendix 1 of the Project standard.

294. Where the changes are identified by or submitted to the DOE contracted to conduct the verification and certification, the DOE shall determine whether the changes are solely of a type(s) listed in appendix 1 of the Project standard and:

- (a) In such cases, the DOE shall submit the changes as part of the request for issuance in accordance with the Project cycle procedure;
- (b) In all other cases, the DOE shall submit the changes via the request for approval of post registration changes process of the Project cycle procedure.

295. Where the changes are submitted to a DOE prior to the commencement of verification, the DOE shall submit the changes via the request for approval of post registration changes process of the Project cycle procedure.

9.5.1. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, monitoring methodology or standardized baseline

9.5.1.1. Verification requirement

296. The DOE shall determine whether there are deviations from the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology and/or the applied standardized baseline.

9.5.1.2. Means of verification

297. If the DOE identifies that the project participants have deviated from the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology, and/or the applied standardized baseline, and where the provisions of appendix 1 of the Project standard do not apply, the DOE shall seek prior approval from the Board with respect to the acceptability of the deviations in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.

298. The DOE shall determine whether the deviation is likely to lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions. In cases where the DOE considers that the deviation will lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions, the DOE shall request the project participants to apply conservative assumptions or discount factors to the calculations to the extent required to ensure that emission reductions will not be over-estimated as a result of the deviation.

299. For cases where a deviation from the monitoring plan may be applicable to the monitoring period under verification, and part of the subsequent monitoring period, the DOE shall verify the exact period to which the deviation applies.

9.5.1.3. Reporting requirement

300. Where the deviation is identified during verification, the DOE shall indicate in the verification report how the monitoring report reflects the application of the approved guidance from the Board regarding the deviation from the provisions of the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology and/or the applied standardized baseline.

301. Where the deviation is identified prior to verification, the DOE shall state its opinion on whether the deviation reflects the application of the approved guidance from the Board regarding the deviation from the provisions of the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology and/or the applied standardized baseline and as per the applicable provisions of the Project standard.

9.5.2. Corrections

9.5.2.1. Verification requirement

302. The DOE shall verify that any corrections to project information or parameters fixed at validation, as described in the registered PDD, made by project participants in a revised PDD comply with the requirements of the Project standard.

9.5.2.2. Means of verification

303. If the DOE identifies that the project participants have made corrections to project information or parameters determined at validation, the DOE shall determine whether:

- (a) The corrected information is an accurate reflection of actual project information; and/or
- (b) The corrected parameters are in accordance with the applied methodology, the monitoring plan and/or the applied standardized baseline.

9.5.2.3. Reporting requirement

304. The DOE shall describe how the corrected information accurately reflects the actual project information and/or how the corrected parameters reflect the application of the applied methodology, the monitoring plan and/or the applied standardized baseline.

9.5.3. Changes to the start date of the crediting period

9.5.3.1. Verification requirement

305. If the project participants wish to change the start date of the crediting period in accordance with section 13.8 relevant requirements in the Project standard, the DOE shall determine whether the proposed changes result in a less conservative baseline.

9.5.3.2. Reporting requirement

306. The DOE shall indicate if the requirements in the Project standard have been met and shall submit a request for post registration changes in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.

9.5.4. Permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan, monitoring methodology or standardized baseline

9.5.4.1. Verification requirement

307. The DOE shall verify whether there are permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology and/or the standardized baseline.

9.5.4.2. Means of verification

308. The DOE shall determine whether the changes to the monitoring plan described in the registered PDD proposed by the project participants are in compliance with the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline and do not reduce the level of accuracy of the monitoring compared with the requirements contained in the registered monitoring plan.

309. In cases where the proposed changes refer to a later version of the applied methodology and/or the applied standardized baseline in the registered PDD, the DOE shall determine whether the application of any later version of the applied methodology, any applicable tool(s) and/or the applied standardized baseline does not impact the conservativeness of the monitoring and verification process, including the related emission reduction calculations.

310. If the DOE identifies that the project participants are unable to implement the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD and it will not be possible to monitor the registered CDM project activity in accordance with a monitoring plan that would comply with the applied methodology, any applicable tool(s), and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline or the relevant provisions of appendix 1 of the Project standard, the DOE shall request guidance from the Board concerning the acceptability of the permanent changes in accordance with the section on post registration changes in the Project cycle procedure.

311. The DOE shall determine whether the permanent changes are likely to lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions. In cases where the DOE considers that the permanent changes will lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions, the DOE shall request the project participants to apply conservative assumptions or discount factors to the calculations to the extent required to ensure that emission reductions will not be over-estimated as a result of the permanent change.

9.5.4.3. Reporting requirement

312. Where permanent changes are identified during verification, the DOE shall indicate in the verification report how the revised PDD reflects the application of the guidance from the Board regarding the permanent changes from the provisions of the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology and/or the applied standardized baseline.

313. Where permanent changes are identified prior to verification, the DOE shall state its assessment opinion on whether the permanent changes reflect the application of the approved guidance from the Board regarding the deviation from the provisions of the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology and/or the standardized baseline.

9.5.5. Changes to the project design of a registered project activity

9.5.5.1. Verification requirement

314. The DOE shall determine whether there are proposed or actual changes to the project design of a registered CDM project activity.

9.5.5.2. Means of verification

315. If the DOE identifies that the project design in the implementation or operation of the project activity does not conform with the description contained in the registered PDD or the relevant provisions of appendix 1 of the Project standard, the DOE shall request guidance from the Board concerning the acceptability of the proposed or actual changes in accordance with the section on post registration changes in the Project cycle procedure.

316. In case of actual changes, the DOE shall, by means of an on-site inspection and review of the submitted revised PDD by the project participants, which describes the nature and extent of the actual changes, determine whether this description accurately reflects the implementation, operation and monitoring of the modified CDM project activity.

317. The DOE shall conduct an on-site inspection to assess the impacts of the actual changes on the compliance of the monitoring plan, the level of accuracy of the monitoring activity, the applied monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s) and/or, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline.

318. The DOE shall, by means of reviewing the revised PDD against applicable additionality and methodological requirements, determine whether the proposed or actual changes would adversely affect the conclusions of the validation report of the registered PDD with regard to:

(a) Additionality of the registered CDM project activity;

(b) Scale of the registered CDM project activity;

(c) Applicability and application of the approved baseline methodology and, where applicable, the approved standardized baseline under which the registered CDM project activity has been registered; or

(d) The compliance of the monitoring plan with the applied monitoring methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline.

319. If the proposed or actual changes affect the additionality of the registered CDM project activity then the DOE shall confirm that:

(a) In the case of investment analysis, project participants have only modified the key parameters in the original spreadsheet calculations affected by the proposed or actual changes to the project activity;

(b) In the case where only barriers have been claimed to demonstrate additionality, project participants have demonstrated that the barriers are still valid under the new circumstances.

320. The following applies to a registered CDM project activity using an approved standardized baseline that standardizes additionality instead of paragraph 319 above: If the proposed or actual changes affect the additionality of the project activity then the DOE shall confirm that the project activity complies with the positive list of the applied standardized baseline in the registered PDD.

321. The DOE shall confirm that the applied methodology including applied tools and/or the applied standardized baseline do not impact on the conservativeness of the monitoring and verification process and the related emission reduction calculations in cases where:

(a) The proposed or actual changes impact on the implementation of the registered CDM project activity;

(b) The original methodology and/or the original standardized baseline would no longer be applicable; and

(c) The project participant applies:

(i) A later version of the methodology and/or the standardized baseline; or

(ii) Another methodology and/or another standardized baseline that is(are) applicable to the registered CDM project activity.

322. The DOE shall assess whether the revised PDD complies with:

(a) The applied methodology, tools and/or standardized baseline;

(b) Any later version of the methodology and/or the standardized baseline; or

(c) The requirements of another methodology and/or another standardized baseline that is(are) applicable to the registered CDM project activity.

9.5.5.3. Reporting requirement

323. Where the proposed or actual changes are identified during verification, the DOE shall state its opinion on indicate its opinion in the verification report on how the revised PDD reflects the application of the approved guidance from the Board regarding the proposed or actual changes from the provisions of the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology and/or the applied standardized baseline and as per the applicable provisions of the Project standard.

324. Where the permanent changes are identified prior to verification, the DOE shall state its assessment opinion on whether the permanent changes reflect the application of the approved guidance from the Board regarding the deviation from the provisions of the

registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology and/or the applied standardized baseline and as per the applicable provisions of the Project standard.

325. The DOE shall provide its opinion containing:

- (a) A description of the proposed or actual changes as compared to the description in the registered PDD;
- (b) An assessment on when the changes occurred, reasons for these changes taking place, whether the changes would have been known prior to registration of the project activity, and how the changes would impact on the overall operation/ability of the project activity to deliver emission reductions as stated in the PDD;
- (c) An assessment regarding whether the changes would adversely affect the conclusions of the validation report of the registered PDD with regard to:
 - (i) Additionality of the registered CDM project activity;
 - (ii) Scale of the registered CDM project activity;
 - (iii) Applicability and application of approved baseline methodology and, where applicable, the approved standardized baseline under which the project activity has been registered or the later version of the applied methodology and/or the applied standardized baseline;
 - (iv) The compliance of the monitoring plan with the applied monitoring methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline; or
 - (v) The level of accuracy of the monitoring compared with the requirements contained in the registered monitoring plan.

326. In validating the revised PDD containing the proposed or actual changes, and in preparing the validation opinion, the DOE shall include information on how:

- (a) The proposed revisions ensure that the level of accuracy and completeness⁴¹ in the monitoring and verification process is not reduced as a result of the revision. The DOE shall, using objective evidence, assess the accuracy and completeness of each proposed revision to the monitoring plan, including the frequency of measurements, the quality of monitoring equipment (e.g. calibration requirements, the quality assurance and quality control procedures);
- (b) The proposed revisions comply with the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline. In cases where the proposed revision refers to a later version of the applied methodology and/or the applied standardized baseline, the DOE shall confirm that this application does not compromise the conservativeness in the monitoring and verification process and of the emission reduction calculations;

⁴¹ Completeness refers to inclusion of all relevant information for assessment of GHG emissions reductions and the information supporting the methods applied as required. For example, if the DOE identifies an on-site generator for emergency use which was not included in the monitoring plan during the verification process, the monitoring of fuel consumption of this generator should be included in the monitoring plan via this procedure.

~~(c) The findings of previous verification reports, if any, have been taken into account.~~

~~327. If the DOE determines that the proposed or actual changes to the project activity comply with the requirements in the Project standard, the DOE shall submit the documents to the Board following the Project cycle procedure for post registration changes.~~

~~328. If the DOE determines that the proposed or actual changes to the project activity do not comply with the requirements in the Project standard, the DOE shall issue a negative validation assessment opinion or should request guidance from the Board.~~

~~9.5.5_{bis} Types of changes specific to afforestation or reforestation project activities~~

~~9.5.5_{bis}.1. Verification requirements~~

~~1. The DOE shall determine whether there are types of changes specific to registered afforestation or reforestation CDM project activities.~~

~~9.5.5_{bis}.2. Means of verification~~

~~2. In case of actual changes, the DOE shall, by means of an on-site inspection(s), interview with relevant personnel and/or desk review of the submitted revised PDD by the project participants, which describes the nature and extent of the actual changes, determine whether this description accurately reflects the implementation, operation or monitoring of the modified registered CDM project activity.~~

~~9.5.5_{bis}.3. Reporting requirement~~

~~3. In case of actual changes, the DOE shall determine whether the changes in the revised PDD are complete and accurate reflection of actual project information.~~

~~4. Where the changes are identified during verification, the DOE shall indicate in the verification report how the changes in the revised PDD do not require prior approval by the Board in accordance with a relevant requirement in appendix 1 of the Project standard.~~

~~5. Where the changes are identified prior to verification, the DOE shall state its opinion on whether the changes do not require prior approval by the Board in accordance with a relevant requirement in appendix 1 of the Project standard.~~

9.6. Verification status and verification report and certification report

9.6.1_{bis} Verification status

1. The DOE shall determine if the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity provided an update of the status of its implementation of the registered CDM project activity or PoA as applicable in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.

2. The DOE shall provide an update of the status of its verification activity as applicable in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.

9.6.1. Verification and certification report

328_{bis} The DOE contracted to conduct a verification and certification of the registered CDM project activity or PoA shall prepare a verification and certification report using the valid

version of the applicable verification and certification report form, taking into account the grace period of the form if it has been revised.

328^{ter.} When completing the verification and certification report form, the DOE shall follow the instructions therein.

329. The verification and certification report shall give an overview of the verification process used by the DOE in order to arrive at its verification conclusions. All verification findings shall be identified and justified.

330. The DOE shall report the following:

- (a) A summary of the verification process, and the scope of verification and the conclusion;
- (b) 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 inspection;
- (c) Findings of the desk review, and on-site inspection and sampling approach used by the DOE. Where the DOE applied a sampling approach to the on-site inspection, the DOE shall include a description of how the sample size was determined and field check was carried out;
- (d) All its applied approaches, of the DOE's findings and conclusions as to whether requirements set out in section 9.4 above and 9.5 above:
 - (i) The project activity has been implemented and operated in accordance with the registered PDD or any approved revised PDD;
 - (ii) The monitoring plan complies with the applied monitoring methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline;
 - (iii) The actual monitoring complies with the monitoring plan, including compliance with any guidance provided by the Board regarding deviations from the provisions of the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology and/or the applied standardized baseline;
 - (iv) The data and calculation of GHG emission reductions have been assessed to correctly support the emission reductions being claimed.
- (e) A list of each parameter specified by the registered monitoring plan and a statement on how the values in the monitoring report have been verified;
- (f) A statement on whether that identifies any post-registration changes to the registered PDD, and their date of approval by the Board have been approved by the Board or will be submitted together with the request for issuance;
- (g) An assessment and close-out of any CARs, CLs or FARs issued to the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity;
- (h) An assessment of remaining issues from the previous verification period, if appropriate;
- (h)^{bis} Information on quality control within the team and in the verification process;

- (i) A conclusion^{41bis} on the verified amount of emission reductions achieved.

330^{bis}. Where the DOE applied the concept of materiality in planning and conducting a verification of the registered CDM project activity in accordance with section 9.2.1.^{bis} above, it shall report:

- (a) The risks, the risk assessment undertaken and how the verification plans and sampling plans were designed to respond to these risks and ensure that all material errors, omissions or misstatements were detected;
- (b) Whether and how the verification plans and sampling plans were revised to take into account the need for further audit procedures due to the nature/type of errors, omissions or misstatements detected;
- (c) How materiality was applied in determining whether a detected error, omission or misstatement was material or immaterial either individually or in aggregate.

331. The DOE shall describe all documentation supporting verification and shall make it available on request.

9.6.2. Certification report

332. The DOE shall, based on its verification report, certify in writing that, during the specified time period, the registered CDM project activity or some or all of included CDM CPAs in the registered CDM PoA achieved the verified amount of reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases that would not have occurred in the absence of the project activity or the CPAs.⁴²

333. The DOE shall inform the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, Parties involved and the Board of its certification decision in writing immediately upon completion of the certification process and shall make the verification and certification report publicly available as part of the request for issuance in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.

333^{bis}. The DOE shall request the secretariat to withdraw the request for issuance in accordance with the Project cycle procedure, if the project participants or the coordinating/ managing entity requested the DOE to withdraw the request for issuance or if the DOE has revised the conclusion of its verification report based on new insights or information.

^{41bis} In paragraph 1 of section 9.6.1.^{bis} above, even if the DOE determines that the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity failed to provide an update of the status of its implementation of the registered CDM project activity or PoA as applicable in accordance with the Project cycle procedure, it does not have any impact on the conclusion of the verification for the CDM project activity or PoA. Similarly, any opinion on the sustainable development co-benefits of the registered CDM project activity or PoA in paragraph 273(e) above does not have any impact on the conclusion.

⁴² In accordance with paragraph 64 of the CDM modalities and procedures, the certification report constitutes a request to the Executive Board for issuance of CERs equal to the verified amount of reductions of anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases.

10. Specific verification requirements

10.1.-bis- Small-scale project activities

333^{terbis}. ~~For a Type II or Type III registered small-scale CDM project activity, the DOE shall determine whether the registered small-scale CDM project activity remains within the limit of the type of small-scale project activities defined in the relevant requirements in the Project standard. If the project activity exceeds the limit of its type in any year of the crediting period, the DOE shall assess whether it is caused by the post-registration changes in accordance with relevant requirements in section 8^{bis} above. If the DOE determines that there are no such post-registration changes to the project activity and therefore the scale of the project activity does not change, for a Type II or Type III registered small-scale CDM project activity, it shall assess whether the calculated emission reductions during this particular year were capped at the amount calculated with the limit of its type.~~

333^{quaterter}. For the bundle of registered small-scale CDM project activities, in accordance with the applicable requirements in the “General principles for bundling”, the DOE shall:

- (a) Determine whether the bundle of registered small-scale CDM project activities was implemented and monitored;
- (b) Prepare a verification report(s) and a certification report(s).

10.1. Afforestation or reforestation project activities

- 334. At the first verification, the DOE, in accordance with paragraph 34(d) of the CDM modalities and procedures for afforestation and reforestation project activities shall confirm those areas of land for which the control over the registered A/R CDM project activity has been established by the project participants since validation.
- 335. As a part of the first verification and certification report, the DOE shall confirm that the boundary of the registered A/R CDM project activity geographically delineates exclusively the afforestation or reforestation project activity under the control of the project participants.

10.2. Carbon dioxide capture and storage project activities

10.2.1.-bis- General

- 336. In accordance with section “verification and certification” of the Project standard, the DOE contracted by the project participants to perform the verification shall:
 - (a) Determine whether monitoring was conducted in accordance with the registered monitoring plan and the provisions for monitoring set out in section “Monitoring” of the Project standard;
 - (b) Determine whether the site development and management plan is being adhered to;
 - (c) Determine whether any significant deviations were observed during history matching and whether, in such a case, a recharacterization of the geological storage site, an update of the risk and safety assessment, an update of the

environmental and socioeconomic impact assessments, a revision to the project boundary, and a revision to the monitoring plan have been conducted, as necessary, in accordance with the CCS-related provisions set out in the Project standard;

- (d) Determine whether seepage occurred from the geological storage site of the registered CCS CDM project activity during the verification period;
 - (e) In the case that such seepage occurred:
 - (i) Determine whether the remedial measures and plans described in the risk and safety assessment were implemented and effective;
 - (ii) Determine whether a net reversal of storage occurred as a result of the seepage;
 - (f) In the case that a net reversal of storage occurred, quantify the amount of the net reversal of storage that occurred as a result of the seepage;
 - (g) Determine whether there have been any unintentional transboundary effects;
 - (h) Where applicable, determine whether the geological storage site has been successfully closed.
337. The DOE shall check, for each verification period, whether the project participants have carried out history matching and, where necessary, updated the numerical models used to characterize the geological storage site by conducting new simulations using the monitored data and information. The numerical models shall be adjusted in the event of significant deviations between observed and predicted behaviour.
338. Where the information prepared in accordance with section “Monitoring” of the Project standard indicates that the geological storage site no longer meets the requirements set out in section “Selection and characterization of the geological storage site” of the Project standard, the DOE shall provide a negative opinion on validation and/or verification.
339. The initial verification and certification of a registered CCS CDM project activity may be undertaken at a time selected by the project participants. Subsequent verification and certification reports shall be submitted to the Executive Board not later than five years after the end of the previous verification period. Verification and certification shall continue beyond the end of the last crediting period of the registered CCS CDM project activity and shall only cease after the monitoring of the geological storage site has been terminated in accordance with the conditions for the termination of monitoring, as set out in section “Monitoring” of the Project standard.

10.2.1. Request for issuance of certified emission reductions

340. A certification report submitted for a verification period during the crediting period shall constitute a request to the Executive Board for issuance of certified emission reductions (CERs) equal to the verified reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs that have occurred as a result of the registered CCS CDM project activity.
341. A certification report submitted for a verification period after the end of the last crediting period shall not constitute a request for issuance but shall provide, where applicable,

information on the amount of any net reversal of storage that occurred during the verification period as a result of seepage from the geological storage site of a registered CCS CDM project activity, in accordance with the Project standard and Project cycle procedure and any decisions of the Executive Board.

342. The last certification report, submitted after the monitoring of the geological storage site has been terminated in accordance with the conditions for the termination of monitoring, as set out in section "Monitoring" of the Project standard, may constitute a request to forward any remaining CERs in the reserve account established for the purpose of accounting for any net reversal of storage to the registry accounts of the Parties and project participants involved.

10.3. Programme of activities

~~10.3.1.~~^{bis} ~~Changes to modalities of communication~~

~~343. If, subsequent to the registration of the CDM PoA, the coordinating/managing entity has changed, then the DOE undertaking the next inclusion of a proposed CDM CPA, the DOE that submits the next request for issuance or the DOE that submits the next post-registration change request, whichever is earlier, shall submit a validation opinion regarding the compliance of the new coordinating/managing entity with the requirements in the Project standard to the UNFCCC secretariat in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.~~

~~(a) New letter(s) of authorization from each respective host Party stating the change in coordinating/managing entity;~~

~~(b) A confirmation from the new coordinating/managing entity that the PoA will be developed and implemented with the same set framework as originally described in the CDM PoA-DD; and~~

~~(c) A validation opinion regarding the compliance of the new coordinating/managing entity with the requirements of the PoA management system as specified in the "Standard for demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of multiple methodologies for programme of activities".~~

~~343^{bis}. Notwithstanding the case referred to in paragraph 343 above, the DOE contracted by the incoming coordinating/managing entity shall submit the validation opinion to the UNFCCC secretariat in accordance with the Project cycle procedure if the coordinating/managing entity wishes to submit the validation opinion before the next inclusion of a proposed CDM CPA, the next request for issuance or the next post-registration change request.~~

~~10.3.1. Post registration changes to programme of activities~~

~~344. The DOE shall determine whether the registered CDM PoA has been amended post-registration~~

~~(a) To expand the geographic coverage or to include additional host Parties; or~~

~~(b) To update revise the eligibility criteria for the inclusion of CDM CPAs; or~~

(c) To remove methodologies and/or standardized baselines from the registered CDM PoA;

345. If the registered CDM PoA has been amended to expand the geographic coverage or to include additional host Parties, then the DOE shall assess and confirm that:

(a) The existing registered PoA-DD has been revised to reflect the changes, in particular the eligibility criteria for inclusion of CDM-CPAs;

(b) The baseline established in the PoA-DD is applicable to the expanded PoA boundary;

(c) In the case of inclusion of additional host Parties:

(i) Each DNAs of the new host Parties issued a letters of approval for the PoA and a letters of authorization for the coordinating/managing entity where the amended PoA boundary includes additional host Parties;

(ii) At least One specific-case CPA-DD for each new host Party has been submitted and it meets the eligibility criteria specified in the PoA-DD.

346. If the registered CDM PoA has been amended to update revise the eligibility criteria for the inclusion of CPAs, then the DOE shall assess and confirm that:

(a) The update revision of the eligibility criteria complies with provisions and conditions set out in the "Standard for demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of multiple methodologies for programme of activities";

(b) The updated revised eligibility criteria meet the requirements of the methodologies and, where applicable, the standardized baselines that are applied in the PoA;

(c) The existing registered PoA-DD is revised appropriately to reflect the updated revised eligibility criteria for inclusion of CDM-CPAs.

347. If the registered CDM PoA has been amended to remove approved baseline and monitoring methodologies and/or standardized baselines, then the DOE shall assess and confirm that:

(a) The change only involves the removal and no addition of methodologies and/or standardized baselines;

(b) The removal of the methodologies and/or standardized baselines does not affect the physical design of and the end-use service provided by the CDM-CPAs that apply the approved methodologies and/or standardized baseline that remain (i.e. the methodologies and/or standardized baselines that were not removed).

348. The DOE shall determine whether the registered CDM PoA has been amended post-registration to add specific-case CPA-DDs. Where specific-case CPA-DDs were added, the DOE shall assess and confirm that the specific-case CPA-DDs that were added correspond to generic CPA-DDs for which specific-case CPA-DDs had not been submitted at the time of request for registration of the PoA.

349. ~~The DOE shall determine whether the registered generic CPA and specific case CPA have been amended post-registration to change the project design due to modifications to or addition of technologies/measures. Where the project design has been changed, the DOE shall assess and confirm that:~~

~~(a) The applicability conditions of the applied methodologies including applied tools and, where applicable, the applied standardized baselines cover the modified or added technologies/measures (i.e. the modified or added technologies/measure are applicable under the applied methodologies including applied tools and, where applicable, the applied standardized baselines);~~

~~(b) The modified or added technologies/measures were either:~~

~~(i) Already included in the originally registered PoA-DD and the eligibility criteria for these technologies/measures had been specified in the originally registered PoA-DD or~~

~~(ii) Subsequently included in the revised PoA-DD following the submission by the coordinating/managing entity and approval by the Board of a request for post-registration changes in accordance with the Project cycle procedure;~~

~~(c) The amendments comply with all the applicable requirements, including those set out in the Project standard, the “Standard for demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of multiple methodologies for programme of activities”, the applied methodologies and, where applicable, the applied standardized baselines.~~

10.3.2. Request for issuance of certified emission reductions for a PoA

350. ~~A-The DOE that has not performed validation activities for a PoA (i.e. validation of the PoA, inclusion of CPAs, renewal of the PoA, or renewal of crediting period of CPAs)⁴³ shall:~~

~~(a) Identify included CDM CPAs that it shall consider for verification in accordance with the method/procedure to be used for verification of the amount of reductions of anthropogenic emissions by sources or removals by sinks of greenhouse gases achieved by the CPAs under the registered CDM PoA and determined in the PoA-DD. Where the PoA has more than one host Party and the host Party’s DNA withdraws its approval of the PoA and/or its authorization of project participants, the DOE shall identify only unaffected CPAs in accordance with the “Procedure: Process for dealing with letters from DNAs that withdraw approval/authorization”;~~

~~(b) Take into account the possible existence of included CDM CPAs complying with different versions of the registered CDM PoA and the need to account for this in its sampling approach, to ensure that a statistically sound sample of CPAs from each version of the PoA are being verified;~~

⁴³ ~~The same DOE that has performed validation activities for a PoA (validation of the PoA, inclusion of CPAs, renewal of the PoA or renewal of crediting period of CPAs) may also undertake the verification if this has been approved in advance by the Board.~~

- (c) Make the monitoring report publicly available immediately in accordance with the Project cycle procedure **except when the host Party's DNA withdraws its approval of the registered CDM PoA and/or its authorization of project participants in accordance with the "Procedure: Process for dealing with letters from DNAs that withdraw approval/authorization";**
 - (d) Systematically verify and certify the correct implementation and operation of the record-keeping system.
351. The DOE ~~conducting the verification~~ shall include in its verification **and certification** report a description of how it applied the methods/procedures for the purpose of verification stipulated in the registered PoA-DD. The DOE shall include in its verification **and certification** report a description/justification of the on-site inspection(s) undertaken.
352. ~~The DOE shall request issuance of CERs for the registered CDM PoA in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.~~ The request **for issuance of CERs** shall correspond to all CDM CPAs included in the PoA in the case of a single monitoring report covering all CPAs of the PoA for the monitoring period, or to one of the **two** batches of CPAs included in the PoA in the case of **two multiple** monitoring reports for the monitoring period.
353. The DOE shall confirm that monitoring periods have been consecutive. Further, the DOE shall confirm that CDM CPAs have been included in **requests for** issuance **requests** in a consecutive manner, i.e. when a CPA has been included in a request for issuance for a monitoring period, the DOE shall confirm that a request for issuance for the previous monitoring period that included the particular CPA has been published.
354. Notwithstanding paragraph 353 above, if the registered CDM PoA applies any of the methodologies listed in the Project cycle procedure as potentially accruing negative emission reductions in a monitoring period, the DOE shall confirm that the CERs, tCERs or ICERs have been issued for all CDM CPAs included in the PoA for the previous monitoring period.
355. A request for issuance shall relate to the certified emission reductions verified as per the above.

10.3.3. Review of erroneous inclusion of component project activities⁴⁴

356. ~~The DOE shall confirm that a CDM CPA that has been excluded shall not be re-included again in that or any other CDM PoA, or qualify as a CDM project activity.~~

11. General validation requirements on renewal of crediting period or renewal of programme of activities

Validation requirement

357. When contracted by project participants **or coordinating/managing entities** to validate **an existing registered CDM project activity for a second or further** renewal of crediting period **of a registered CDM project activity** **or renewal of a registered CDM PoA**, the

⁴⁴ ~~Erroneous inclusion of a CDM CPA into a PoA registered as a single CDM project activity (PoA) means that the CPA does not meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion as specified in the PoA-DD.~~

DOE shall determine whether the project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** have updated sections of the PDD **or PoA-DD** relating to the baseline, estimated **GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals, and** the monitoring plan **and the crediting period** using the valid version(s) of the approved baseline and monitoring methodology and, where applicable, the approved standardized baseline that is(are) applicable **to for** the project activity **or PoA**.

Means of validation

357_{bis}. The DOE shall apply the requirements in section 7.3 above *mutatis mutandis* to validate the information provided by the project participants **or the coordinating/ managing entity**.

358. The DOE shall determine whether the project participants **or the coordinating/managing entity** have updated the **relevant sections of PDD or PoA-DD** in accordance with **section 13.9 relevant requirements** in the Project standard.

358_{bis}. If the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity used the later valid version of the PDD or PoA-DD form for the updated PDD or PoA-DD than the version of the PDD or PoA-DD form of the registered PDD or PoA-DD, the DOE shall determine whether information transferred to the later valid version of the PDD or PoA-DD form is materially the same as that in the registered PDD or PoA-DD.

359. The DOE shall assess the validity of the original baseline or its update through an assessment of the following issues:

- (a) The impact of new relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances on the baseline taking into account relevant guidance from the Board with regard to renewal of the crediting period **of the registered CDM project activity or renewal of the registered CDM PoA** at the time of requesting renewal of crediting period **of the project activity or renewal of the PoA**;
- (b) The correctness of the application of the approved methodology and, where applicable, the approved standardized baseline for the determination of the continued validity of the baseline or its update, and the estimation of emission reductions for the applicable crediting period **of the registered CDM project activity or for the renewal of the registered CDM PoA**.

360. The requirements contained in paragraph 359(a) above are not applicable to a registered CDM project activity **or generic CPA** using the valid version of an applicable approved standardized baseline that standardizes the baseline scenario.

361. The DOE shall check that the names of the project participants included in the **updated PDD request for renewal of crediting period** are consistent with the names of the **registered project participants in the registered PDD for the CDM project activity, or that the names of the coordinating/managing entity and project participants included in the updated PoA-DD are consistent with the names of the coordinating/managing entity and project participants in the registered PoA-DD**.

361_{bis}. If the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity selected another methodology and/or standardized baseline for the purpose of renewal of crediting period **of the registered CDM project activity or renewal of PoA** due to the inapplicability of the valid version of the methodology (including a consolidated methodology thereof) **and/or standardized baseline** applied to the **original registered PDD or PoA-DD**, the DOE shall

assess whether the updated PDD or PoA-DD complies with all the requirements in the selected methodology and/or standardized baseline except for additionality demonstration. Regarding the baseline, the DOE shall follow the step referred to in paragraph 359 above.

361^{ter}. If the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity requested a deviation from the valid version of the methodology (including a consolidated methodology thereof) applied in the registered PDD or PoA-DD, or from any other selected methodology for the purpose of renewal of crediting period of the registered CDM project activity or renewal of PoA, or if the DOE finds at validation that updated PDD or PoA-DD deviated from the valid version of the methodology applied in the registered PDD or PoA-DD or from any other selected methodology, paragraphs 80 and 81 above shall apply mutatis mutandis.

361^{quater}. If the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity requested post-registration changes together with the request for renewal of crediting period of the registered CDM project activity or renewal of PoA, the DOE shall also validate the post-registration changes in accordance with relevant requirements in sections 8^{bis} and 8^{ter} above and the Project cycle procedure, and submit a request for approval of changes together with the request for renewal of crediting period of the registered CDM project activity or renewal of PoA in accordance with relevant requirements in the Project cycle procedure.

362. The DOE shall request the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity to provide a revised updated PDD or PoA-DD (with its revised updated generic CPA-DD part), applying the valid version of an applicable approved standardized baseline whose selection is mandatory, if:

- (a) The updated PDD or PoA-DD has been submitted for the notification of the intention to request a renewal of crediting period of the registered CDM project activity or renewal of PoA when no applicable approved standardized baseline was valid;
- (b) An applicable approved standardized baseline whose selection is mandatory has become valid after the submission of the updated PDD or PoA-DD (with its updated generic CPA-DD part) for the notification of the intention to request a renewal of crediting period of the registered CDM project activity or renewal of PoA but before the submission of a request for renewal of crediting period of the project activity or renewal of PoA;
- (c) The request for renewal of crediting period of the registered CDM project activity or renewal of PoA has not been submitted within 240 days after the standardized baseline became valid.

Reporting requirement

362^{bis}. The DOE shall prepare a validation report for renewal of crediting period of the registered CDM project activity or renewal of PoA using the valid version of the applicable validation report form for renewal of crediting period of the CDM project activity or renewal of PoA, taking into account the grace period of the form if it has been revised.

362^{ter.} When completing the validation report form for renewal of crediting period of the CDM project activity or renewal of PoA, the DOE shall follow the instructions therein.

363. In its validation report for renewal of crediting period of the CDM project activity or renewal of PoA, ~~the DOE shall report on the renewal of the crediting period on~~

(a) Provide all its applied approaches, findings and conclusions on whether:

(i) The updated PDD or PoA-DD complies with the valid version of the applicable PDD or PoA-DD form and instructions therein for filling out the PDD or PoA-DD form;

(ii) Information transferred to the later valid version of the PDD or PoA-DD form is materially the same as that in the registered PDD or PoA-DD, where applicable;

(iii) The baseline and monitoring methodology and, where applicable, the standardized baseline was(were) applied in accordance with the applicable requirements in the Project standard;

(iv) The baseline, the estimated GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals, and the monitoring plan in the updated PDD or PoA-DD comply with the applicable requirements in the Project standard, and the valid version of the methodology and, where applicable, the standardized baseline that is(are) applicable to the registered CDM project activity or PoA;

(v) The next crediting period of the registered CDM project activity commences on the day immediately after the expiration of the current crediting period;

(vi) The names of project participants in the updated PDD are consistent with the names of the project participants in the registered PDD, or whether the names of the coordinating/managing entity and project participants in the updated PoA-DD are consistent with the names of the coordinating/managing entity and project participants in the registered PoA-DD;

(b) Report on all items listed in paragraph 155 above except sub-paragraph 155(b) above;

(c) Follow paragraphs 150 - 153 above mutatis mutandis on its validation opinion;

(d) Provide a statement on whether any proposed post-registration changes for the next crediting period will be submitted together with the request for renewal of crediting period of the registered CDM project activity or renewal of PoA.

~~(a) Describe the steps undertaken to assess, and state its opinion on, the compliance of whether the validity of the original baseline or its update, the estimated GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals, and the updated monitoring plan are in line with the applicable requirements in the Project standard and the latest applicable valid version of the methodology applicable to the registered CDM project activity or the registered CDM PoA;~~

~~(b) Provide a confirmation on the consistency of the names of project participants included in the request for renewal of crediting period;~~

~~(c) If the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity selected another methodology for the purpose of renewal of crediting period, describe the steps undertaken to assess, and state its opinion on, the compliance of the updated PDD or PoA-DD with the requirements of that methodology;~~

363^{bis}. The DOE shall submit the validation report for renewal of crediting period of the registered CDM project activity or renewal of PoA, along with the supporting documents, to the Board as part of the request for renewal of crediting period of the project activity or renewal of PoA in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.

363^{ter}. The DOE shall request the secretariat to withdraw the request for renewal of crediting period of the registered CDM project activity or renewal of PoA in accordance with the Project cycle procedure, if the project participants or the coordinating/ managing entity requested the DOE to withdraw the request for renewal of crediting period of the project activity or renewal of PoA before the adoption of the decision on the request for renewal of crediting period of the project activity or renewal of PoA.

12. Specific validation requirements on renewal of crediting period or renewal of programme of activities

12.1. ~~Specific validation requirements for c~~Carbon dioxide capture and storage project activities

364. In accordance with section “Monitoring” of the Project standard, the DOE shall determine whether the project participants have carried out the following updates to ensure that they meet the requirements related to CCS project activities:

- (a) Recharacterize the geological storage site, in accordance with section “Selection and characterization of the geological storage site” of the Project standard;
- (b) Revise the project boundary;
- (c) Update the risk and safety assessment, in accordance with section “Risk and safety assessment” of the Project standard;
- (d) Update the environmental and socioeconomic impact assessments;
- (e) Revise the monitoring plan, in order to improve the accuracy and/or completeness of data and information, taking into account observed deviations determined during history matching, changes to the project boundary, changes to the risk and safety assessment, changes to the environmental and socioeconomic impact assessments, new scientific knowledge and improvements in the best available technology;
- (f) Update the site development and management plan, taking account of the results of the activities described in subparagraphs (a) – (e) above, where appropriate.

365. Where the information prepared in accordance with paragraph 364 above indicates that the geological storage site no longer meets the requirements set out in section

“Selection and characterization of the geological storage site” of the Project standard, the issuance of CERs shall cease and the DOE shall issue a negative validation opinion.

12.2. ~~Renewal of a crediting period of CPAs under a registered PoA~~ Specific validation requirements for Programme of activities

12.2.1. Renewal of programme of activities

365^{bis}. The DOE shall determine whether the coordinating/ managing entity, in accordance with the relevant requirements in the Project standard,:

- (a) Updated the eligibility criteria for inclusion of CDM CPAs in the PoA;
- (b) ~~Prepared a new completed PoA-DD and a new version of the generic CPA-DD;~~
Requested renewal of the registered CDM PoA seven years after the approval of the revised version of the methodology and/or standardized baseline if the version of the PoA has been revised because the applied methodology and/or the applied standardized baseline have been revised or replaced after having been placed on hold or withdrawn.

12.2.2. Renewal of crediting period of component project activities

365^{ter}. The DOE shall prepare a validation report for renewal of crediting period of the included CDM CPA using the valid version of the applicable validation report form for renewal of crediting period of the CDM CPA, taking into account the grace period of the form if it has been revised.

365^{quater}. When completing the validation report form for renewal of crediting period of the CDM CPA, the DOE shall follow the instructions therein.

366. The DOE shall assess the information in the updated specific-case CPA-DD against the latest version of the registered CDM PoA-DD (with its generic CPA-DD part), including the eligibility criteria, and documentation requirements and, if consistency is confirmed, shall renew the crediting period of the existing specific-case CDM CPA in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.

13. General validation requirements on re-registration and re-inclusion

[Option 1]

367. The DOE contracted with project participants to validate for the re-registration of a de-registered CDM project activity or for the re-inclusion of an excluded CDM CPA shall be accredited for the validation function for the specific CDM sectoral scope.

Validation requirement

368. If the crediting period (e.g. maximum seven years for a non-A/R project activity or CPA) when the project activity was de-registered or the CPA was excluded has already expired but its entire renewable crediting period (e.g. maximum 21 years for a non-A/R project activity or CPA) has not expired yet, the DOE shall determine whether:

- (a) The project participants have updated the relevant sections of the de-registered PDD relating to the baseline, estimated GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals, the monitoring plan and the crediting period using the valid version(s) of the approved baseline and monitoring methodology and, where applicable, the approved standardized baseline that is(are) applicable to the project activity; or
- (b) The coordinating/managing entity has updated the excluded CPA-DD against the latest version of the registered PoA-DD (with its generic CPA-DD part), including the eligibility criteria, and documentation requirements.

Means of validation

- 369. The DOE shall determine whether the crediting period when the project activity was de-registered or the CPA was excluded has already expired but its entire renewable crediting period has not expired yet.
- 370. The DOE shall determine whether the updated PDD or CPA-DD is materially the same as the de-registered PDD or CPA-DD except sections that the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity has updated in accordance with the relevant requirements in the Project standard.
- 371. The DOE shall confirm that the project activity or CPA is not a CPA that has been excluded from a registered CDM PoA as a result of erroneous inclusion of the CPA.
- 372. The DOE shall determine whether the DNA of each Party indicated as being involved in the project activity in the updated PDD has provided a written statement confirming that the DNA has no objection to the re-registration of the project activity.
- 373. The DOE shall apply, mutatis mutandis, the relevant requirements in section 11 above to determine whether the project participants have updated the relevant sections of the de-registered PDD in accordance with the Project standard.

Reporting requirement

- 374. In the validation report for re-registration of the de-registered CDM project activity, the DOE shall:
 - (a) Provide all its applied approaches, findings and conclusions on paragraphs 369–373 above;
 - (b) Report on all items listed in paragraph 155 above except sub-paragraph 155(b) above;
 - (c) Follow paragraphs 150–153 above mutatis mutandis on its validation opinion.
- 375. In the validation report for re-inclusion of the excluded CDM CPA, the DOE shall:
 - (a) Provide all its applied approaches, findings and conclusions on paragraphs 368(b) and 369–371 above;
 - (b) Report on all items listed in paragraph 155 above except sub-paragraph 155(b) above;
 - (c) Follow paragraphs 150–153 above mutatis mutandis on its validation opinion.

376. The DOE shall submit the validation report, along with the supporting documents, to the Board as part of the request for re-registration or re-inclusion in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.

[Option 2]

367. The DOE contracted with project participants to validate for the re-registration of a de-registered CDM project activity or for the re-inclusion of an excluded CDM CPA shall be accredited for the validation function for the specific CDM sectoral scope.

Validation requirement

368. The DOE shall determine whether:

- (a) The project participants have updated the relevant sections of the de-registered PDD relating to the baseline, estimated GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals, the monitoring plan and the crediting period using the valid version(s) of the approved baseline and monitoring methodology and, where applicable, the approved standardized baseline that is(are) applicable to the project activity; or
- (b) The coordinating/managing entity has updated the de-registered CPA-DD against the latest version of the registered PoA-DD (with its generic CPA-DD part), including the eligibility criteria, and documentation requirements.

Means of validation

369. The DOE shall determine whether the updated PDD or CPA-DD is materially the same as the de-registered PDD or CPA-DD except sections that the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity has updated in accordance with the relevant requirements in the Project standard.

370. The DOE shall determine whether the entire renewable or fixed crediting period (e.g. maximum 21 years or 10 years respectively for a non-A/R project activity or CPA) has not expired.

371. The DOE shall confirm that the project activity or CPA is not a CPA that has been excluded from a registered CDM PoA as a result of erroneous inclusion of the CPA.

372. The DOE shall determine whether the DNA of each Party indicated as being involved in the project activity in the updated PDD has provided a written statement confirming that the DNA has no objection to the re-registration of the project activity.

373. The DOE shall apply, mutatis mutandis, the relevant requirements in section 11 above to determine whether the project participants have updated relevant sections of the de-registered PDD in accordance with the Project standard.

Reporting requirement

374. In the validation report for re-registration of the de-registered CDM project activity, the DOE shall:

- (a) Provide all its applied approaches, findings and conclusions on paragraphs 369–373 above;

(b) Report on all items listed in paragraph 155 above except sub-paragraph 155(b) above;

(c) Follow paragraphs 150–153 above mutatis mutandis on its validation opinion.

375. In the validation report for re-inclusion of the excluded CDM CPA, the DOE shall:

(a) Provide all its applied approaches, findings and conclusions on paragraphs 368(b) and 369–371 above;

(b) Report on all items listed in paragraph 155 above except sub-paragraph 155(b) above;

(c) Follow paragraphs 150–153 above mutatis mutandis on its validation opinion.

376. The DOE shall submit the validation report, along with the supporting documents, to the Board as part of the request for re-registration or re-inclusion in accordance with the Project cycle procedure.

Appendix 1. Calibration

1. The following provides an illustrative example for applying the provisions in paragraph 283 (a) and (b).
2. An electricity energy meter with a maximum permissible error ($\pm 5\%$), which may be used for measuring the electricity export for baseline emissions and electricity import for project emission calculations, is required to be calibrated every year. If the calibration is delayed and instead of after one year it is conducted after one and a half years, and the result of the delayed calibration is available at the time of verification, to account for the delayed calibration the measured values shall be corrected as demonstrated in the following Table 1 and Table 2 for situations stipulated in paragraph 283 (a) and (b).

Table 1. Sample calculation for the cases where the error identified in the delayed calibration is smaller than the maximum permissible error

Measured value	Parameter	Error identified during delayed calibration	Corrected Values
100 MWh	Electricity Export	$\pm 2\%$	100 (1-Max. permissible error%/100) = 95 MWh
100 MWh	Electricity Import	$\pm 2\%$	100 (1+Max. permissible error%/100) = 105 MWh

Table 2. Sample calculation for the cases where the error identified in the delayed calibration is larger than the maximum permissible error

Measured value	Parameter	Error identified during delayed calibration	Corrected Values
100 MWh	Electricity Export	$\pm 7\%$	100 (1-error%/100) = 93 MWh
100 MWh	Electricity Import	$\pm 7\%$	100 (1+error%/100) = 107 MWh

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
08.0	11 November 2014	<p>Published within annex 9 to the annotated agenda of EB 81.</p> <p>Revision includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification of information to be included in prior consideration of the CDM and removal of exemption of notification of prior consideration; • Elaboration of rules for cases where various changes have occurred after the publication of the PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation; • Introduction of requirements allowing withdrawal of published monitoring report; • Introduction of requirements for withdrawal of request for issuance; • Clarification of continuity of crediting periods and consequence where notification of intention to renew the crediting period is delayed; • Introduction of requirements for combining the submission of post-registration changes and request for renewal of crediting period; • Restructuring of sections related to the programme of activities, post-registration changes and renewal of crediting period; • Introduction of requirements for re-registration for project activities and re-inclusion of CPAs; • Elaboration of requirements for requesting approval of the same DOE doing both validation and verification for the same project activity or PoA; • Improvement of requirements related to global and local stakeholder consultation processes; • Introduction of requirements for delayed validation of monitoring plan; • Changes to the rules on PoAs (more flexible batched issuance requests, increased number of specific case CPAs that may be submitted at the time of request for registration or post-registration change); • Introduction of requirements related to the application of materiality.
07.0	1 June 2014	<p>EB 79, Annex 4</p> <p>The document title has changed from “<i>Clean development mechanism validation and verification standard</i>” to “<i>CDM validation and verification standard</i>”. Revision also includes provisions on standardized baselines and batched issuance requests for a PoA.</p>
06.0	11 April 2014	Revision to incorporate the amendment to the requirements for carbon dioxide capture and storage in CDM-EB78-A04.
05.0	4 October 2013	Revision to incorporate the requirements for programme of activities in the amendment in CDM-EB75-A05 which includes:

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To enable two issuance requests for the same monitoring period; • To eliminate the requirement of minimum 90 days period between two issuance requests.
04.0	29 July 2013	<p>Revision to incorporate the amendment in CDM-EB74-A04 which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration of clarification CDM-EB72-A06-CLAR and CDM-EB73-A16-CLAR; • Clarification on the situations in which prior consideration of PoAs need to be validated; • Clarification on the validation of post registration changes in the context of PoAs and CPAs.
03.0	23 November 2012	<p>EB 70, Annex 3</p> <p>Revision to reflect revised requirements for PoAs.</p>
02.0	25 November 2011	<p>EB 65, Annex 4</p> <p>The document title has changed. This document, along with the “Clean development mechanism project standard” and the “Clean development mechanism project cycle procedure”, supersedes and replaces the following documents on the date when these three documents above enter into force:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clean development mechanism validation and verification manual (version 01.2) • Procedures for requesting post-registration changes to the start date of the crediting period (version 02.0) • Procedures for modalities of communication between project participants and the Executive Board (version 01.0) • Procedures for registration of a programme of activities as a single CDM project activity and issuance of certified emission reductions for a programme of activities (version 04.1) • Procedures for processing and reporting on validation of CDM project activities (version 03.0) • Procedures for requests to the Executive Board for deviation from an approved methodology (version 01.0) • Procedures for approval of the application of multiple methodologies to a programme of activities (version 01.0) • Procedure for requests for registration of proposed CDM project activities (version 2.0) • Procedures for review of erroneous inclusion of a CPA (version 03.0) • Procedures for withdrawal of a request for registration (version 01.0) • Procedures for renewal of the crediting period of a

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
		<p>registered CDM project activity (version 06.0)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making the monitoring report available to the public in accordance with § 62 of the modalities and procedures for the CDM (version 01.0) • Procedure for requests for issuance of CERs (version 01.2) • Procedures for withdrawal of a request for issuance of certified emission reductions (version 01.0) • Procedures for notifying and requesting approval of changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD (version 01.0) • Procedures for revising monitoring plans in accordance with paragraph 57 of the modalities and procedures for the CDM (version 02.0) • Procedures for requests for deviation prior to submitting request for issuance (version 01.0) • Guidelines on the demonstration and assessment of prior consideration of the CDM (version 04.0) • Guidance related to monitoring requirements (EB23, paragraph 24) • Guidance on application of the definition of the project boundary to A/R CDM project activities (version 01.0) • Guidelines on assessment of different types of changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD (version 01.0) • Guidelines for assessing compliance with the calibration frequency requirements (version 01.0) • Clarifications on the consideration of national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances in baseline scenarios (version 02.0) • Clarifications on the treatment of national and/or sectoral policies and regulations (paragraph 45 (e) of the CDM Modalities and Procedures) in determining a baseline scenario (version 01.0) • Clarification regarding the “Procedures for registration of a programme of activities as a single CDM project activity and issuance of certified emission reductions for a programme of activities (version 01.0) • Additional clarifications to the validation requirements to be checked by a designated operational entity” (EB 11 annex 6)
01.2	30 July 2010	<p>EB 55, Annex 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporation of applicable decisions of the Board from EB 51 to EB 54; • Revision of references to the procedures, tools and guidance documents;

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Editorial review.
01.1	4 December 2009	EB 51, Annex 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Incorporation of applicable decisions of the Board from EB 44 to EB 50;• Revision of references to the procedures, tools and guidance documents;• Editorial review.
01.0	28 November 2008	EB 44, Annex 3 Initial adoption.

Decision Class: Regulatory
Document Type: Standard
Business Function: Issuance, Registration
Keywords: crediting period, standardized baselines, validation, verification

Appendix 4. Draft Procedure. CDM project cycle procedure (version 07.008.0)

CDM-EB81-AA-A09

Revision of CDM project standard, validation and verification standard, and project cycle procedure

Version 04.0

CDM-EB81-AA-A09

Procedure

CDM project cycle procedure

Version 08.0



United Nations
Framework Convention on
Climate Change

TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	248
1.1. Background.....	248
1.2. Objectives	248
2. SCOPE, APPLICABILITY AND ENTRY INTO FORCE	248
2.1. General.....	248
2.2. Entry into force.....	249
3. TERMS AND DEFINITIONS	249
4. PRE-REGISTRATION ACTIVITIES.....	249
4.1. Prior consideration of the clean development mechanism.....	249
4.2. Participation requirements of host Party for CCS project activities	250
4.2.1. Expression of host Party agreement for CCS project activities	250
4.2.2. Laws and regulations of host Party for CCS project activities	250
4.3. Publication of project design document	251
4.3.1. Submission of project design document	251
4.3.2. Submission and treatment of public comments.....	255
4.4. Reporting of validation status.....	256
4.4 _{bis} . Withdrawing of the published design documents	257
4.5. Modalities of communication.....	257
4.6. Request for deviation from approved methodology	258
4.6.1. Submission of request for deviation	258
4.6.2. Processing request for deviation.....	259
4.7. Application of multiple methodologies in programme of activities	261
5. REGISTRATION OF PROJECT ACTIVITY OR PROGRAMME OF ACTIVITIES	262
5.1. Request for registration.....	262
5.1.1. Submission of request for registration.....	262
5.1.2. Processing request for registration	263
5.1.3. Requesting review of request for registration.....	265

5.1.4.	Finalizing request for registration if no request for review	265
5.2.	Review of request for registration	266
5.2.1.	Commencement of review	266
5.2.2.	Assessment	267
5.2.3.	Consideration by the Board.....	268
5.2.4.	Finalization and implementation of the ruling	269
5.3.	Withdrawal of request for registration	270
5.3.1.	Submission of request for withdrawal	270
5.3.2.	Processing request for withdrawal	271
6.	POST-REGISTRATION ACTIVITIES	271
6.1.	Inclusion of component project activities in programme of activities	271
6.1.1.	Submission of component project activity design documents	271
6.1.2.	Review of erroneous inclusion or renewal of crediting period of component project activities	272
6.2.	Changes to registered CDM project activity or programme of activities	274
6.2.1.	Submission of request for approval of changes	274
6.2.2.	Processing request for approval of changes	279
6.3.	Changes to modalities of communication	282
6.3.1.	General requirements	282
6.3.2.	Specific requirements on changes to focal points	284
6.3.3.	Specific requirements on changes of coordinating/managing entity for programme of activities	285
6.3.4.	Specific requirements on changes to project participants	285
7.	PRE-ISSUANCE ACTIVITIES	286
7.1.	Publication of monitoring report	286
7.2.	Reporting of status of registered project activity or programme	287
7.3.	History matching and significant deviation for CCS project activities	288
8.	ISSUANCE OF CERTIFIED EMISSION REDUCTIONS	289
8.1.	Request for issuance	289
8.1.1.	Submission request for issuance	289
8.1.2.	Processing request for issuance	290

8.1.3.	Requesting review of request for issuance	291
8.1.4.	Finalizing request for issuance if no request for review	292
8.2.	Review of request for issuance	293
8.2.1.	Commencement of review	293
8.2.2.	Assessment	294
8.2.3.	Consideration by the Board.....	295
8.2.4.	Finalization and implementation of the ruling	295
8.3.	Withdrawal of request for issuance	297
8.3.1.	Submission of request for withdrawal	297
8.3.2.	Processing request for withdrawal	298
8.4.	Addressing non-permanence in CCS project activities	298
9.	RENEWAL OF CREDITING PERIOD	301
9.1.	Preparation of revised project or programme design document and notification to the secretariat of the intention to renew the crediting period	301
9.2.	Request for renewal of crediting period	301
9.2.1.	Submission of request for renewal of crediting period	301
9.2.	Request for renewal of crediting period	302
9.2.1.	Submission of request for renewal of crediting period	302
9.2.2.	Processing of request for renewal of crediting period	304
9.2.3.	Requesting review of request for renewal of crediting period.....	304
9.2.4.	Finalizing request for renewal of crediting period if no request for review	304
9.3.	Review of request for renewal of crediting period	305
9.4.	De-registration of project activity	306
9.4.1.	Submission of request for de-registration	306
9.4.2.	Processing of request for de-registration	306
9.4.3.	Consideration by the Board.....	307
9.4.4.	Finalizing request for de-registration	307
9.4.5.	Effects of de-registration	307
APPENDIX 1.	FEE SCHEDULE	311

APPENDIX 2.	REQUESTING A REVIEW AND MAKING DECISIONS AND OBJECTIONS REGARDING REVIEW ASSESSMENTS	314
APPENDIX 3.	BASELINE AND MONITORING METHODOLOGIES INDICATING POTENTIAL ACCRUAL OF NEGATIVE EMISSION REDUCTIONS	321

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

1. The Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP), at its first session, established the basis of a regulatory framework of the clean development mechanism (CDM) to implement Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol through the annex to decision 3/CMP.1, the annexes II, III and IV to decision 4/CMP.1, the annex to decision 5/CMP.1, the annex to decision 6/CMP.1 and the annex to decision 10/CMP.7. The CMP revised provisions in these decisions through new decisions in subsequent sessions and revoked annexes III and IV to decision 4/CMP.1. In addition, the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism (hereinafter referred to as the Board) operationalized the CDM process by adopting various standards, procedures and guidelines and revised them, as appropriate, with a view to improving the CDM process.
2. This document, developed in accordance with the “CDM management plan 2011” under its objective 3(b) “Clarification, consolidation and enhancement of the consistencies of all the existing regulatory decisions of the Board that relate to validation and verification of project activities”, consolidates all procedural provisions relating to the project cycle under the CDM: from prior consideration of seeking CDM status, the publication of project design document (PDD) regarding a CDM project activity or programme design document (PoA-DD) regarding a CDM programme of activities (PoA) up to the issuance of certified emission reductions (CERs) for the CDM project activity or PoA and the renewal of crediting period.
3. The document information section at the end of this document lists all documents that are superseded by this document individually or in conjunction with the “CDM project standard” and the “CDM validation and verification standard”.

1.2. Objectives

4. The objectives of the “CDM project cycle procedure” (hereinafter referred to as this procedure) are to:
 - (a) Improve the consistency and clarity in processing by the Board and the UNFCCC secretariat (hereinafter referred to as the secretariat) of the submissions of documents relating to the registration of a proposed CDM project activity or PoA and issuance of CERs;
 - (b) Enhance the overall efficiency and integrity of the CDM.

2. Scope, applicability and entry into force

2.1. General

5. This procedure describes the administrative steps to follow for project participants, coordinating/managing entities for PoAs, designated operational entities (DOEs), other stakeholders, the Board and the secretariat for registration of a CDM project activity or PoA, issuance of CERs and related actions.

2.2. Entry into force

6. Version 08.0 of this procedure enters into force on 1 April 2015.

3. Terms and definitions

7. In addition to the definitions in the “Glossary of CDM terms”, the following terms apply in this procedure:

- (a) “Shall” is used to indicate requirements to be followed;
- (b) “Should” is used to indicate that among several possibilities, one course of action is recommended as particularly suitable;
- (c) “May” is used to indicate what is permitted.

4. Pre-registration activities

4.1. Prior consideration of the clean development mechanism

8. For project activities with a start date on or after 2 August 2008, the project participants shall notify the designated national authority(ies) (DNAs) of the host Party(ies) of the project activity, **if the DNA exists**, and the secretariat in writing of the commencement of the project activity and their intention to seek the CDM status within 180 days of the start date of the project activity as defined in the “Glossary of CDM terms”, by using the “CDM project activity prior consideration form” (CDM-PC-FORM). Such notification is not necessary if:

~~(a)~~ **A a** PDD regarding the project activity has been published for global stakeholder consultation in accordance with paragraphs **21 below; or 18–22 below.**

~~(b)~~ **A new baseline and monitoring methodology is proposed or a revision of an approved baseline and monitoring methodology is requested for the project activity before the start date in accordance with relevant procedures.**

8_{bis}. The notification to be submitted according to paragraph 8 above shall include information on: the location of the project activity, indicating country, region and the precise geographical location(s) (geo-coordinates, or other adequate means to identify the project location); and the technology under consideration for the project activity.

8_{ter}. The secretariat shall conduct a completeness check to determine whether the information submitted by the project participant is complete. If the secretariat, during the completeness check, identifies that information is missing, the secretariat shall request this information to the project participants. The project participants shall submit the requested information within 14 days of receipt of the request. The secretariat shall notify the project participants whether the notification submitted is considered complete.

9. ~~The secretariat shall maintain a publicly available list of such notifications on the UNFCCC CDM website.~~ **Once the secretariat has determined that the notification is complete, it shall publish it on the UNFCCC CDM website.**

10. **The project participants of project activities referred to in paragraph 8 above, until they meet a condition in paragraph 8(a) or 8(b) above, the project participants** shall inform the

secretariat of the progress of the project activity every ~~subsequent~~ two years after the initial notification, using the “CDM project activity prior consideration form” (CDM-PC-FORM) until the PDD regarding the project activity has been published for global stakeholder consultation.

11. For project activities with a start date before 2 August 2008, for which the PDD has not been published for global stakeholder consultation or the start date is prior to the date of publication of the PDD for global stakeholder consultation in accordance with paragraph ~~21 below~~~~18–22 below~~, the project participants shall provide information to demonstrate that the CDM was seriously considered in the decision to implement the project activity in accordance with the “CDM project standard” to the DOE that performs validation of the proposed CDM project activity.
12. Provisions in paragraphs 8–10 above shall not apply to PoAs. However, the coordinating/managing entity may notify to the DNA(s) of the host Party(ies) of the PoA and the secretariat in writing of the intention to seek the CDM status for the PoA, using the “CDM programme of activities prior consideration form” (CDM-PoA-PC-FORM) for the purpose of determining the start date of the PoA.

4.2. Participation requirements of host Party for CCS project activities

4.2.1. Expression of host Party agreement for CCS project activities

13. If a Party wishes to host CDM CCS project activities on its territory, it shall submit to the UNFCCC secretariat, through its DNA, an expression of its agreement (EoA) to allow the implementation of CCS project activities on its territory. A host Party's EoA shall be submitted prior to the PDD for the first proposed CCS project activity on the host Party's territory being published for global stakeholder consultation. A DNA shall submit the EoA by e-mail to [Moderator-DNA@unfccc.int].
14. A host Party's EoA shall apply to all CCS project activities implemented on its territory.
15. The EoA should list the host Party's laws and regulations that satisfy the requirements set out in section 4.2.2 below as an appendix.

4.2.2. Laws and regulations of host Party for CCS project activities

16. Prior to the publication of the PDD for global stakeholder consultation for the first proposed CCS project activities on its territory, a host Party shall ensure that it has established laws and/or regulations that:
 - (a) Set procedures that include provisions for the appropriate selection, characterization and development of geological storage sites, recognizing the project requirements for CCS project activities under the CDM set out in section “Selection and characterization of the geological storage site” of the “CDM project standard”;
 - (b) Define means by which rights to store carbon dioxide in, and gain access to, a subsurface pore space can be conferred to project participants;
 - (c) Provide for timely and effective redress for affected entities, individuals and communities for any significant damage, such as environmental damage,

including damage to ecosystems, other material damage or personal injury, caused by the project activity, including in the post-closure phase;

- (d) Provide for timely and effective remedial measures to stop or control any unintended seepage of carbon dioxide, to restore the integrity of a geological storage site, and to restore long-term environmental quality significantly affected by a CCS project activity;
- (e) Establish a means for addressing liability arrangements for carbon dioxide geological storage sites, taking into account the provisions set out in section "Liability" of the "CDM project standard";
- (f) For a host Party that accepts the obligation to address a net reversal of storage, establish measures to fulfil such an obligation.

4.3. Publication of project **or programme** design document

4.3.1. Submission of project **or programme** design document

17. The project participants of a proposed CDM project activity shall complete a PDD, or the coordinating/managing entity of a proposed CDM PoA shall complete a PoA-DD and the PoA-specific component project activity design document(s) (CPA-DDs), in accordance with the "CDM project standard", and submit it/them together with supporting documentation, to the designated operational entity (DOE) contracted by the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity to perform validation of the project activity or PoA.
18. The DOE shall make the PDD or PoA-DD **and CPA-DD** publicly available through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website for global stakeholder consultation. The duration of the period for submission of comments for the global stakeholder consultation shall be 30 days except with respect to large-scale afforestation and reforestation (A/R) project activities or large-scale A/R PoAs, for which the duration shall be 45 days.
19. When submitting the PDD or PoA-DD, the DOE shall, through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website, also submit the following information to be made publicly available:
 - (a) The name of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA;
 - (b) The host Party(ies) of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA;
 - (c) The names of the project participants listed in the PDD or PoA-DD. **The DOE shall indicate** with which **of the project participants** the DOE has a contractual relationship for validation of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA, as well as the name of the coordinating/managing entity in the case of PoA;
 - (d) The estimated annual greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions or removal enhancements indicated in the PDD or, in the case of a PoA, the estimated total annual GHG emission reductions or removal enhancements of all **specific case component project activities (CPAs) expected to be included in the PoA for which CPA-DDs were submitted with the PoA-DD at the time of its publication;**

- (e) The approved baseline and monitoring methodology(ies) and, where applicable, the approved standardized baseline(s) that is(are) applied to the proposed CDM project activity or PoA;
- (f) Reference to any previous publication of the PDD or PoA-DD for public comments on the UNFCCC CDM website;
- (g) The proposed start date of the proposed CDM project activity and the start date and the length of its first crediting period, or the proposed start date of the proposed CDM PoA and the start date and the length of the first crediting period of each of the specific case CPAs published;
- (h) The report on the feedback provided by stakeholders during the local stakeholder consultation;
- (i) A summary of the environmental impact assessment report of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA, if applicable.
- (j) In the case of a proposed CDM PoA, in addition to subparagraphs (a)–(g) above:
 - (i) The generic CPA-DD part of the PoA-DD, which specifies the generic information relevant to all CPAs that may be included in the PoA. If the PoA applies more than one technology/measure or more than one methodology, the generic CPA-DD part of the PoA-DD shall be completed for each technology/measure, each methodology and each combination thereof, unless the technologies/measures in the applied methodologies are included in the positive lists for additionality demonstration under the “Guidelines on demonstration of additionality of small-scale project activities” or “Guidelines on demonstration of additionality of microscale project activities”. In the latter case, the generic CPA-DD may cover more than one technology/measure, and the specific case CPA-DD(s), to be submitted in accordance with subparagraphs (ii) and (iii) below, may correspond to any one of the technologies/measures or their combinations;
 - (ii) At least one but no more than five specific case CPA-DDs that correspond to each generic CPA-DD. In case where all specific case CPA-DDs to cover all generic CPA-DDs cannot be provided at the time of publication of the PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, ~~at least one~~ specific case CPA-DD(s) corresponding to ~~any of the at least one~~ generic CPA-DDs shall be provided at the time of publication of the PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation. In this case, for each of the remaining generic CPA-DDs, one specific case CPA-DD(s) shall be provided at the time of request for registration of the PoA or after the registration of the PoA. In the latter case, the specific case CPA-DD(s) shall be provided for approval by the Board in accordance with the post-registration change process as defined in section 6.2 below;
 - (iii) If the PoA is hosted in more than one ~~host~~ Party, a specific case CPA-DD shall also be provided for each host Party at the time of publication of the PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation. In this case, if the PoA-DD defines more than one generic CPA-DD, the specific-case CPA-DD for a host Party may correspond to any generic CPA-DD. However, the

requirements in subparagraph (ii) above shall still apply to the PoA as a whole.

20. ~~When submitting a request for registration of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA, all project participants with a contractual relationship with the DOE for validation of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA shall be listed in the PDD or PoA-DD, unless they have provided a letter of voluntary withdrawal from the project activity or PoA. The DOE may remove project participants that are listed in the PDD or PoA-DD published for global stakeholder consultation but do not have a contractual relationship with the DOE for validation from the PDD or PoA-DD at the time of the request for registration.~~
21. ~~The DOE may recommence the validation activity through a new or revised contract with a different set of project participants or a different coordinating/managing entity by:~~
 - ~~(a) Indicating that the first validation contract has been terminated in accordance with paragraph 28(a) below; and~~
 - ~~(b) Republishing the PDD or PoA-DD or a revised version thereof for global stakeholder consultation in accordance with paragraphs 18 and 19 above.~~
22. If the DOE is accredited for the validation function in all sectoral scope(s)¹ to which the proposed CDM project activity or PoA is linked through the application of baseline and monitoring methodology(ies), the secretariat, through the CDM information system, shall make the PDD or PoA-DD publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website. The period for submission of comments for global stakeholder consultation on the PDD or PoA-DD shall commence at midnight GMT subsequent to the publication of the PDD or PoA-DD. The CDM information system shall inform the DOE of the location of the PDD or PoA-DD on the UNFCCC CDM website and the opening and closing dates **and time** of the period for submission of comments.
23. ~~If the PDD or PoA-DD applies the previous version of an approved baseline and monitoring methodology and/or an approved standardized baseline, and a request for registration of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA has not been submitted within the grace period for the use of the previous version as defined in the procedure "Development, revision and clarification of baseline and monitoring methodologies and methodological tools" and/or the procedure "Development, revision, clarification and update of standardized baselines", the project participants shall revise the PDD, or the coordinating/managing entity shall revise the PoA-DD, applying the revised version of the methodology and/or the standardized baseline in its entirety or elements of it as required (e.g. in the case of an approved deviation). In this case, the DOE shall not publish the revised PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, but shall submit it when it submits a request for registration in accordance with paragraph 62 below, unless otherwise decided by the Board when it approves the revised methodology and/or the revised standardized baseline.~~

¹ There are 16 sectoral scopes in the CDM and these are used in the accreditation of DOEs. The list of sectoral scopes, the DOEs accredited in each scope as well as the approved baseline and monitoring methodologies linked with these sectoral scopes are given on the UNFCCC CDM website.

4.3.1_{bis} Changes after publication of project or programme design document**4.3.1_{bis}1 Change of project participants or coordinating managing/entity**

23_{bis}. When submitting a request for registration of the proposed CDM project activity, all project participants shall be listed in the PDD, and all project participants and the coordinating/managing entity shall be listed in the PoA-DD. The list shall specify which project participants have a contractual relationship with the DOE for validation of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA.

23_{ter}. If all project participants or the coordinating/managing entity that have a contractual relationship with the DOE for validation at the time of the publication of the PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation have been replaced, the revised PDD or PoA-DD shall be published for global stakeholder consultation in accordance with paragraphs 18–22 above.

4.3.1_{bis}2 Change of designated operational entity

23_{quater}. If the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity wish to change the DOE after the publication of the PDD or PoA-DD, they shall notify the change to the secretariat by e-mail informing of the name of the newly appointed DOE before the submission of the request for registration of the CDM project activity or PoA. This DOE will not need to republish the PDD or the PoA-DD in accordance with paragraphs 18–22 above but shall take into account the comments received during the global stakeholder consultation of the PDD or PoA-DD in its validation.

4.3.1_{bis}3 Change to design of project activity or programme of activities

23_{quinquies}. If the design of the CDM project activity or PoA has undergone changes determined by the DOE as significant after the publication of the PDD or PoA-DD, the DOE may seek guidance from the Board on whether a revised PDD or PoA-DD shall be published for global stakeholder consultation by submitting such request to a specified UNFCCC e-mail account. ~~the PDD or PoA-DD will not need to be republished for global stakeholder consultation in accordance with paragraphs 18–22 above unless the environmental impact assessment conducted for the proposed CDM project activity or PoA or the national or local environmental permissions are no longer valid due to the changes.~~

23_{sexies}. The Board shall expeditiously consider the case, through electronic means where possible, and provide guidance to the DOE. In doing so, the Board shall consider the significance of the changes in terms of the impact on the application of the methodology, local stakeholders.

4.3.1_{bis}3 Application of standardized baseline whose selection is mandatory

24. If the PDD or PoA-DD has been published for global stakeholder consultation when no applicable approved standardized baseline was valid, ~~if and~~ an applicable approved standardized baseline whose selection is mandatory has become valid after the publication of the PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation ~~but before the submission of a request for registration of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA~~, and if the request for registration has not been submitted within 240 days after the standardized baseline became valid, the project participants shall revise the PDD, or the coordinating/managing entity shall revise the PoA-DD, applying the ~~applicable approved~~

standardized baseline. In this case, the DOE shall publish the revised PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation in accordance with paragraph 18–22 above.

4.3.1^{bis} 4 Change of baseline and monitoring methodology or standardized baseline

25. If the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity wish to change the approved baseline and monitoring methodology, approved standardized baseline and/or combination of approved baseline and monitoring methodologies that is(are) applied in the PDD or PoA-DD that has already been published for global stakeholder consultation, then:

- (a) The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall revise the PDD or PoA-DD accordingly;
- (b) The DOE shall subsequently publish the revised PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation in accordance with paragraphs 18–22 above, except when the following conditions apply to a PoA:
 - (i) The change only involves the removal and no addition of approved baseline and monitoring methodologies and/or approved standardized baselines;
 - (ii) The removal of the approved baseline and monitoring methodologies and/or the approved standardized baselines does not affect the physical design of, and the end-use services provided by, the CPAs that apply the methodologies and, where applicable, the standardized baselines that remain (i.e. the methodologies and, where applicable, standardized baselines that were not removed).

25^{bis}. If the PDD or PoA-DD applies the previous version of an approved baseline and monitoring methodology and/or an approved standardized baseline, and a request for registration of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA has not been submitted within the grace period for the use of the previous version as defined in the “Procedure: Development, revision and clarification of baseline and monitoring methodologies and methodological tools” and/or the “Procedure: Development, revision, clarification and update of standardized baselines”, the project participants shall revise the PDD, or the coordinating/managing entity shall revise the PoA-DD, applying the revised version of the methodology and/or the standardized baseline in its entirety or elements of it as required (e.g. in the case of an approved deviation). In this case, the DOE shall not publish the revised PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, but shall submit it when it submits a request for registration in accordance with paragraph 62 below, unless otherwise decided by the Board when it approves the revised methodology and/or the revised standardized baseline.

4.3.2. Submission and treatment of public comments

26. Parties, stakeholders² and UNFCCC accredited observers may submit comments, in English, on the validation requirements for the proposed CDM project activity or PoA to the DOE through the secretariat via a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website. The submitters of the comments shall provide the name and contact details of the individual or organization on whose behalf the comments are submitted. The DOE shall

² For the purpose of this procedure all members of the public are considered to be stakeholders.

~~check the authenticity of this information in case of doubt.~~ Comments from stakeholders shall:

- (a) Be specific to the proposed CDM project activity or PoA;
- (b) Provide objective and verifiable information;
- (c) Be limited to the additionality of the emission reductions ~~or removal enhancements~~ generated by the project ~~activity or PoA~~, its claimed sustainable development benefits and any impact it may have on the environment and on local communities.

27. The secretariat shall make the comments ~~that the DOE has deemed appropriate for publication determined that they meet the requirements on commenting referred to in paragraph 26 above,~~ publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website where the PDD or PoA-DD is displayed, and shall remove those that the DOE has determined to be unauthentic in accordance with paragraph 26 above.

- 27^{bis}. After the completion of the local stakeholder consultation, local stakeholders may submit a complaint to the DNA(s) of the host Party(ies) if they find that the outcome of the local stakeholder consultation is not appropriately taken into account. The DOE shall request the DNA(s) to forward such complaints, if any, to the DOE and promptly forward them to the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity during the validation in accordance with the "CDM validation and verification standard".

4.4. Reporting of validation status

28. At 180 days subsequent to the end of the period for submission of comments on the PDD or PoA-DD, the DOE shall provide, through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website, an update on the status of its validation activity, unless it has submitted a request for registration of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA in accordance with paragraph 62 below. The DOE shall include one of the following statuses in the update:

- (a) The validation contract has been terminated. In this case the DOE shall also provide a reason for the termination ~~to the Board through the secretariat~~ on a confidential basis;

- (a)^{bis} A revised PDD or PoA-DD for the same project activity or PoA has been published;

- (b) The DOE has issued a negative validation opinion;
- (c) The DOE has raised one or more corrective action requests or clarification requests, to which no response has been received from the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, or the DOE is seeking further clarification to the responses received from the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity. In this case, the DOE shall also provide a summary of the issues raised and update or reconfirm the status of the validation activities at 90-day intervals thereafter;
- (d) The DOE has finalized a positive validation opinion with the exception of the receipt of a valid letter of approval from one or more Party(ies) involved. In this case, the DOE shall also indicate from which Party(ies) involved a valid letter of approval has not been received;

- (e) The DOE is performing validation activities and it has not yet sent any corrective action or clarification requests to the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity. In this case the DOE shall also provide an explanation on the length of time taken and update or reconfirm the status of the validation activities at 90-day intervals thereafter.

28_{bis}. The secretariat shall inform the stakeholders who submitted comments that were considered authentic during the global stakeholder consultation about the update provided by the DOE by sending them an e-mail to the addresses provided when they submitted comments.

4.4_{bis}. Withdrawal of published project or programme design documents

28_{ter}. At any time before the submission of a request for registration, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity may, through the DOE, withdraw the PDD or PoA-DD published for global stakeholder consultation. In this case, the DOE shall submit a request for withdrawal of the PDD or PoA-DD to the secretariat by using the "Project or programme design document withdrawal request form" (CDM-PW-FORM). If the form contains all required information, the PDD or PoA-DD shall be considered withdrawn and the secretariat shall mark the PDD or PoA-DD on the UNFCCC CDM website as "withdrawn".

4.5. Modalities of communication

29. The project participants of a CDM project activity or PoA shall designate one or more focal point entities (hereinafter referred to as focal points) to communicate on their behalf with the Board and the secretariat within the defined scopes of authority referred to in paragraph 32 below and include this information in a modalities of communication (MoC) statement.
30. After the submission of a request for registration of a proposed CDM project activity or PoA in accordance with paragraph 62 below, all official communication between the project participants and the Board or the secretariat for the specific project activity or PoA shall be conducted in accordance with the MoC statement with the exception of communications undertaken in accordance with paragraph 165 and 174(b) below.
31. The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall submit to the DOE at the time of validation of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA an MoC statement using the latest valid version of the MoC statement form (CDM-MOC-FORM), including its annex 1. ~~The contact details of the focal points shall be included in the F-CDM-MOC and the contact details of the project participants in its annex 1.~~
32. The project participants shall grant the focal points the authority to:
 - (a) Communicate in relation to requests for forwarding of CERs to individual accounts of project participants (scope (a)); and/or
 - (b) Communicate in relation to requests for addition and/or voluntary withdrawal of project participants and focal points, as well as changes to company names, legal status, contact details and specimen signatures (scope (b)); and/or
 - (c) Communicate on all other project- or programme-related matters not covered by (a) or (b) above (scope (c)).

33. The project participants may designate separate entities for each scope of authority either in a sole, shared or joint focal point role and shall designate two or more focal points for a shared or joint focal point role.
34. The project participants and the focal points may designate one primary authorized signatory and one alternate authorized signatory. The signature of either the primary or alternate authorized signatory shall suffice for authenticating the project participant's or the focal point's consent or instruction(s).
35. A project participant that is also a focal point for the same CDM project activity or PoA may designate different authorized signatories for the project participant status and for the focal point status.
36. For CDM PoAs, the coordinating/managing entity shall be either the sole or a joint focal point for each scope of authority. The number of joint focal points for a PoA shall be limited to five, or equal to the number of host Parties if greater than five.
37. The project participants shall not include or refer to private contractual arrangements in an MoC statement such as the establishment of conditions for the designation or change of focal points or the purchase and/or sale of CERs. The project participants and focal points shall be solely responsible for honouring such arrangements.
38. The secretariat shall, when conducting the completeness check of the request for registration submission in accordance with paragraphs 67–68 below, consider the contact details included in ~~annex 1 of the F CDM MOC~~ the MoC statement to be the valid contact details of the project participants whenever such details differ from the details of the project participants and their representatives included in ~~annex 1 of~~ the PDD or PoA-DD for the CDM project activity or PoA.
39. The secretariat shall publish the ~~F CDM MOC together with its annex 1-MoC statement~~ on the respective CDM project activity or PoA webpage on the UNFCCC CDM website following the registration of the project activity or PoA.
40. The secretariat shall not make available specimen signatures, contact details and other personal information to anyone other than members ~~and alternate members~~ of the Board, the project participants, the focal points and the DOE involved in the CDM project activity or PoA.

4.6. Request for deviation from approved methodology

4.6.1. Submission of request for deviation

41. The DOE may ~~seek guidance from the Board on the acceptability of a deviation~~ prior to the submission of a request for registration or publication of the PDD or PoA-DD ~~for global stakeholder consultation~~ of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA, ~~seek guidance from the Board on the acceptability of a deviation from selected approved baseline and monitoring methodology~~, if the DOE, when performing validation for a proposed CDM project activity or PoA, or upon request from the project participants or coordinating/managing entity before the publication of the PDD or PoA-DD, finds that, due to a project- or programme-specific issue implying that a revision of the methodology would not be required to address the issue, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity deviated from:

- (a) The methodology; or
 - (b) A section (or sections) in the methodology that is(are) not standardized by the selected standardized baseline(s), if the proposed CDM project activity or PoA uses standardized baselines.
42. Alternatively, if the DOE considers that a revision of the methodology would be required to address the project or programme situation, it shall follow the “Procedure: Development, revision and clarification of baseline and monitoring methodologies and methodological tools”.
43. If the DOE cannot determine the applicability of the selected methodology and/or the selected standardized baseline to the proposed CDM project activity or PoA, the DOE shall request a clarification on the applicability in accordance with the “Procedure: Development, revision and clarification of baseline and monitoring methodologies and methodological tools” and/or the “Procedure: Development, revision, clarification and update of standardized baselines”.
44. To seek guidance from the Board on the acceptability of the deviation, the DOE shall submit the “Deviation from approved methodology request form” (CDM-DEV-METH-FORM) through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website. In the submission the DOE shall provide:
- (a) A clear and precise assessment of the case including demonstration that the deviation does not imply a revision of the methodology;
 - (b) A description of the impact of the deviation on the GHG emission reductions or removal enhancements from the project activity or PoA **for the Board to evaluate.**

4.6.2. Processing request for deviation

45. The secretariat shall maintain a publicly available list of all submitted requests for deviation on the UNFCCC CDM website, excluding supporting documentation provided by the DOE as confidential. The secretariat shall make publicly available the schedule of processing the requests for deviation, including the expected date of commencement. The secretariat shall schedule the commencement of the processing of the requests for deviation in accordance with the secretariat’s operational plans, i.e. monthly quotas, which shall also incorporate any relevant instructions from the Board.
46. The secretariat shall commence the processing of the request for deviation in accordance with the schedule. Upon commencement of the processing of the request for deviation, the secretariat shall conduct within seven days a completeness check to determine whether the request submission is complete in accordance with paragraph 44 above.
47. If the secretariat, during the completeness check, identifies issues of an editorial nature **or consistency in the submission**, it shall request the DOE by e-mail to submit **the missing or** revised documents and/or information. In this case, the DOE shall submit the requested documents and/or information within two days of receipt of the request. If the DOE does not submit the requested documents and/or information by this deadline, the secretariat shall conclude that the request submission is incomplete.

48. Upon conclusion of the completeness check, the secretariat shall notify the DOE of the conclusion of the completeness check. If the request submission is found incomplete, the secretariat shall also communicate the underlying reasons to the DOE and make them publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website. In this case, the DOE may re-submit a request for deviation with revised documentation. Upon submission of the revised documentation, the request shall be treated as a new submission of a request for deviation.
- 48^{bis}. Upon positive conclusion of the completeness check, the secretariat shall publish the request for deviation on the UNFCCC CDM website, and the request for deviation shall be deemed received by the Board for consideration.
49. ~~Upon determination by the secretariat that the request submission is complete, the~~ secretariat shall, ~~within 14 days,~~ prepare and send to the Board a summary note on the request for deviation including a recommendation on the course of action, or with a notification that the case will be placed on the agenda of the next Board meeting, ~~within 14 days of the date of publication of the request for deviation.~~
50. If the secretariat, during the preparation of the summary note, identifies issues that require clarifications from the DOE, it shall request the DOE to submit revised documents and/or information to clarify the issues within 14 days of receipt of the request. In this case, the secretariat shall, notwithstanding the provision in paragraph 49 above, finalize the summary note and send it to the Board within 14 days of receipt of the requested documents and/or information from the DOE. If the DOE does not submit the requested documents and/or information by this deadline, the secretariat shall not process the request submission any further.
51. If the request submission is removed from processing in accordance with paragraph 50 above, the DOE may request the secretariat, by e-mail through a dedicated e-mail address, to make a telephone call ~~or an internet-based call~~ to the DOE to provide clarifications on the issues identified if they are not sufficiently clear to it. Only one such request shall be allowed per request for deviation. In this case, the DOE shall provide the contact details of the person to be called with preferred time slots. The secretariat shall fix a call appointment within three days of receipt of the request. The secretariat shall record the call.
52. If the secretariat, during the preparation of the summary note, identifies issues that require inputs from a relevant panel or working group, it shall place the case on the agenda of the next meeting of the panel or working group. In this case, the secretariat shall, notwithstanding the provisions in paragraphs 49 and 50 above, finalize the summary note and send it to the Board within 14 days of receipt of the inputs from the panel or working group.
53. If no member of the Board objects to the secretariat's recommendation on the course of action referred to in paragraph 49 above within 20 days of receipt of the summary note, the recommended course of action shall be deemed to be the decision adopted by the Board.
54. An objection by a member of the Board shall be made by notifying the Chair of the Board through the secretariat, giving reasons in writing. The secretariat shall acknowledge receipt of the objection and make it available to the Board.

55. If a member of the Board objects to the secretariat's recommendation on the course of action more than 14 days prior to the next Board meeting, the case shall be placed on the agenda of the next Board meeting; otherwise it shall be placed on the agenda of the subsequent Board meeting.

4.6.3. Finalizing request for deviation

56. If the Board considers the case at its meeting in accordance with paragraph 49 or 55 above, it shall decide on the course of action at the meeting.
57. The course of action ~~referred to in paragraph 49 above~~ shall be:
- (a) Approve the deviation and allow submission of a request for registration with the deviation; or
 - (b) Decide that the deviation requires a revision of ~~an approved baseline and monitoring the~~ methodology before submitting a request for registration; ~~or~~
 - (c) **Reject the request.**
58. Once a decision has been made by the Board, the secretariat shall inform the DOE of the decision, **the reasons thereof** and any guidance provided by the Board as applicable, and make the decision, **reasons** and guidance publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website **by publishing a ruling note within three days of the decision of the Board.**

4.7. Application of multiple methodologies in programme of activities

59. If the proposed CDM PoA applies more than one approved baseline and monitoring methodology and/or technology or measure in the PoA, the DOE that performs its validation and the coordinating/managing entity shall follow the process in paragraph 60 or 61 below as applicable.
60. If the PoA applies only small-scale methodologies and, where applicable, standardized baselines, and if "cross effects" as defined in the "Standard: Demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of multiple methodologies for programme of activities" exist between the technologies or measures applied, the coordinating/managing entity shall propose methods to account for such cross effects and request approval by the Board using the process in section 4.6 above mutatis mutandis. Before submitting such request, the coordinating/managing entity may seek clarification ~~from the Board~~ on cross effects in the proposed combination of technologies or measures, using the "Procedure: Development, revision and clarification of baseline and monitoring methodologies and methodological tools" by submitting the PoA-DD **and generic CPA-DD** with completed sections for detailed technical descriptions. Where possible, such clarification requests shall be treated under the "fast track" of the procedure ~~and the clarification shall be provided within 28 days.~~
61. If the PoA applies only large-scale methodologies and, where applicable, standardized baselines, or both large-scale and small-scale methodologies and, where applicable, standardized baselines, and if the combination is explicitly permitted in the methodologies, **or each CPA will apply only one methodology, and be in different location so that there are no interactions between technology/measures of the CPAs,** the DOE may proceed with the publication of the PoA-DD or the request for registration without pre-approval by the Board of the application of the multiple methodologies. ~~If the~~

~~combination is not explicitly permitted in the methodologies~~ In other cases, the coordinating/managing entity shall seek clarification ~~from the Board~~ on the eligibility of the proposed combination, using the “Procedure: Development, revision and clarification of baseline and monitoring methodologies and methodological tools”.

5. Registration of project activity or programme of activities

5.1. Request for registration

5.1.1. Submission of request for registration

62. The DOE, after determining that the proposed CDM project activity or PoA meets all relevant requirements in the “CDM project standard” by following the relevant provisions of the “CDM validation and verification standard” and other CDM requirements, shall submit, through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website, a request for registration of the proposed CDM project activity or PoA by using the “CDM project activity registration request form” (CDM-REG-FORM) or the “CDM programme of activities registration request form” (CDM-PoA-REG-FORM), respectively, and all the required documents listed in the completeness check checklist for requests for registration.
63. The secretariat shall issue a unique reference number for the submission of the request for registration and a statement of the registration fee due, or confirmation that no registration fee is due, determined in accordance with the provisions on the registration fee, as contained in appendix 1, and shall communicate these to the DOE.
64. The DOE shall communicate to the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity the unique reference number, and the registration fee due or a confirmation that no registration fee is due.
- 64^{bis}. The secretariat shall communicate to the stakeholders who submitted comments ~~that were considered authentic during the global stakeholder consultation for the proposed CDM project activity or PoA and that the comments were determined by the DOE as meeting commenting requirements,~~ that a request for registration has been submitted for the proposed CDM project activity or PoA.
65. The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall pay the registration fee by bank transfer, quoting the unique reference number referred to in paragraph 63 above. The DOE shall submit proof of payment (e.g. bank transfer record) through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website. If the proposed CDM project activity or PoA applies:
- (a) A methodology that has been revised, withdrawn, or suspended by the Board, either proof of payment must be uploaded within 20 days or payment must be received ~~by the secretariat~~ within 40 days of the end of the grace period for revision or the date of withdrawal or suspension, as defined in the “Procedure: Development, revision and clarification of baseline and monitoring methodologies and methodological tools”; and/or
 - (b) A standardized baseline that has been revised, suspended or has expired, either proof of payment must be uploaded within 20 days or payment must be received

by the secretariat within 40 days of the end of the grace period for revision, the date of suspension or expiry, as defined in the “Procedure: Development, revision, clarification and update of standardized baselines”.

5.1.2. Processing request for registration

66. The secretariat shall maintain a publicly available list of all submitted requests for registration for which the applicable registration fee has been received by the secretariat on the UNFCCC CDM website. The secretariat shall make publicly available the schedule of processing the requests for registration, including the expected date of commencement. The secretariat shall schedule the commencement of the processing of the requests for registration in accordance with the secretariat’s operational plans, i.e. monthly quotas, which shall also incorporate any relevant instructions from the Board.
67. The secretariat shall commence the completeness check stage in accordance with the schedule. Upon commencement of the completeness check stage, the secretariat shall, subject to the guidance of the Board, conduct within seven days a completeness check to determine whether the request for registration submission is complete in accordance with the completeness check checklist for requests for registration.
68. If the secretariat, during the completeness check, identifies issues of an editorial nature or consistency in the submission, it shall request the DOE by e-mail, copying the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, to submit the missing or revised documents and/or information. In this case, the DOE shall submit the requested documents and/or information within two days of receipt of the request. If the DOE does not submit the requested documents and/or information by this deadline, the secretariat shall conclude that the request submission is incomplete.
69. Upon conclusion of the completeness check stage, the secretariat shall notify the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE, of the conclusion of the completeness check stage. If the request submission does not meet the requirements of the completeness check, the secretariat shall also communicate the underlying reasons to the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE, and make them publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website. In this case, the DOE may re-submit the request for registration with revised documentation. Upon submission of the revised documentation, the request shall be treated as a new submission of a request for registration.
70. Upon positive conclusion of the completeness check stage, the secretariat shall, subject to the guidance of the Board, conduct within 23 days an information and reporting check in accordance with the information and reporting check checklist for requests for registration.
71. If the secretariat, during the information and reporting check, identifies issues of an editorial nature or missing basic information, it shall request the DOE by e-mail, copying the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, to submit the missing or revised documents and/or information. In this case, the DOE shall submit the requested documents and/or information within two days of receipt of the request. If the DOE does not submit the requested documents and/or information by this deadline, the secretariat shall conclude that the request submission [submission is incomplete] [cannot be processed any further].

72. Upon conclusion of the information and reporting check stage, the secretariat shall notify the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE, of the conclusion of the information and reporting check stage. If the request submission for which the secretariat conducted an information and reporting check does not meet the requirements of the information and reporting check, the secretariat shall conclude that the request submission is ~~submission is incomplete~~ ~~cannot be processed any further~~, and communicate the underlying reasons to the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE, and make them publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website. In this case, the DOE may re-submit the request for registration with revised documentation. Upon submission of the revised documentation, the request shall be ~~treated as a new submission of a request for registration~~ ~~processed further~~.
73. Upon positive conclusion of the information and reporting check stage, the secretariat shall publish the request for registration on the UNFCCC CDM website, and the request for registration shall be deemed received by the Board for consideration.
74. If the ~~request submission is found incomplete as a result of the information and reporting check~~ ~~request cannot be processed any further in accordance with paragraph 72 above~~, the DOE, or the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, may request the secretariat, by e-mail through a dedicated e-mail address, to make a telephone call ~~or an internet-based call~~ to them to provide clarifications on the issues identified if they are not sufficiently clear to them. Only one such request, regardless of the requesting party, shall be allowed per request for registration. In this case, the DOE, or the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, shall provide the contact details of the person to be called with preferred time slots. The secretariat shall fix a call appointment within three days of receipt of the request. The secretariat shall record the call.
75. For re-submission ~~purposes of a request for registration after the completeness check as a new submission in accordance with paragraph 69 above~~, the DOE shall be granted an extension of the validity of the baseline and monitoring methodology and/or the standardized baseline ~~applied in the initial submission~~ by the number of days in excess of the ~~45-22~~ days elapsed before the notification on incompleteness is made, if the secretariat notifies ~~it to the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE, that the request for registration is incomplete in accordance with paragraph 69 [or 72 above]~~, more than ~~45-22~~ days after the submission of the request for registration, and the request for registration was submitted more than ~~45-22~~ days prior to the expiry of:
- (a) The grace period of the previous version of a baseline and monitoring methodology and/or a standardized baseline; or
 - (b) The validity of the previous version of a standardized baseline.
- ~~75bis-~~ For re-submission of a request for registration after the information and reporting check in accordance with paragraph 72 above, the DOE shall be granted an extension of the validity of the baseline and monitoring methodology and/or the standardized baseline applied in the initial submission until the end of the 28th-day period after the notification that the submission cannot be processed any further.
76. The secretariat shall notify the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, the DNA(s) of the Party(ies) involved, and the DOE that: the Board has received the

request for registration for consideration of registration; the secretariat has published the request for registration on the UNFCCC CDM website; and the last day by which members of the Board or a Party involved may request a review of the request for registration, as referred to in paragraph 78 below.

77. The secretariat shall, subject to the guidance of the Board, prepare and send to the Board a summary note on the request for registration within 14 days of the date of publication of the request for registration.

5.1.3. Requesting review of request for registration

78. Any Party involved in the proposed CDM project activity or PoA and/or any member of the Board may request a review of the request for registration within 28 days of the date of publication of the request for registration. If a Party involved wishes to request a review, the relevant DNA shall send the request by e-mail to the Board, through the secretariat, using the “CDM project activity/programme of activities registration request review form” (CDM-REGR-FORM) ~~by official means of communication (such as a letter with recognized official letterhead and signature or an e-mail sent from an official dedicated e-mail account)~~. If a member of the Board wishes to request a review, he/she shall communicate the request to the Board through the secretariat, using the “CDM project activity/programme of activities registration request review form” (CDM-RR-FORM) and in accordance with appendix 2.
79. The secretariat shall acknowledge receipt of a request for review and promptly make it available to the Board.
80. A request for review shall be deemed to be received by the Board on the date it has been received by the secretariat. A request for review shall not be recognized by the Board if it is received after 5 p.m. GMT of the last day of the 28-day period following the publication of the request for registration.
81. A request for review shall provide, inter alia, the reasons for the request for review based on the “CDM project standard”, “CDM validation and verification standard” or any other applicable CDM requirements.

5.1.4. Finalizing request for registration if no request for review

82. If the secretariat does not receive a request for review from a Party involved or at least three members of the Board in accordance with paragraphs 78–81 above, the Board shall register the proposed CDM project activity or PoA as a CDM project activity or PoA.
83. For requests for registration, for which the initial submission was made on or after 11 December 2010, the effective date of registration in the case referred to in paragraph 82 above shall be ~~one of the following (hereinafter referred to as the date on which when the DOE submitted a complete request for registration). This date shall be one of the following:~~

~~Option 1:~~

- ~~(a) The date when the deposit of the fee has been received by the secretariat in accordance with paragraph 65, if the request for registration was concluded as complete both after the completeness check and the information and reporting check thereafter;~~

~~(b) The date when the information was resubmitted during the completeness check in accordance with paragraph 69 above, if the request for registration was concluded as complete both after that submission of information and after the information and reporting check thereafter; or~~

~~(c) The date when the information was resubmitted during the information and reporting check in accordance with paragraph 72 above if the request for registration was concluded as complete after the information and reporting check.~~

~~Option 2:~~

(a) The date when the request for registration was submitted in accordance with paragraph 62 above, if no registration fee is due in accordance with appendix 1 (if the request for registration was submitted as a new submission after the previous submission had been concluded as incomplete at the completeness check stage in accordance with paragraph 69 above and no additional registration fee is due upon the new submission, it is the date of the new submission); or

(b) The date when the deposit of the registration fee was received by the secretariat in accordance with paragraph 65 above and appendix 1 (if the request for registration was submitted as a new submission after the previous submission had been concluded as incomplete at the completeness check stage in accordance with paragraph 69 above and additional registration fee is due upon the new submission, it is the date when the additional fee was received by the secretariat), if the request for registration was concluded as complete after the completeness check thereafter; or.

~~(c) The date when the information was submitted during the completeness check in accordance with paragraph 69 above, if the request for registration was concluded as complete after the completeness check.~~

84. For requests for registration, for which the initial submission was made before 11 December 2010, the effective date of registration in the case referred to in paragraph 82 above shall be the next day after the 28-day review request period referred to in paragraph 78 above.

5.2. Review of request for registration

5.2.1. Commencement of review

85. If a Party involved in the proposed CDM project activity or PoA, or at least three members of the Board, request a review of the request for registration, the secretariat shall:
- (a) Notify the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE that validated the proposed CDM project activity or PoA, that a Party involved in the proposed CDM project activity or PoA, or at least three members of the Board, have requested a review of the request for registration;
 - (b) Mark the request for registration as “under review” on the UNFCCC CDM website and make publicly available an anonymous version of each “CDM project

activity/programme of activities registration request review form” (CDM-REGR-FORM);

- (c) Establish a team comprising two experts selected from the Registration and Issuance Team (RIT Team) to conduct an assessment of the request for review. The secretariat shall appoint one of the RIT Team members to serve as the lead, who shall be responsible for all communications with the secretariat.
86. The DOE, or the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, may request the secretariat, by e-mail through a dedicated e-mail address, to make a telephone call or an internet-based call to them to provide clarifications on the issues identified if they are not sufficiently clear to them. Only one such request, regardless of the requesting party, shall be allowed per review of the request for registration. In this case, the DOE, or the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, shall provide the contact details of the person to be called with preferred time slots. The secretariat shall fix a call appointment within three days of receipt of the request. The secretariat shall record the call.
87. The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE, shall provide responses to the issues identified in the request for review no later than 28 days after the notification of the request for review.
88. For each issue (or sub-issue) raised in the request for review, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE, shall either:
- (a) Respond by making any revisions that they deem necessary to the PDD or PoA-DD and/or validation report to ensure, inter alia, that all facts are clearly stated and sufficiently validated; or
 - (b) Respond in writing by addressing why no revisions to the PDD or PoA-DD and/or validation report are necessary.
89. The secretariat shall schedule the commencement of the review of the request for registration in accordance with its operational plans and any relevant instructions by the Board. The secretariat shall make the schedule of reviews publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website. Upon scheduling the commencement date, or altering it as applicable, the secretariat shall inform the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE, of the scheduled or altered commencement date, respectively.
90. The date of commencement of the review shall be the date when the secretariat notifies the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE, that the review has commenced.

5.2.2. Assessment

91. The secretariat shall conduct an assessment of the request for registration in the context of the reasons for the request for review provided in the “CDM project activity/programme of activities registration request review form” (CDM-REGR-FORM) and the CDM requirements, taking into account the responses from the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE.

92. Concurrently and independently from the secretariat's assessment referred to in paragraph 91 above, the RIT Team established in accordance with paragraph 85(c) above shall conduct an assessment of the request for registration in accordance with the terms of reference of the RIT, and in the context of the reasons for the request for review provided in the "CDM project activity/programme of activities registration request review form" (CDM-REGR-FORM) and the CDM requirements, taking into account the responses of the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE.
93. Both the secretariat and the RIT Team shall finalize their assessments no later than 14 days after the commencement of the review.
94. Both the secretariat and the RIT Team shall, in ~~each of~~ their assessment ~~reports~~, include a proposed decision taking into account appendix 2. Each proposed decision shall suggest either to:
- (a) Register the proposed project activity or PoA; or
 - (b) Reject the request for registration.
95. If a proposed decision is to reject the request for registration, then the assessment report shall include a proposed ruling. The proposed ruling shall contain an explanation of the reasons and rationale for the proposed decision, including, but not limited to:
- (a) The facts and any interpretation of the facts that formed the basis of the proposed decision;
 - (b) The CDM requirements applied to the facts;
 - (c) The interpretation of the CDM requirements as applied to the facts.
96. In addition, both the secretariat and the RIT Team shall, in their assessment reports, highlight any issues of significant importance related to the policies and goals of the CDM arising from the assessment. The secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the Board, shall bring these issues to the attention of the Board by preparing background notes and policy options and presenting them to the Board at its meetings.
97. The RIT Team shall submit its assessment report to the Board through the secretariat.
98. The secretariat shall inform the Board of the availability of each assessment report, and make each assessment report available to the Board, together with any responses from the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE, and any revision to the PDD ~~or PoA-DD, and/or~~ validation report and ~~or~~ other relevant documentation.

5.2.3. Consideration by the Board

99. If the respective assessment reports of the secretariat and the RIT Team contain the same proposed decision (i.e. both are to register the proposed CDM project activity or PoA, or both are to reject the request for registration), then the proposed decision shall become the final decision of the Board 20 days after the date when the availability of the assessment reports of the secretariat ~~and/or~~ the RIT Team, ~~whichever the later~~ was communicated to the Board, unless a member of the Board objects to the proposed decision.

100. An objection by a member of the Board shall be made by notifying the Chair of the Board through the secretariat, giving reasons in writing and in accordance with appendix 2. The secretariat shall acknowledge receipt of the objection and make it available to the Board.
101. If a member of the Board objects to the proposed decision more than 14 days prior to the next Board meeting, the case shall be placed on the agenda of the next Board meeting; otherwise it shall be placed on the agenda of the subsequent Board meeting.
102. If the assessment reports of the secretariat and the RIT Team contain different proposed decisions (i.e. one is to register the proposed CDM project activity or PoA, and the other is to reject the request for registration) and the Board receives both proposed decisions more than 14 days prior to the next Board meeting, the case shall be placed on the agenda of the next Board meeting; otherwise, it shall be placed on the agenda of the subsequent Board meeting.
103. At the Board meeting for which the case is placed on the agenda, the Board shall, in accordance with appendix 2, decide to either:
 - (a) Register the proposed CDM project activity or PoA; or
 - (b) Reject the request for registration.

5.2.4. Finalization and implementation of ruling

104. If the Board's final decision made in accordance with paragraph 99 or 103 above is to register the proposed CDM project activity or PoA, the secretariat shall register it as a CDM project activity or PoA on the first working day subsequent to the finalization of the decision. The effective date of registration in such cases shall be **one of the following: the day on which the latest revisions to the validation report and/or supporting documentation were submitted.**
 - (a) The date when the DOE submitted a complete request for registration as referred to in paragraph 83 above, if the response to the request for review was made in accordance with paragraph 88(b) above; or**
 - (b) The date when the latest revisions to the PDD or PoA-DD and/or validation report were submitted in accordance with paragraph 88(a) above.**
105. If the Board's final decision made in accordance with paragraph 99 or 103 above is to reject the request for registration, the secretariat shall update the information on the UNFCCC CDM website accordingly on the first working day subsequent to the finalization of the decision. Furthermore, within 21 days of the finalization of the decision, the secretariat shall provide the Chair of the Board with an information note containing a proposed ruling incorporating the final decision.
106. The proposed ruling shall contain an explanation of the reasons and rationale for the final decision, including, but not limited to:
 - (a) The facts and any interpretation of the facts that formed the basis of the proposed ruling;
 - (b) The CDM requirements applied to the facts;
 - (c) The interpretation of the CDM requirements as applied to the facts.

107. Once approved by the Chair of the Board, the secretariat shall immediately make the proposed ruling available to the Board. The proposed ruling shall become the final ruling of the Board 10 days after the date when the proposed ruling was made available to the Board, unless a member of the Board objects to the proposed ruling.
108. An objection by a member of the Board shall be made by notifying the Chair of the Board through the secretariat, giving reasons in writing and in accordance with appendix 2. The secretariat shall acknowledge receipt of the objection and make it available to the Board.
109. If a member of the Board objects to the proposed ruling more than 14 days prior to the next Board meeting, the case shall be placed on the agenda of the next Board meeting; otherwise it shall be placed on the agenda of the subsequent Board meeting.
110. At the Board meeting for which the case is placed on the agenda, the Board shall, in accordance with appendix 2, finalize the ruling.
111. The secretariat shall ~~make the final~~ publish a ruling ~~publicly available note~~ on the UNFCCC CDM website; ~~no later than three days after the ruling was finalized.~~
- 111^{bis}. After the publication of the ruling note, the DOE, or the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, may request the secretariat, by e-mail through a dedicated e-mail address, to make a telephone call or an internet-based call to them to provide clarifications on the ruling. Only one such request, ~~regardless of the requesting party,~~ shall be allowed per ruling. In this case, the DOE, or the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, shall provide the contact details of the person to be called with preferred time slots. The secretariat shall fix a call appointment within three (3) days of receipt of the request. The secretariat shall record the call.
- 111^{ter}. If the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity wish to request the registration of a project activity or PoA that has been rejected by the Board, the validation activity ~~by the same or a different DOE~~ for the project activity or PoA shall restart, including the publication of a revised PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation in accordance with paragraphs 18–22 above.

5.3. Withdrawal of request for registration

5.3.1. Submission of request for withdrawal

112. For the following cases, the DOE shall submit a request for withdrawal of a request for registration by using the “Registration request withdrawal request form” (CDM-REGW-FORM) and uploading it through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website:
- (a) The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity voluntarily wish to withdraw a proposed CDM project activity or PoA, of which the DOE is requesting for registration;³
 - (b) The DOE has revised its validation ~~opinion report~~ based on new insights or information ~~and has determined that the proposed project activity or PoA does not meet all relevant requirements for a CDM project activity or PoA.~~

³ In such cases the DOE shall process the request expeditiously.

5.3.2. Processing request for withdrawal

113. Upon receipt of the request for withdrawal of a request for registration, the secretariat shall as soon as possible check the documents submitted, and if the request is complete, take the following actions:

~~114. (a) Type 1:~~ If the DOE requests the withdrawal prior to the publication of the request for registration made in accordance with paragraph 73 above, the secretariat shall reimburse the registration fee in full to the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity in accordance with appendix 1. In this case, the secretariat shall not mark the project activity or PoA as “withdrawn”, but shall block the unique reference number assigned to the withdrawn project activity or PoA from further use.

~~115. (b) Type 2:~~ If the DOE requests the withdrawal during as from the 28-day period for requesting a review of the request for registration in accordance with paragraph 78 above, the secretariat shall reimburse any registration fee paid above USD 30,000 to the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity in accordance with appendix 1, and mark the proposed CDM project activity or PoA as “withdrawn” on the UNFCCC CDM website.

~~116. Type 3:~~ If the DOE requests the withdrawal subsequent to being notified a request for review of the request for registration in accordance with paragraph 85(a) above, any registration fee paid above USD 30,000 shall be reimbursed to the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the proposed CDM project activity or PoA shall be marked as “withdrawn” on the UNFCCC CDM website.

~~117. Submissions of requests for withdrawal shall feed into the framework for performance monitoring of DOEs.~~

6. Post-registration activities

6.1. Inclusion of component project activities in programme of activities

6.1.1. Submission of component project activity design documents

118. To include a CPA in a registered CDM PoA, the coordinating/managing entity shall forward a completed specific case CPA-DD to any a DOE, after having ensured that the CPA and the specific case CPA-DD meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the PoA defined in the latest version of the registered PoA-DD and its generic CPA-DD part. The coordinating/managing entity may forward more than one specific case CPA-DD at one time. Only upon the approval of the first specific case CPA-DD corresponding to a generic CPA-DD by the Board, CPAs corresponding to that generic CPA-DD may be included in the registered CDM PoA.

119. If the DOE confirms that the CPA meets the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the PoA, it shall include the CPA in the PoA by submitting the specific CPA-DD to the Board via uploading it the corresponding specific case CPA-DD through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website. Such uploads shall be grouped and not occur more frequently than once per month.

120. The CPA identified in the specific CPA-DD uploaded by the DOE will be automatically included in the registered CDM PoA and displayed on the view page of that PoA. The secretariat shall automatically notify the DOE, the coordinating/managing entity and the DNA of the change in the status of the PoA.
121. If an approved baseline and monitoring methodology and/or an approved standardized baseline that is(are) applied to the PoA is(are) put on hold or withdrawn for any reason other than for the purpose of including the methodology in a consolidated methodology, no new CPAs shall be included in the PoA, in accordance with the timelines indicated in the “Procedure: Development, revision and clarification of baseline and monitoring methodologies and methodological tools” and/or the “Procedure: Development, revision, clarification and update of standardized baselines”.
122. If the methodology and/or the standardized baseline, subsequent to being placed on hold, is(are) revised, the coordinating/managing entity shall revise the PoA-DD **including its generic CPA-DD part, including by, inter alia,** updating the eligibility criteria for inclusion of CPAs in the PoA to be in line with the revised methodology and/or the revised standardized baseline, ~~and the generic CPA-DD applying the updated eligibility criteria~~ following the process described in paragraph 140 below. Such revision to the PoA-DD ~~and the including its~~ generic CPA-DD **part** is not required in cases where the methodology is revised or withdrawn to be included in a consolidated methodology without being placed on hold, unless otherwise indicated in the report of the Board meeting at which the Board approved the revised or consolidated methodology.
123. Once the revised PoA-DD ~~with and including its~~ generic CPA-DD **part** with **the revised eligibility criteria for inclusion of CPAs in the PoA** has been approved by the Board, the inclusion of all new CPAs shall be based on the new version of the generic CPA-DD.
124. The CPAs that were included before ~~the methodology and/or the standardized baseline was put on hold the revision of the eligibility criteria PoA-DD~~ shall apply the latest version of the generic CPA-DD at the time of the **request for** renewal of the crediting period.

6.1.2. Review of erroneous inclusion or renewal of crediting period of component project activities

125. If a DNA involved in the PoA or a Board member identifies information that may disqualify the CPA from inclusion in the PoA or renewal of its crediting period, it/he/she shall request a review of the inclusion of the CPA by notifying the Secretary of the Board within one year after the inclusion of the CPA into the PoA or renewal of the crediting period of the CPA, or within 180 days after the first issuance of CERs for that CPA, by submitting a completed “Component project activity inclusion review form” (CDM-CPA-IR-FORM). Such request for review shall be related to issues associated with the compliance of the CPA with the eligibility criteria **for inclusion in the PoA as** specified in the PoA-DD.
126. If the request is received from a Board member, the Chair of the Board, in consultation with the secretariat, shall assess the information referred to in paragraph 125 above and decide, within 14 days, whether to add the request for review to the agenda of the next Board meeting.

127. If the Chair of the Board decides not to add the request to the agenda of the next Board meeting, the secretariat shall inform the relevant Board member of the reasons for this decision.
128. If the Chair of the Board decides to add the request to the agenda of the next Board meeting, or if the request has been received from ~~a the~~ DNA from of a Party involved, the secretariat shall accordingly notify the coordinating/managing entity, the DOE that included the CPA in the PoA (hereinafter referred to as including DOE) and the DNAs of all Parties involved. The coordinating/managing entity and the including DOE shall provide initial comments on the request for review no later than 28 days from the date of notification of the review.
129. If the request for review is added to the agenda of the next Board meeting in accordance with paragraph 126 or 128 above, the Board shall, at that meeting, taking into account any comments received from the coordinating/managing entity and the including DOE:
- (a) Exclude the CPA from the PoA with immediate effect if it determines that the CPA was erroneously included in the PoA; and
 - (b) Initiate a full review if it determines that the consideration of the request for review raises concerns regarding the processes used to include CPAs in the PoA.
130. If the Board initiates the full review referred to in paragraph 129(b) above, it shall request the secretariat to contract a DOE, that has not performed validation, ~~registration~~, CPA inclusion or verification functions with regard to this PoA, to review the CPAs that have been included in the PoA in the one year period or have had their first issuance in the 180-day period preceding the request for review. The DOE shall submit a review report to the secretariat within 30 days.
131. The Board shall establish an assessment team to analyse the DOE's review report ~~referred to in paragraph 130 above~~ and provide findings and recommendations to the Board within 14 days. The assessment team may discuss the findings of the DOE's review report and seek comments from the coordinating/managing entity and including DOE, as appropriate. Based on this assessment, the assessment team shall make a finding as to:
- (a) Whether any CPAs have been erroneously included in the PoA; and
 - (b) Whether the compliance of each of the CPAs reviewed with the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the PoA was adequately assessed by the including DOE in accordance with the ~~validation requirements established by the Board "CDM validation and verification standard"~~ and other CDM requirements applicable at the time of the inclusion ~~and, if any, validation requirements established in the CDM PoA-DD.~~
132. The Board shall consider the DOE's review report and the assessment team's finding at the next Board meeting for which the report and the finding have been made available by the 14-day documentation deadline.
133. The Board shall decide to exclude any of the CPAs from the PoA if it concludes that they have been erroneously included.

134. Any CPA that has been excluded **after having been identified as erroneously included in the PoA** shall not be re-included in that or any other PoA, or qualify as a CDM project activity.
135. Where, for any of the CPAs excluded in accordance with paragraph 129(a) or 133 above, the Board determines that the including DOE failed to adequately assess their compliance with the eligibility criteria **for inclusion in the PoA** in accordance with the “CDM validation and verification standard”, the DOE shall acquire and transfer, within 30 days of the exclusion of the CPAs, an amount of **reduced tonnes of carbon dioxide emission reduction units (ERUs), CERs, assigned amount units (AAUs) and/or removal units (RMUs)** equivalent to the amount of CERs issued for the CPAs as a result of the CPAs having been included, to a cancellation account in the CDM registry maintained by the Board.

6.1^{bis}. Exclusion and re-inclusion of component project activities from/in programme of activities

135^{bis}. Any time after the inclusion of a CPA in a registered PoA, the coordinating/managing entity of the PoA may request the exclusion of the CPA from the PoA by submitting the “Component project activity exclusion request form” (CDM-CPA-EX-FORM) containing an evidence of the agreement of all project participants of the CPA with the exclusion to the secretariat through a specified e-mail account made available on the UNFCCC CDM website.

135^{ter}. The secretariat shall conduct a completeness check of the documents submitted within five days of receipt of the request, and if the form contains all required information, the secretariat shall mark the CPA as excluded on the UNFCCC CDM website. The effective date of exclusion shall be the date when the coordinating/managing entity submitted a complete submission of the request.

135^{quater}. The excluded CPA may be re-included in the PoA at any time after its exclusion. In this case, the processes and requirements for inclusion of CPAs including the review of erroneous inclusion or renewal of crediting period of CPAs as set out in 6.1 above shall apply mutatis mutandis.

135^{quinquies}. For re-inclusion, the corresponding specific CPA-DD shall be consistent with the latest version of the applicable generic CPA-DD and meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the PoA valid at the time of requesting for its re-inclusion. The type of crediting period and the end date of the final crediting period shall remain the same as those of initially included. If the renewal crediting period type had been chosen for the CPA, the new crediting period of maximum seven years shall start at the time of re-inclusion.

6.2. Changes to registered CDM project activity or programme of activities

6.2.1. Submission of request for approval of changes

136. A request for approval of changes may be submitted in respect of the following changes that have occurred or are expected to occur to a registered CDM project activity or PoA:

- (a) Temporary deviation from the monitoring plan as described in the registered PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD, or the monitoring-applied baseline and monitoring methodology or standardized baseline;
- (b) Permanent changes:
 - (i) Corrections;
 - (ii) Changes to the start date of the crediting period of the project activity or CPA;
 - (ii)_{bis} Inclusion of a monitoring plan to the registered PDD, PoA-DD or CPA-DD, if a monitoring plan was not included at the time of their registration;
 - (iii) Permanent changes to the monitoring plan as described in the registered PDD, PoA-DD, CPA-DD, or the monitoring-applied baseline and monitoring methodology or standardized baseline, including changes to apply the provisions of the most recent valid version of the "Standard: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities";
 - (iv) Changes to the project or programme design as described in the registered CDM project activity or PoA-PDD or PoA-DD;
 - (v) Changes to the project design as described in the registered generic CPA-DD or specific case CPA-DD.

136_{bis}. For the changes referred to in paragraph 136(b)(ii) above, if the change is up to one year (up to two years for a project activity or PoA hosted by a least developed country), the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity are not required to request for approval by the Board of the change but shall notify the secretariat, by e-mail through a dedicated e-mail address, of the change. If the change is more than one year but up to two years (up to four years for a project activity or PoA hosted by a least developed country) a DOE shall submit a request for approval by the Board of the change in accordance with paragraph 140 below. The change may be allowed only once for each registered CDM project activity or CPA. The change of more than two years (four years for a project activity or PoA hosted by a least developed country) shall not be allowed.

137. For CDM PoAs, with regard to the changes referred to in paragraph 136(b)(iv) above, only the following changes shall be allowed:

- (a) Changes to programme boundary to expand geographical coverage or to include additional host Parties;
- (b) Updates—The following revisions to the eligibility criteria under following circumstances indicated in the "Standard for demonstration of additionality, development of eligibility criteria and application of multiple methodologies for programme of activities" (e.g. to implement changes decided by the Board if an issue related to environment integrity is identified):
 - (i) If the version of baseline and monitoring methodologies applied by the PoA is revised or replaced subsequent to being placed on hold;

- (ii) If the revision of the eligibility criteria of a registered PoA is initiated by the Board at any time during the lifetime of the PoA if an issue related to environmental integrity is identified;
- (iii) If the use of positive lists is introduced based on the “Guidelines on the demonstration of additionality of small-scale project activities” or the provisions of “Guideline: Demonstrating additionality of microscale project activities”;
- ~~(c) If a PoA includes more than one generic CPA-DD, addition of specific case CPA-DDs corresponding to generic CPA-DDs for which a specific case CPA-DD has not been submitted at the time of request for registration of the PoA;~~
- (d) Removal of methodologies and/or standardized baselines from the registered PoA;
- (e) Addition or change of technologies/measures with or without addition or change of applied methodologies⁴ in the registered PoA-DD as follows:
 - (i) Changes that allow a shift to more efficient less GHG-intensive or at least equivalent technologies/measures;⁵
 - (ii) Changes that introduce complementary measures/technologies involving mass and/or energy transfer to/from the originally registered technology/measure (e.g. addition or change of Type I methodologies in a registered PoA primarily applying Type III methodologies).⁶

~~137^{bis} In the cases described in paragraph 137(e) above, the scope of changes shall not cover adding technologies/measures and methodologies that are not related to the technologies and methodologies included in the originally registered PoA.⁷~~

138. For generic and specific case CPAs of a registered CDM PoA, with regard to the changes referred to in paragraph 136(b)(v) above, the following conditions have to be met to modify⁸ or add technologies/measures:

- (a) The applicability conditions of the applied baseline and monitoring methodologies and tools and, where applicable, the applied standardized baselines, cover the

⁴ If the change leads to the application of a new version or a new methodology, in that case the latest version ~~should~~ **shall** be applied in its entirety

⁵ Examples of this are shifting to LED lighting from CFL lighting, introducing LED lamps with the Solar Home System (SHS) instead of CFL lamps with the same SHS, shifting from AMS-II.G to AMS-I.E to distribute renewable biomass burning cookstoves instead of efficient cookstoves using non-renewable biomass, introducing institutional cookstoves for a registered household cookstoves PoA, introducing charcoal-burning stoves (fully accounting for production emissions of charcoal) in a registered PoA that distributes household wood-burning stoves.

⁶ An example of this is changing the utilization of recovered methane (e.g. from flaring to heat generation, from heat generation to electricity generation). This may involve the addition/change of Type I methodologies to registered PoAs applying Type III waste/wastewater methodologies.

~~⁷ An example of this is a PoA registered for biogas digesters providing biogas for cooking in households intending to implement mass rapid transport technologies; this will not be eligible.~~

⁸ Modifications to technologies/measures may include changes to the effective output capacity.

modified or added technologies/measures (i.e. the modified or added technologies/measure are applicable under the approved baseline and monitoring methodologies and, where applicable, the approved standardized baselines);

- (b) The modified or added technologies/measures were either: (i) already included in the originally registered PoA-DD and the eligibility criteria for these technologies/measures had been specified in the originally registered PoA-DD⁵; or (ii) subsequently included in the revised PoA-DD following the submission by the coordinating/managing entity and approval by the Board of a request for post-registration changes in accordance with paragraphs 137 above and 139 below.⁹

138_{bis}. In the cases referred to in paragraph 136(b)(v) above, the request for approval of post-registration changes to specific case CPA-DDs may be combined with a request for approval of post-registration changes to the PoA-DD regarding the changes referred to in paragraph 137(e) above. In this case the draft revised PoA-DD is considered to be the basis for the revised CPA-DDs instead of the originally registered PoA-DD in applying the conditions referred to in paragraph 138 above.

139. In the cases referred to in paragraph 137 above, the coordinating/managing entity shall update-revise the eligibility criteria for inclusion of CPAs in the PoA to reflect the change, and include them in the new version of the PoA-DD and including its generic CPA-DD part, to be validated by the DOE and approved by the Board in accordance with paragraph 140 below.

139_{bis}. In the cases referred to in paragraph 137(e) above, the scope of changes shall not cover adding technologies/measures and methodologies that are not related to the technologies and methodologies included in the originally registered PoA.

140. In the following circumstances, the DOE shall submit a request for approval by the Board prior to the submission of the request for issuance in accordance with paragraphs 145–146 below:

- (a) The DOE, when performing a verification for a registered CDM project activity or PoA, determines that one or more of the changes referred to in paragraph 136 above have occurred or are expected to occur to the project activity or PoA after its registration, and the changes require “prior approval” by the Board in accordance with the “CDM project standard”;
- (b) The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity have requested a DOE at any time prior to the commencement of a verification, to conduct a validation of one or more of the changes referred to in paragraph 136 above that have occurred or are expected to occur to the project activity or PoA after its registration, irrespective of whether the changes require prior approval by the Board;

⁹ An example is the case of a CPA that included portable LED lamps that are charged by mechanical energy whereas charging from other renewable energy sources such as solar PV electricity is also required during project implementation; PV electricity to charge the lamps would be eligible if the registered PoA-DD had included it.

- (c) If a PoA includes more than one generic CPA-DD, addition of specific case CPA-DDs corresponding to that generic CPA-DDs for which a specific case CPA-DD has not been submitted at the time of request for registration of the PoA.
- 140^{bis}. For the cases referred to paragraph 140 above, the project participants may appoint any DOE for the validation of the changes. The project participants may also appoint this DOE to perform a verification for the same project activity or PoA if it has not performed other validation activities for the CDM project activity or PoA (including the i.e. registration, renewal of crediting period and inclusion of CPAs in the PoA), unless the project activity is a small-scale one or the DOE is authorized by the Board to do so in accordance with paragraphs 183^{bis}–183^{quinquies} below.
- ~~140^{ter}. For the changes referred to in paragraph 136(b)(ii) above, if the change is up to one year (up to two years for a project activity or PoA hosted by a least developed country), the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity are not required to request for approval by the Board of the change but shall notify the secretariat, by e-mail through a dedicated e-mail address, of the change. If the change is more than one year but less than two years (less than four years for a project activity or PoA hosted by a least developed country) a DOE shall submit a request for approval by the Board of the change in accordance with paragraph 140 above. The change of more than two years (four years for a project activity or PoA hosted by a least developed country) shall not be allowed.~~
141. In the cases referred to in paragraph 140 above, where more than one of the changes referred to in paragraph 136 above or addition of specific case CPA-DDs have occurred or are expected to occur to the project activity or PoA after its registration, the DOE shall, wherever possible, combine such changes or addition into one request for approval.
142. In all other cases, the DOE that performs a verification for the project activity or PoA shall submit the changes for acceptance by the Board as part of the request for issuance in accordance with section 8.1.1 below.
143. In both cases referred to in paragraphs 140 and 142 above, the DOE shall be accredited for the validation function in the sectoral scope(s) of the project activity or PoA in question.
- ~~144. For the change referred to in paragraph 136(b)(ii) above, the request for approval of change may be made only once for each registered CDM project activity or CPA.~~
145. To obtain an approval from the Board of the changes, the DOE shall submit a request for approval of changes to the secretariat through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website.
146. The request for approval of changes shall contain:
- (a) A duly completed “Post-registration changes request form” (CDM-PRC-FORM);
 - (b) An assessment-validation opinion on the changes by the DOE prepared in accordance with the “CDM validation and verification standard”;
 - (c) A revised PDD, or revised PoA-DD, with including its revised generic CPA-DD part, and specific CPA-DD (in both clean and track-change versions), as applicable;

- (d) A specific CPA-DD for each of the additionally included host Parties in the CDM PoA, as applicable;
- (e) Letters of approval by the DNAs of the additionally included host Parties in the CDM PoA, as applicable;
- (f) Supplemental documentation, as appropriate.

6.2.2. Processing request for approval of changes

147. The secretariat shall maintain a publicly available list of all submitted requests for approval of changes on the UNFCCC CDM website. The secretariat shall make publicly available the schedule of processing the requests for approval of changes, including the expected date of commencement. The secretariat shall schedule the commencement of the processing of the requests for approval of changes in accordance with the secretariat's operational plans, i.e. monthly quotas, which shall also incorporate any relevant instructions from the Board.
148. The secretariat shall commence the processing of the request for approval of changes in accordance with the schedule. Upon commencement of the processing of the request for approval of changes, the secretariat shall conduct within seven days the completeness check to determine whether the request submission is complete in accordance with paragraph 146 above.
149. If the secretariat, during the completeness check, identifies issues of an editorial nature or consistency in the submission, it shall request the DOE by e-mail, copying the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, to submit the missing or revised documents and/or information. In this case, the DOE shall submit the requested documents and/or information within two days of the receipt of the request. If the DOE does not submit the requested documents and/or information by this deadline, the secretariat shall conclude that the request submission is incomplete.
150. Upon conclusion of the completeness check stage, the secretariat shall notify the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE, of the conclusion of the completeness check stage. If the request submission is found incomplete, the secretariat shall also communicate the underlying reasons to the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE, and make them publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website. In this case, the DOE may re-submit a request for approval of changes with revised documentation. Upon submission of the revised documentation the request shall be treated as a new submission of a request for approval of changes.
- 150^{bis}. Upon positive conclusion of the completeness check stage, the secretariat shall publish the request for approval of changes on the UNFCCC CDM website, and the request shall be deemed received by the Board for consideration.
151. ~~Upon determination by the secretariat that the request submission is complete, the~~ secretariat shall, within 14 days of the date of publication of the request for approval of changes, prepare and send to the Board a summary note on the request for approval of changes including a recommendation on the course of action, or with a notification that the case will be placed on the agenda of the next Board meeting.
152. If the secretariat, during the preparation of the summary note, identifies issues that require clarifications from the DOE, or project participants or the coordinating/managing

entity, it shall request the DOE **by e-mail, copying the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity**, to submit revised documents and/or information to clarify the issues within 14 days of the receipt of the request. In this case, the secretariat shall, notwithstanding the provision in paragraph 151 above, finalize the summary note and send it to the Board within 14 days of receipt of the requested documents and/or information from the DOE. If the DOE does not submit the requested documents and/or information by this deadline, the secretariat shall not process the request submission any further.

153. If the request submission is removed from processing in accordance with paragraph 152 above, the DOE, or the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, may request the secretariat, **by e-mail through a dedicated e-mail address**, to make a telephone call **or an internet-based call** to them to provide clarifications on the issues identified if they are not sufficiently clear to them. Only one such request, regardless of the requesting party, shall be allowed per request for approval of changes. In this case, the DOE, or the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, shall provide the contact details of the person to be called with preferred time slots. The secretariat shall fix a call appointment within three days of receipt of the request. The secretariat shall record the call.
154. If the secretariat, during the preparation of the summary note, identifies issues that require inputs from a relevant panel or working group, it shall place the case on the agenda of the next meeting of the panel or working group. In this case, the secretariat shall, notwithstanding the provisions in paragraphs 151 and 152 above, finalize the summary note and send it to the Board within 14 days of receipt of the inputs from the panel or working group.
155. If no member of the Board objects to the secretariat's recommendation on the course of action referred to in paragraph 151 above within 20 days of receipt of the summary note, the recommended course action shall be deemed to be the decision adopted by the Board.
156. An objection by a member of the Board shall be made by notifying the Chair of the Board through the secretariat, giving reasons in writing. The secretariat shall acknowledge receipt of the objection and make it available to the Board.
157. If a member of the Board objects to the secretariat's recommendation on the course of action more than 14 days prior to the next Board meeting, the case shall be placed on the agenda of the next Board meeting; otherwise it shall be placed on the agenda of the subsequent Board meeting.

6.2.2_{bis} Finalizing request for approval of changes

158. If the Board considers the case at its meeting in accordance with paragraph 151 or 157 above, it shall decide on the course of action at the meeting.
159. For the changes referred to in paragraph 136(b)(iv) **and (v) above**, the course of action shall be:
 - (a) Approve the changes and allow subsequent requests for issuance for the project activity or PoA;

- (b) Approve the changes and allow subsequent requests for issuance for the project activity or PoA, but, for the case of a project activity **or CPA**, limit the CERs up to the level estimated in the originally registered PDD **or specific case CPA-DD**;
 - (c) Reject the proposed changes but allow subsequent requests for issuance for the project activity or PoA only if it is implemented as described in the registered PDD **or PoA-DD or specific case CPA-DD**.
160. For the changes referred to in paragraphs 136(a) and 136(b)(i)–(iii) above, the course of action shall be:
- (a) Approve the changes;
 - (b) Reject the changes.
- ~~160_{bis}. If the request for post-registration changes combines several changes, the Board may decide on different courses of action for each change according to paragraphs 159 and 160 above.~~
161. Once a decision has been made by the Board, the secretariat shall inform the DOE of the decision, **the reasons thereof**, and any guidance provided by the Board as applicable, and make the decision, **reasons** and guidance publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website **by publishing a ruling note within three days of the decision of the Board**.
- ~~161_{bis}. After the publication of the ruling, the DOE, or the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, may request the secretariat, by e-mail through a dedicated e-mail address, to make a telephone call or an internet-based call to them to provide clarifications on the ruling. Only one such request, **regardless of the requesting party**, shall be allowed per ruling. In this case, the DOE, or the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, shall provide the contact details of the person to be called with preferred time slots. The secretariat shall fix a call appointment within three (3) days of receipt of the request. The secretariat shall record the call.~~
- ~~161_{ter}. If the Board's does not decide the same course of action for every change requested in the request for changes decision is in accordance with paragraph 159(c) above, the project participants, through the DOE, shall submit a revised PDD or PoA-DD **covering the changes approved by the Board removing all requested changes 30 days after the secretariat has informed the DOE of the decision of the Board**. When uploading the revised PDD or PoA-DD, the DOE shall confirm that it **reflects the changes approved by the Board has been correctly updated**.~~
162. The secretariat shall make the revised PDD, **or** revised PoA-DD, **and revised generic CPA-DD or specific case CPA-DD**, and the validation or assessment opinion by the DOE, as applicable, publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website. This version of the PDD, **or** PoA-DD **and generic CPA-DD, or specific case CPA-DD** shall be applied for future requests for issuance or for inclusion of new CPAs in the PoA.
163. The CPAs that were included before the changes **to the programme boundary** shall apply the latest version of **the PoA-DD including the its** generic CPA-DD **part** only at the time of the renewal of its crediting period.

6.2.2_{ter} Withdrawal of request for approval of changes

163_{bis}. At any time before the adoption of the decision by the Board on the request for approval of changes, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity may, through the DOE, withdraw the request. In this case, the DOE shall submit a request for withdrawal of the request for approval of changes to the secretariat using the “Post-registration change request withdrawal form” (CDM-PRCW-FORM) duly signed by the projects participants or the coordinating/managing entity. If the form contains all required information, the request for approval of changes shall be considered withdrawn. If the DOE submits the request for withdrawal after the publication of the request for approval of changes, the secretariat shall mark the request for approval of changes on the UNFCCC CDM website as “withdrawn”.

6.3. Changes to modalities of communication**6.3.1. General requirements**

164. The focal point(s) for scope (b) of the CDM project activity or PoA referred to in paragraph 32 above shall request changes to any modalities of the MoC statement to the secretariat ~~as soon as possible~~ **within 90 days** after the changes become effective.
165. The authorized signatories or the legal representatives of the project participants, **the focal points, or the DNAs of the Parties involved** may directly notify the secretariat on any issues regarding the MoC statement through a specified e-mail account made available on the CDM Registry section of the UNFCCC CDM website. In this case, the secretariat may request additional clarifications ~~and shall advise on further actions to the notifying party.~~ The secretariat may contact any of the focal point entities or project participants of the respective CDM project activity or PoA or, in the case of insolvency, liquidators/administrators, in order to request additional clarifications from these entities. The secretariat shall advise on further actions to the parties involved including those referred to in section 6.3.1_{bis} below.
166. The secretariat shall request a new submission of an MoC statement through the validating DOE whenever the secretariat identifies inconsistencies or inaccuracies in an initial MoC statement **or when inconsistencies or inaccuracies are reported to the secretariat.** The secretariat may provide specific guidance for the re-submission and may, after sending a notice to the focal points and the project participants, temporarily put on hold the forwarding of CERs if the inconsistencies or inaccuracies prevent the secretariat from establishing the focal point(s) for scope of authority (a). For any other inconsistencies or inaccuracies, the secretariat may temporarily put on hold the forwarding of CERs, after sending a notice to the focal points and the project participants, **if the new submission is not received by the secretariat within three (3) months 90 days of notification from the secretariat that such a submission is required requesting for a new submission.**
167. The secretariat may seek agreement from the project participants to submit a new MoC statement in cases where the existing MoC statement was submitted prior to the introduction of the MoC statement form and does not clearly define the role(s) of focal point(s) and their respective scopes of authority.
168. The focal point(s) shall use the **latest valid** version of the MoC statement form to request changes to ~~MoC statements~~ **the modalities of communication** and shall submit it to the

secretariat through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website. The project participants shall use the same interface to submit a new MoC statement in accordance with paragraph 174(b) below.

169. The focal point(s) for scope (b) or the project participants who submit a new MoC statement in accordance with paragraph 174 below shall ensure that:
 - (a) Supporting documentation, including powers of attorney, or extracts from board meeting minutes or company association documentation, or extracts/certificates from national company registries that cannot be verified online, is dated or notarized within two years from the time of submission of a request for change to the modalities of communication. This time limitation does not apply to letters of approval issued by DNAs nor to copies of national personal identity documents;
 - (b) To the extent possible, changes applicable to more than one CDM project activity or PoA or multiple changes affecting the same CDM project activity or PoA, are consolidated in a single form in accordance with the instructions provided in the CDM Registry section of the UNFCCC CDM website.
170. The legal representatives signing on behalf of ~~entities~~ the focal points or the project participants shall provide written evidence that they are authorized to sign on behalf of the respective entities.
171. The secretariat may request additional clarification and/or documentation from the submitting entity(ies) if submissions do not clearly provide evidence in support of a specific request.
172. The secretariat shall make detailed guidance available on the CDM Registry section of the UNFCCC CDM website on how to request changes to project participants and focal points.
173. The secretariat shall display the effective dates of updated MoC statements on the corresponding CDM project activity and PoA view pages.

6.3.1^{bis} Specific requirements related to reported issues resulting from insolvency and/or disputes on modalities of communication

- 173^{bis}. In accordance with paragraph 165 above, project participants or focal points may notify the secretariat of any issues regarding the MoC statement, including the issues resulting from insolvency and/or of disputes in relation to the MoC statement ~~between any of the project participants or focal points~~ with regard to the designation or changes to the designation of focal points.
- 173^{ter}. The secretariat may engage the DNA(s) of the Parties involved in the respective CDM project activity or PoA whenever issues resulting from insolvency and/or disputes referred to in 173^{bis} above over the designation of focal points are notified to the secretariat. The secretariat may provide information, subject to the confidentiality of such information, and/or administrative assistance to the DNA(s) as may be if so requested by the respective DNA(s).
- 173^{quater}. The CDM registry administrator may, after sending a notice to the focal points and the project participants, temporarily put on hold the forwarding of CERs for the CDM project activity or PoA for which the project participants or the focal points have notified a

case of insolvency and/or a dispute in relation to the MoC statement, pending resolution of the issues resulting from insolvency or resolution of the disputes.

173^{quinquies}. The secretariat shall display indicative information, subject to the confidentiality, on the respective CDM project activity or PoA page on the UNFCCC CDM website, related to the notifications ~~to the Board or~~ to the secretariat of issues resulting from insolvency and/or of disputes ~~only in the cases~~ where the forwarding of CERs has been temporarily put on hold pending the resolution of the issues.

6.3.2. Specific requirements on changes to focal points

174. The project participants of a registered CDM project activity may change the designation of any of the focal points for any reason and at any time by submitting a new MoC statement duly signed by all project participants, either through:

- (a) The focal point(s) for scope of authority (b); or
- (b) Any of the project participants ~~directly, for changes to the MoC statement excluding its annexes.~~

175. The project participants of a registered CDM PoA may change the designation of any of the focal points for any reason and at any time by submitting a new MoC statement duly signed by and through the coordinating/managing entity. ~~When the coordinating/managing entity is changing, the incoming coordinating/managing entity shall sign and submit the F CDM-MOC.~~

176. ~~For changing the designation of a focal point in accordance with paragraph 174 or 175 above, the focal point(s) for scope of authority (b) or the project participants shall submit:~~

- (a) A new MoC statement for changes related to designation of focal points, with the exception of changes affecting only contact details and specimen signatures;
- (b) Annex 2 of the MoC statement, for changes related only to contact details and specimen signatures.

177. When a focal point that is not a project participant is added to represent the project participants for any or for all scopes of authority ~~in accordance with paragraph 176(a) above~~, the focal point(s) for scope of authority (b) or the project participant that makes the submission in accordance with paragraph ~~174(b)–176(a)~~ above shall ~~also~~ provide written evidence of:

- (a) The new focal point's corporate identity; and
- (b) The personal identity and employment status of the new focal point's authorized signatory(ies), including their specimen signature(s).

178. The legal representative of a project participant may sign an MoC statement ~~submitted in accordance with paragraph 176(b) above.~~

179. The legal representative of a focal point for scope of authority (b) may submit annex 2 of the MoC statement ~~in accordance with paragraph 174(b) above~~ if the authorized signatory(ies) of the focal point concerned is(are) no longer available.

6.3.3. Specific requirements on change of coordinating/managing entity for programme of activities

179^{bis}. When the coordinating/managing entity is changing, the incoming coordinating/managing entity shall sign and submit the MoC statement to the secretariat. The incoming coordinating/managing entity shall also attach letter(s) of authorization from each respective host Party stating the change of coordinating/managing entity and a confirmation from the new coordinating/managing entity that the PoA will be developed and implemented with the same set framework as originally described in the PoA DD.

180. In addition to the requirements as referred to in paragraphs 164–179^{bis} above, if the coordinating/managing entity for a registered CDM PoA has changed after the registration of the PoA, the DOE undertaking the next inclusion of a CPA, the DOE that submits the next request for issuance or the DOE that submits the next post-registration change request, whichever is earliest, shall submit a validation opinion regarding the compliance of the new coordinating/managing entity with the relevant requirements in the “CDM project standard”.

180^{bis}. The coordinating/managing entity may also contract a DOE only for the purpose of issuing a validation opinion on the change of the coordinating/managing entity, if it wants to submit the validation opinion before the next inclusion of a CPA under the CDM PoA, or submission of the next request for issuance or the next request for post-registration changes. In such case, the DOE shall send the documentation to the secretariat through a specified UNFCCC e-mail address or through a dedicated interface.

180^{ter}. The secretariat shall assess the validation opinion and, after confirming the compliance of the new coordinating/managing entity with the relevant requirements in the “CDM project standard”, shall upload the validation opinion on the UNFCCC CDM website.

6.3.4. Specific requirements on changes to project participants

181. If the project participants of a registered CDM project activity or PoA have changed after the registration of the project activity or PoA, the focal point(s) for scope of authority (b) shall submit annex 2 of the MoC statement for each of the following changes:

- (a) Addition of a project participant. The submission shall be accompanied by a new letter of approval from the DNA authorizing participation;
- (b) Changes related to entity names/legal status. The submission shall be accompanied by a letter of approval or validating letter that includes reference to both the old and the new names/legal status of the project participant from the DNA authorizing participation;
- (c) Withdrawal of a project participant. If a project participant has ceased operations due to bankruptcy or other reasons and is unable to sign annex 2 of the MoC statement, the submission shall be accompanied by documented evidence of the cessation;
- (d) Changes related only to contact details and specimen signatures.

182. A project participant added to a registered CDM project activity or PoA shall accept the existing MoC statement, ~~unless—or~~ a new MoC statement ~~if it~~ is submitted simultaneously.

7. Pre-issuance activities

7.1. Publication of monitoring report

183. The project participants of a registered CDM project activity or the coordinating/managing entity of a registered CDM PoA shall prepare (a) monitoring report(s) in accordance with the “CDM project standard”, and submit it/them together with supporting documentation to the DOE contracted by the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity to perform verification of the monitored GHG emission reductions or removal enhancements.

183^{bis}. If a DOE that has performed a validation activity (including the renewal of crediting period and the inclusion of a CPA in a registered PoA) for the CDM project activity or PoA wishes to perform a verification for the same project activity or PoA, it shall submit a request for authorization to do so from the Board by completing the “Validation and verification by same DOE authorization request form” (CDM-VV-FORM) to the secretariat providing the following information:

(a) Availability of, and access to, DOEs that are accredited to undertake the verification activity in the region where the CDM project activity or PoA is located;

(b) Impacts of the same DOE undertaking both validation and verification activities on the transaction costs of the CDM project activity or PoA;

(c) Measures that the DOE proposes to implement to safeguard impartiality and integrity of the DOE in undertaking the verification;

(d) Total estimated size of emission reductions or removal enhancements by the CDM project activity or PoA.

183^{ter}. The requirement in paragraph 183^{bis} above shall not apply for small-scale CDM project activities or small-scale A/R CDM project activities. For these project activities, a DOE may perform both validation and verification activities for the same project activity without having been authorized to do so from the Board.

183^{quater}. If the request is received by the secretariat more than 14 days prior to the next Board meeting, the request shall be placed on the agenda of the next Board meeting; otherwise it shall be placed on the agenda of the subsequent Board meeting.

183^{quinquies}. The decision of the Board on the request shall be recorded in the meeting report.

184. The DOE shall make the monitoring report publicly available through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website, no later than 14 days before at the latest 21 days prior to undertaking the on-site visit-inspection for the verification.

184^{bis}. After publication of the monitoring report, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, through the DOE, may request the secretariat to withdraw the monitoring report by submitting the “Monitoring report withdrawal request form” (CDM-MRW-FORM), containing, inter alia, an evidence of the agreement of the project participants or the coordinating/management entity with the withdrawal. If the form contains all required information, the secretariat shall mark the monitoring report on the

UNFCCC CDM website as “withdrawn”. The secretariat shall process the request no later than five days after the receipt of the request with the required information. After the withdrawal of the monitoring report, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, through the same or a different DOE, may submit other monitoring report for the period covered by the monitoring report withdrawn in order to restart the verification or may change the monitoring period.

185. When submitting the monitoring report, the DOE shall, through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website,:
 - (a) Select the CDM project activity or PoA that the monitoring report concerns from a list of registered CDM project activities or PoAs;
 - (b) Specify the start and end dates of the monitoring period covered by the monitoring report.
186. If the DOE is accredited for the verification function in all sectoral scopes to which the CDM project activity or PoA is linked through the application of baseline and monitoring methodology(ies), the secretariat, through the CDM information system, shall make the monitoring report publicly available on the UNFCCC website.
187. The UNFCCC CDM web page where the monitoring report is made publicly available shall contain the following information:
 - (a) The name and reference number of the CDM project activity or PoA;
 - (b) A link to the monitoring report;
 - (c) The name of the DOE contracted by the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity for the verification;
 - (d) The name of the DOE that performed the validation of the CDM project activity or PoA, and, if this DOE has been authorised by the Board to perform the verification of the CDM project activity or PoA, a reference to the meeting report where the authorisation was granted.

7.2. Reporting of status of registered project activity or programme

188. At two years subsequent to the registration of a CDM project activity or PoA, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall provide, ~~through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website,~~ an update of the status of its implementation of the project activity or PoA, unless a DOE contracted by the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity to perform a verification has made a monitoring report for the project activity or PoA publicly available in accordance with paragraph 184 above. The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall provide this information by answering, within five days of its receipt, to the e-mail that the secretariat shall send to them requesting the update. The information shall include at least one of the following statuses in the update:
 - (a) The project activity or PoA is under implementation, but has not reached the stage of monitoring of GHG emission reductions or removal enhancements. In this case the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall also provide an update of the status at 180-day intervals thereafter;

- (b) The project activity or PoA has not yet been implemented, but is still planned to be implemented. In this case the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall also provide an update of the status at 180-day intervals thereafter;
 - (c) The project activity or PoA has been implemented, but the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity have not yet decided to proceed with the request for issuance stage;
 - (d) The implementation of the project activity or PoA has been cancelled;
 - (e) Any other reason for not having submitted a monitoring report for the project activity or PoA.
189. At 180 days subsequent to the publication of the monitoring report, the DOE shall provide, through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website, an update of the status of its verification activity, unless it has submitted a request for issuance of CERs **for the corresponding monitoring period** for the registered CDM project activity or PoA in accordance with paragraph 192 below. The DOE shall include **at least** one of the following statuses in the update:
- (a) The verification contract has been terminated. In this case the DOE shall also provide a reason for the termination to **the Board through** the secretariat on a confidential basis;
 - (b) The DOE has issued a negative verification opinion;
 - (c) The DOE has raised one or more corrective action requests or clarification requests, for which no response has been received from the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity. In this case the DOE shall also provide a summary of the issues raised and update or reconfirm the status of the verification activities at 90-day intervals thereafter;
 - (d) The DOE is **still** performing the verification activity and it has not yet sent any corrective action or clarification requests to the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity. In this case the DOE shall also provide an explanation on the length of time taken and update or reconfirm the status of the verification activities at 90-day intervals thereafter.

7.3. History matching and significant deviation for CCS project activities

190. The project participants of a registered CCS project activity shall, for each verification period, carry out history matching in accordance with the “CDM project standard”. If during history matching a significant deviation is observed (as defined by the methodology used by the project activity), the project participants shall immediately notify the host Party and the Board in writing.
191. The project participants shall follow the process for changes to registered CDM project activity or programme of activities as set out in section 6.2 above for changes that require the prior approval of the Board.

8. Issuance of certified emission reductions

8.1. Request for issuance

8.1.1. Submission of request for issuance

192. The DOE, after verifying that the monitored GHG emission reductions or removal enhancements meet the relevant requirements in the “CDM project standard” and certifying the quantity of CERs claimed in the monitoring report, by following the relevant provisions of the “CDM validation and verification standard” and other CDM requirements, shall submit, through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website, a request for issuance of CERs by using the “CDM project activity issuance request form” (CDM-ISS-FORM) or “CDM programme of activities issuance request form” (CDM-PoA-ISS-FORM), as applicable, ~~only after it verifies that the monitored GHG emission reductions or removal enhancements meet the relevant requirements in the “CDM project standard” and certifies the quantity of CERs claimed in the monitoring report, by following the relevant provisions of the “CDM validation and verification standard” and other CDM requirements and all the required documents listed in the completeness check checklist for requests for issuance.~~

~~193. The DOE shall submit the required documents listed in the completeness checklist for requests for issuance. The DOE shall submit the required documents through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website.~~

193^{bis}. For a CDM project activity, if the revised monitoring report submitted with the request for issuance covers a different monitoring period from the period covered by the original monitoring report published on the UNFCCC CDM website in accordance with paragraph 184 above, the secretariat shall reflect the dates of the revised monitoring report in the view page of that project activity.

194. The following applies to the requests for issuance for a PoA:

- (a) The request for issuance for a specified monitoring period shall either:
 - (i) Relate to all CPAs included in the PoA; or
 - (ii) In the case of ~~two multiple~~ separate monitoring reports for a monitoring period ~~prepared in accordance with the “CDM project standard”~~, relate to all CPAs included in the batch of CPAs that the request covers, out of ~~all~~ the ~~two~~ batches of CPAs in the PoA. ~~In this case the same DOE shall submit the request for the two batches;~~
- (b) The monitoring periods shall be consecutive. CPAs shall be included in issuance requests in a consecutive manner, i.e. a CPA can be included in a request for issuance for the PoA for a monitoring period only after the request for issuance for the previous monitoring period that included the particular CPA has been published;
- (c) If the PoA applies any of the methodologies listed in appendix 3 as indicating potential accrual of negative emission reductions, a request for issuance for a monitoring period can be submitted only after the CERs, tCERs or ICERs have been issued for all CPAs included in the PoA for the previous monitoring period.

~~195. For a PoA, the coordinating/managing entity shall submit a request for forwarding of CERs issued in accordance with the modalities of communication as agreed between project participants.~~

196. If the DOE submits changes to a registered CDM project activity or PoA for acceptance by the Board in accordance with paragraph 142 above, it shall also submit the documentation and information listed in paragraph 146 above in addition to those referred to in paragraph ~~193 above~~ 192 above.

8.1.2. Processing request for issuance

197. The secretariat shall maintain a publicly available list of all submitted requests for issuance on the UNFCCC CDM website. The secretariat shall make publicly available the schedule of processing the requests for issuance, including the expected date of commencement. The secretariat shall schedule the commencement of the processing of the requests for issuance in accordance with the secretariat's operational plans, i.e. monthly quotas, which shall also incorporate any relevant instructions from the Board.

198. The secretariat shall commence the completeness check stage in accordance with the schedule. Upon commencement of the completeness check stage, the secretariat shall, subject to the guidance of the Board, conduct within seven days a completeness check to determine whether the request for issuance submission is complete in accordance with the completeness check checklist for requests for issuance.

199. If the secretariat, during the completeness check, identifies issues of an editorial nature ~~or consistency in the submission~~, it shall request the DOE by e-mail, copying the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, to submit ~~the missing or~~ revised documents and/or information. In this case, the DOE shall submit the requested documents and/or information within two days of receipt of the request. If the DOE does not submit the requested documents and/or information by this deadline, the secretariat shall conclude that the request submission is incomplete.

200. Upon conclusion of the completeness check stage, the secretariat shall notify the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE, of the conclusion of the completeness check stage. If the request submission does not meet the requirements of the completeness check, the secretariat shall also communicate the underlying reasons to the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE, and make them publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website. In this case, the DOE may re-submit the request for issuance with revised documentation. Upon submission of the revised documentation, the request shall be treated as a new submission of a request for issuance.

201. Upon ~~positive~~ conclusion of the completeness check stage, the secretariat shall, subject to the guidance of the Board, conduct within 23 days an information and reporting check in accordance with the information and reporting checklist for requests for issuance.

202. If the secretariat, during the information and reporting check, identifies issues of an editorial nature ~~or missing basic information~~, it shall request the DOE by e-mail, copying the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, to submit ~~the missing or~~ revised documents and/or information. In this case, the DOE shall submit the requested documents and/or information within two days of receipt of the request. If the DOE does

not submit the requested documents and/or information by this deadline, the secretariat shall conclude that the request submission ~~is incomplete cannot be processed any further.~~

203. Upon conclusion of the information and reporting check stage, the secretariat shall notify the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE, of the conclusion of the information and reporting check stage. If the request submission for which the secretariat conducted an information and reporting check does not meet the requirements of the information and reporting check, the secretariat shall conclude that the request submission ~~is incomplete cannot be processed any further~~ and communicate the underlying reasons to the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE, and make them publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website. In this case, the DOE may re-submit the request for issuance with revised documentation. Upon submission of the revised documentation, the request shall be ~~treated as a new submission of a request for issuance processed further.~~
204. Upon positive conclusion of the information and reporting check stage, the secretariat shall publish the request for issuance on the UNFCCC CDM website, and the request for issuance shall be deemed received by the Board for consideration.
205. If the request ~~submission is found incomplete as a result of the information and reporting check cannot be processed any further in accordance with paragraph 203 above,~~ the DOE, or the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, may request the secretariat, by e-mail through a dedicated e-mail address, to make a telephone call ~~or an internet-based call~~ to them to provide clarifications on the issues identified if they are not sufficiently clear to them. Only one such request, regardless of the requesting party, shall be allowed per request for issuance. In this case, the DOE, or the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, shall provide the contact details of the person to be called with preferred time slots. The secretariat shall fix a call appointment within three days of receipt of the request. The secretariat shall record the call.
206. The secretariat shall notify the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, the DNA(s) of the Party(ies) involved, and the DOE that: the Board has received the request for issuance for consideration of issuance; the secretariat has published the request for issuance on the UNFCCC CDM website; and the last day by which members of the Board or a Party involved may request a review of request for issuance, as referred to in paragraph 208 below.
207. The secretariat shall, subject to the guidance of the Board, prepare and send to the Board a summary note on the request for issuance within 14 days of the date of publication of the request for issuance.

8.1.3. Requesting review of request for issuance

208. ~~Any~~ Party involved in the CDM project activity or PoA and ~~for~~ any member of the Board may request a review of the request for issuance within 28 days of the date of publication of the request for issuance for the project activity or within 42 days of the date of publication of the request for issuance for the PoA, respectively. If a Party involved wishes to request a review, the relevant DNA shall send the request by e-mail to ~~the Board, through~~ the secretariat, using the “CDM project activity/programme of activities issuance request review form” (CDM-ISSR-FORM) ~~by official means of communication (such as a letter with recognized official letterhead and signature or an e-~~

~~mail sent from official dedicated e-mail account~~. If a member of the Board wishes to request a review, he/she shall communicate the request to the Board through the secretariat, using the “CDM project activity/programme of activities issuance request review form” (CDM-IR-FORM) and in accordance with appendix 2.

209. The secretariat shall acknowledge receipt of a request for review and promptly make it available to the Board.
210. A request for review shall be deemed to be received by the Board on the date it has been received by the secretariat. A request for review shall not be recognized by the Board if it is received after 5 p.m. GMT of the last day of the request for review period referred to in paragraph 208 above following the publication of the request for issuance.
211. A request for review shall provide, inter alia, the reasons for the request for review based on the “CDM project standard”, “CDM validation and verification standard” or any other applicable CDM requirements.

8.1.4. Finalizing request for issuance if no request for review

212. If the secretariat does not receive a request for review from a Party involved or at least three members of the Board in accordance with the modalities described in paragraphs 208–211 above, the Board shall instruct the CDM registry administrator to issue the quantity of CERs claimed in the request for issuance into the pending account of the Board in the CDM registry in the following manner:
- (a) For project activities other than CCS: in accordance with decision 3/CMP.1, annex, paragraph 66;
 - (b) For CCS project activities: in accordance with decision ~~7/CMP.1–10/CMP.7~~, annex, paragraph 21, which requires that for CCS project activities upon such issuance, the CDM registry administrator shall promptly:
 - (i) Forward the quantity of CERs corresponding to the share of proceeds to cover administrative expenses and to assist in meeting the costs of adaptation, respectively, in accordance with Article 12, paragraph 8, of the Kyoto Protocol, to the appropriate accounts in the CDM registry for the management of the share of proceeds;
 - (ii) Forward 5 per cent of the CERs issued to a reserve account of the CDM registry, established for the CCS project activity for the purpose of accounting for any net reversal of storage;
 - (iii) Forward the remaining CERs to the registry accounts of the Parties and project participants involved, in accordance with their request.
213. The secretariat shall inform the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity of the Board’s instruction to the CDM registry administrator and of any share of proceeds payable by the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity to cover administrative expenses of the CDM in accordance with the provisions contained in appendix 1. The secretariat shall update the status of the request for issuance on the UNFCCC CDM website accordingly.
214. The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall pay the share of proceeds and instruct the CDM registry administrator on the distribution of the CERs

using the “Certified emission reductions forwarding request form” (CDM-FWD-FORM). After receiving the share of proceeds and the instruction from the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, the secretariat shall forward the CERs to the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity accordingly.

8.2. Review of request for issuance

8.2.1. Commencement of review

215. If a Party involved in the registered CDM project activity or PoA, or at least three members of the Board request a review of the request for issuance, the secretariat shall:
- (a) Notify the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE that verified and certified the claimed CERs, that a Party involved in the proposed CDM project activity or PoA, or at least three members of the Board have requested a review of the request for issuance;
 - (b) Mark the request for issuance as “under review” on the UNFCCC CDM website and make publicly available an anonymous version of each “CDM project activity/programme of activities issuance request review form” (CDM-ISSR-FORM);
 - (c) Establish a team comprising two experts selected from the Registration and Issuance Team (RIT Team) to conduct an assessment of the request for review. The secretariat shall appoint one of the RIT Team members to serve as the lead, who shall be responsible for all communications with the secretariat.
216. The DOE, or the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, may request the secretariat, by e-mail through a dedicated e-mail address, to make a telephone call or an internet-based call to them to provide clarifications on the issues identified if they are not sufficiently clear to them. Only one such request, regardless of the requesting party, shall be allowed per review of the request for issuance. In this case, the DOE, or the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, shall provide the contact details of the person to be called with preferred time slots. The secretariat shall fix a call appointment within three days of receipt of the request. The secretariat shall record the call.
217. The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE, shall provide responses to the issues identified in the request for review no later than 28 days after the notification of the request for review.
218. For each issue (or sub-issue) raised in the request for review, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE, shall either:
- (a) Respond by making any revisions that they deem necessary to the monitoring report and attached spreadsheets, verification report, and/or certification report, and where there is a change to the number of CERs requested, by also submitting a new request for issuance form, to ensure, inter alia, that all facts are clearly stated and sufficiently verified; or
 - (b) Respond in writing by addressing why no revisions to the monitoring report, verification report, and/or certification report are necessary.

219. The secretariat shall schedule the commencement of the review of the request for issuance in accordance with its operational plans and any relevant instructions from the Board. The secretariat shall make the schedule of review publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website. Upon scheduling the commencement date, or altering it as applicable, the secretariat shall inform the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE, of the scheduled or altered commencement date, respectively;
220. The date of commencement of the review shall be the date when the secretariat notifies the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE, that the review has commenced.

8.2.2. Assessment

221. The secretariat shall conduct an assessment of the request for issuance in the context of the reasons for the request for review provided in the “CDM project activity/programme of activities issuance request review form” (CDM-ISSR-FORM) and the CDM requirements, taking into account the responses from the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE.
222. Concurrently and independently from the secretariat’s assessment referred to in paragraph 221 above, the RIT Team established in accordance with paragraph 215(c) above shall conduct an assessment of the request for issuance in accordance with the terms of reference of the RIT, and in the context of the reasons for the request for review provided in the “CDM project activity/programme of activities issuance request review form” (CDM-ISSR-FORM), taking into account the responses of the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE.
223. Both the secretariat and the RIT Team shall finalize their assessments no later than 14 days after the commencement of the review.
224. Both the secretariat and the RIT Team shall, in their assessment reports, include a proposed decision taking into account appendix 2. Each proposed decision shall suggest either to:
- (a) Issue the CERs; or
 - (b) Reject the request for issuance.
225. If a proposed decision is to reject the request for issuance, then the assessment report shall include a proposed ruling. The proposed ruling shall contain an explanation of the reasons and rationale for the proposed decision, including, but not limited to:
- (a) The facts and any interpretation of the facts that formed the basis of the proposed decision;
 - (b) The CDM requirements applied to the facts;
 - (c) The interpretation of the CDM requirements as applied to the facts.
226. In addition, both the secretariat and the RIT Team shall, in their assessment reports, highlight any issues of significant importance related to the policies and goals of the CDM arising from the assessment. The secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the

Board, shall bring these issues to the attention of the Board by preparing background notes and policy options and presenting them to the Board at its meetings.

227. The RIT Team shall submit its assessment report to the Board through the secretariat.
228. The secretariat shall inform the Board of the availability of each assessment report, and make each assessment report available to the Board, together with any responses from the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, and the DOE, and any revision to the monitoring report, and/or verification report and/or other relevant documentation.

8.2.3. Consideration by the Board

229. If the assessment reports of the secretariat and the RIT Team contain the same proposed decision (i.e. both are to issue the CERs, or both are to reject the request for issuance), then the proposed decision shall become the final decision of the Board 20 days after the date when the availability of the assessment report of the secretariat or the RIT Team, whichever the later, was communicated to the Board, unless a member of the Board objects to the proposed decision.
230. An objection by a member of the Board shall be made by notifying the Chair of the Board through the secretariat, giving reasons in writing and in accordance with appendix 2. The secretariat shall acknowledge receipt of the objection and make it available to the Board.
231. If a member of the Board objects to the proposed decision more than 14 days prior to the next Board meeting, the case shall be placed on the agenda of the next Board meeting; otherwise it shall be placed on the agenda of the subsequent Board meeting.
232. If the assessment reports of the secretariat and the RIT Team contain different proposed decisions (i.e. one is to issue the CERs and the other is to reject the request for issuance) and the Board receives both proposed decisions more than 14 days prior to the next Board meeting, the case shall be placed on the agenda of the next Board meeting; otherwise, the case shall be placed on the agenda of the subsequent Board meeting.
233. At the Board meeting for which the case is placed on the agenda, the Board shall, in accordance with appendix 2, decide either to:
- (a) Issue the CERs; or
 - (b) Reject the request for issuance.

8.2.4. Finalization and implementation of ruling

234. If the Board's final decision made in accordance with paragraph 229 or 233 above is to issue the CERs, the Board shall instruct the CDM registry administrator to issue the specified quantity of CERs into the pending account of the Board in the CDM registry in the following manner:
- (a) For project activities other than CCS: in accordance with decision 3/CMP.1, annex, paragraph 66;

- (b) For CCS project activities: in accordance with decision 7/CMP.1–10/CMP.7, annex, paragraph 21 which requires that for CCS project activities upon such issuance, the CDM registry administrator shall promptly:
 - (i) Forward the quantity of CERs corresponding to the share of proceeds to cover administrative expenses and to assist in meeting the costs of adaptation, respectively, to the appropriate accounts in the CDM registry for the management of the share of proceeds;
 - (ii) Forward 5 per cent of the CERs issued to a reserve account of the CDM registry, established for the CCS project activity for the purpose of accounting for any net reversal of storage;
 - (iii) Forward the remaining CERs to the registry accounts of the Parties and project participants involved, in accordance with their request.
- 235. The secretariat shall inform the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity of the Board's instruction to the CDM registry administrator and of any share of proceeds payable by the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity to cover administrative expenses of the CDM. The secretariat shall update the status of the request for issuance on the UNFCCC CDM website accordingly.
- 236. The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall pay the share of proceeds and instruct the CDM registry administrator on the distribution of the CERs using the "Certified emission reductions forwarding request form" (CDM-FWD-FORM). After receiving the share of proceeds and the instruction from the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, the secretariat shall forward the CERs to the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity accordingly.
- 237. If the Board's final decision made in accordance with paragraph 229 or 233 above is to reject the request for issuance, the secretariat shall update the information on the UNFCCC CDM website accordingly on the first working day subsequent to the finalization of the decision. Furthermore, within 21 days of the finalization of the decision, the secretariat shall provide the Chair of the Board with an information note containing a proposed ruling incorporating the final decision.
- 238. The proposed ruling shall contain an explanation of the reasons and rationale for the final decision, including, but not limited to:
 - (a) The facts and any interpretation of the facts that formed the basis of the proposed ruling;
 - (b) The CDM requirements applied to the facts;
 - (c) The interpretation of the CDM requirements as applied to the facts.
- 239. Once approved by the Chair of the Board, the secretariat shall immediately make the proposed ruling available to the Board. The proposed ruling shall become the final ruling of the Board 10 days after the date when the proposed ruling was made available to the Board, unless a member of the Board objects to the proposed ruling.
- 240. An objection by a member of the Board shall be made by notifying the Chair of the Board through the secretariat, giving reasons in writing and in accordance with

appendix 2. The secretariat shall acknowledge receipt of the objection and make it available to the Board.

241. If a member of the Board objects to the proposed ruling more than 14 days prior to the next Board meeting, the case shall be placed on the agenda of the next Board meeting; otherwise it shall be placed on the agenda of the subsequent Board meeting.

242. At the Board meeting for which the case is placed on the agenda, the Board shall, in accordance with appendix 2, finalize the ruling.

243. The secretariat shall ~~make the final~~ publish a ruling ~~publicly available note~~ on the UNFCCC CDM website ~~no later than three days after the ruling was finalized~~.

243^{bis}. After the publication of the ruling note, the DOE, or the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, may request the secretariat, by e-mail through a dedicated e-mail address, to make a telephone call or an internet-based call to them to provide clarifications on the ruling. Only one such request, ~~regardless of the requesting party,~~ shall be allowed per ruling. In this case, the DOE, or the project participants, or the coordinating/managing entity shall provide the contact details of the person to be called with preferred time slots. The secretariat shall fix a call appointment within three (3) days of receipt of the request. The secretariat shall record the call.

244. If the request for issuance is rejected in accordance with paragraph 229 or 233 above, the DOE may re-submit the request for issuance with revised documentation if the reasons for the rejection can be addressed by means of a revised verification report, based on a revised monitoring report as appropriate. ~~In this case, the DOE shall submit a request for re-submission of the request for issuance, justifying that the re-submission falls under such case. The Board shall consider such request at its subsequent meeting following receipt of the request and decide whether to allow the re-submission on a case-by-case basis. The Board may provide further guidance, as appropriate. In cases where the re-submitted request for issuance is also rejected by the Board, further re-submission of a request for issuance for the same monitoring period shall not be allowed.~~

8.3. Withdrawal of request for issuance

8.3.1. Submission of request for withdrawal

245. For the following cases, the DOE shall submit a request for withdrawal of a request for issuance by using the "Issuance request withdrawal form" (CDM-ISSW-FORM) and uploading it through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website:

- (a) The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity voluntarily wish to withdraw the request for issuance for the specified monitoring period;¹⁰
- (b) The DOE has revised its verification report and/or certification report based on new insights or information.

¹⁰ In such cases the DOE shall process the request expeditiously.

8.3.2. Processing request for withdrawal

246. Upon receipt of the request for withdrawal of a request for issuance, the secretariat shall as soon as possible check the documents submitted, and if the request is complete, update the information in the project view page of the relevant project activity or PoA. If the DOE requests the withdrawal after the publication of the request for issuance was made in accordance with paragraph 204 above, the request for issuance shall be marked as “withdrawn”. The DOE may re-submit the request for issuance at any time.

246^{bis}. If the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity wish to change the monitoring period covered by the monitoring report that corresponds to the withdrawn request for issuance, the DOE shall request the withdrawal of the published monitoring report in accordance with paragraph 184^{bis} above ~~first, then. The DOE shall~~ publish and verify a revised monitoring report. If the final date of the changed monitoring period is after the date of the DOE’s on-site inspection referred to in paragraph 184 above, the DOE shall undertake an additional on-site inspection; otherwise, the DOE shall decide whether a new on-site inspection is necessary in order to duly perform its verification. After the verification, the DOE may resubmit its request for issuance.

~~247. Type 1: If the DOE requests the withdrawal prior to the publication of the request for issuance in accordance with paragraph 204 above, the request for issuance for the specified monitoring period will not be marked as “withdrawn”. If the DOE re-submits the request for issuance for the same monitoring period after such withdrawal, the request for issuance shall be treated as a new submission.~~

~~248. Type 2: If the DOE requests the withdrawal during the 28-day period for requesting a review of the request for issuance in accordance with paragraph 208 above, the request for issuance for the specified monitoring period will be marked as “withdrawn”. The DOE may re-submit the request for issuance without requesting permission from the Board.~~

~~249. Type 3: If the DOE requests the withdrawal subsequent to being notified a request for review of the request for issuance in accordance with paragraph 215(a) above, the request for issuance for the specified monitoring period shall be marked as “withdrawn”. The DOE may re-submit the request for issuance for the same monitoring period after such withdrawal. In this case, the DOE shall request permission from the Board to re-submit such request.~~

~~250. Submissions of requests for withdrawal shall feed into the framework for monitoring performance of DOEs.~~

8.4. Addressing non-permanence in CCS project activities

251. To address the non-permanence in CCS project activities, the monitoring of the geological storage site shall follow the criteria specified in section “Monitoring” for CCS project activities in the “CDM project standard”. The monitoring shall not be terminated earlier than 20 years after the end of the last crediting period of the CCS project activity or after the issuance of the CERs has ceased, whichever occurs first.

252. The monitoring of the geological storage site shall be conducted by the entity or Party that is liable for the geological storage site, or by an entity that is under contractual arrangement with the liable entity or Party.

253. A certification report submitted for a verification period after the end of the last crediting period shall not constitute a request for issuance but shall provide, where applicable, information on the amount of any net reversal of storage that occurred during the verification period as a result of seepage from the geological storage site of a CCS project activity.
254. The last certification report, submitted after the monitoring of the geological storage site has been terminated in accordance with the conditions for the termination of monitoring, as set out in section "Monitoring" of the "CDM project standard", may constitute a request to forward any remaining CERs in the reserve account established for the purpose of accounting for any net reversal of storage to the registry accounts of the Parties and project participants involved.
255. Upon submission of the last certification report referred to in paragraph 254 above, and upon finalization of the consideration of the certification report by the Board, the CDM registry administrator shall promptly forward any CERs remaining in the reserve account established for the purpose of accounting for any net reversal of storage to the registry accounts of the Parties and project participants involved, in accordance with their request.
256. Where a verification report determines that a net reversal of storage occurred during the verification period as a result of seepage from the geological storage site of a CCS project activity, the Board shall:
- (a) Notify the CDM registry administrator to cancel, up to the amount of the net reversal of storage, the CERs issued for the CCS project activity held in the CDM registry:
 - (i) Firstly, from the reserve account established for the purpose of accounting for any net reversal of storage;
 - (ii) Secondly, from the pending account;
 - (iii) Finally, from the holding accounts of the project participants, proportional to the amount of CERs for the CCS project activity held in each holding account;
 - (b) Determine any outstanding amount of the net reversal of storage for which no CERs were cancelled under subparagraph (a) above and, where such amount is outstanding, request the project participants to transfer, within 30 days after the notification, the amount of AAUs, CERs, ERUs or RMUs equivalent to the outstanding amount to a cancellation account of the CDM registry established for this purpose or a cancellation account of the national registry of any Party.
257. Where a verification report is not submitted within the time frame specified in section "Verification and certification" for CCS project activities in the "CDM project standard", the Board shall forthwith request the project participants to provide the outstanding verification report. If the verification report is not received within **six months-180 days** of receipt of the request by the project participants, the Board shall:
- (a) Instruct the CDM registry administrator to cancel all CERs that were issued for the CCS project activity and are being held in the CDM registry;

- (b) Subsequently request the project participants to cancel, within one year after the request, the amount of AAUs, CERs, ERUs or RMUs equivalent to the amount of CERs issued from the start of the CCS project activity:
 - (i) Minus any AAUs, CERs, ERUs or RMUs that were transferred to a cancellation account for the purpose of compensating for a net reversal of storage, prior to the request to the CDM registry administrator referred to in paragraph 256(a) above;
 - (ii) Minus any CERs issued for the CCS project activity that were cancelled in accordance with paragraph 256(a) above.
- 258. If the project participants do not fully comply with the requirements set out in paragraphs 256 or 257(b) above, the outstanding amount of units shall be transferred to a cancellation account of the national registry of a Party included in Annex I to the Convention (Annex I Party) or the CDM registry, within one year of the request by the Board, by:
 - (a) The host Party, if the host Party has accepted the obligation to address a net reversal of storage in such a situation in its letter of approval;
 - (b) The Annex I Parties that hold CERs issued for the CCS project activity in accounts of their national registries, if the host Party has not accepted the obligation to address a net reversal of storage in such a situation in its letter of approval.
- 259. If the host Party has accepted the obligation to address a net reversal of storage in such a situation in its letter of approval, the Board shall determine the outstanding amount of units that must be cancelled and notify the host Party concerned of the requirement for cancellation. To meet this requirement, the host Party shall transfer the amount of AAUs, CERs, ERUs or RMUs equivalent to the outstanding amount to the cancellation account established for this purpose in the CDM registry or a cancellation account of the national registry of any Party.
- 260. If the host Party has not accepted the obligation to address a net reversal of storage in such a situation in its letter of approval, the Board shall:
 - (a) Determine the outstanding amount of units that must be cancelled;
 - (b) Request the international transaction log administrator to identify the quantity of CERs issued for the CCS project activity held in each national registry, distinguishing between units in holding accounts and other accounts, for the current and previous commitment periods;
 - (c) Immediately notify the international transaction log that the CERs identified as being in holding accounts are ineligible for transfers other than for the purpose of the requirement set out in paragraph 258 above. When the requirement for cancellation, as set out in paragraph 258 above, has been satisfied, the CERs issued for the CCS project activity in holding accounts shall be again eligible for transfer;
 - (d) Determine the outstanding amount of units that must be cancelled by each Annex I Party proportionally, by dividing the amount identified in subparagraph (b) above by the total outstanding amount;

- (e) Notify each Annex I Party that holds CERs issued for the CCS project activity in accounts of its national registry of the requirement of cancellation, as determined in subparagraph (d) above. To meet this requirement, the relevant Annex I Parties shall transfer the amount of AAUs, CERs, ERUs or RMUs equivalent to the outstanding amount to the cancellation account established for this purpose in the CDM registry or a cancellation account of their national registries.

9. Renewal of crediting period

9.1. Preparation of revised project or programme design document and notification to the secretariat of the intention to renew the crediting period General requirements

260^{bis}. For PoAs, crediting period is defined only at the CPA level and for each specific case CPA individually, while the PoA, as the framework, is to be renewed every seven years (every 20 years for A/R PoAs) maximum three times, i.e. maximum 28 years in total (maximum 80 years in total for A/R PoAs), by updating the PoA-DD including its generic CPA-DD part in accordance with the "CDM project standard".

261. Project participants or the coordinating/managing entity wishing to renew the crediting period of a registered CDM project activity or PoA (hereinafter in section 9 "renew/renewal of crediting period of PoA" shall be read as "renew/renewal of PoA" in the context of PoAs) shall update the PDD or prepare a new PoA-DD and new generic CPA-DD, in accordance with the "CDM project standard".

261^{bis}. The new crediting period shall start on the day immediately after the expiration of the current crediting period regardless of the date when the crediting period is deemed renewed in accordance with paragraph 276 below. However, if the notification of the intention to request a renewal of the crediting period was not received by the secretariat by 180 days prior to the date of expiration of the current crediting period in accordance with paragraph 266 below, and if the date when the renewal of crediting period is deemed renewed after the expiration of the current crediting period, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall not be entitled to claim the issuance of CERs from the first day of the next crediting period until the last day before the renewal of crediting period is deemed renewed or until the number of days equivalent to the delay in the notification have elapsed since the notification submission deadline, whichever is earlier.

9.2. Request for renewal of crediting period Notification of intention of renewal of crediting period

9.2.1. Submission of request for renewal of crediting period

262. The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall notify the secretariat, by e-mail or through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website, of their intention to request a renewal of crediting period of the registered CDM project activity or PoA by submitting an updated PDD, or new PoA-DD and new generic CPA-DDs, and informing the secretariat of their selection of a DOE to request the renewal of crediting period and to perform related tasks referred to in paragraph 267 below, within 270 to 180 days prior to the date of expiration of the current crediting period. For this purpose, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity may select any DOE.

~~263. No fee is due for requests of a renewal of crediting period.~~

~~264. When submitting the request for renewal of crediting period, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall ensure that any changes to the list of project participants in the PDD or PoA-DD have been notified to the secretariat in accordance with section 6.3 above.~~

~~265. For the purpose of renewal of crediting period it is not necessary to obtain a new letter of approval from Parties involved.~~

266. Project participants or the coordinating/managing entity wishing to renew the crediting period of a registered CDM project activity or PoA shall notify the secretariat, of the intention to renew the crediting period by sending the "Intention of renewing crediting period notification form" (CDM-RENN-FORM) and an updated PDD or PoA-DD to the secretariat by e-mail or through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website, within 270 to 180 days prior to the date of expiration of the current crediting period. The secretariat shall make every effort to inform the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity in advance of the period for notifying the intention of renewing the crediting period in accordance with the registered modalities of communication. It remains the responsibility of project participants or the coordinating/managing entity to ensure that all actions are taken in accordance with the current section of this procedure in a timely manner. ~~If the notification of the intention to request a renewal of crediting period is not received by the secretariat 180 days prior to the date of expiration of the current crediting period, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall not be entitled to claim the issuance of CERs for the period from the expiration date of the current crediting period until the last date before the crediting period is deemed renewed.~~

266_{bis}. The secretariat shall publish the notifications of the intention to renew the crediting period on the UNFCCC CDM website, stating the date when the notification was received.

~~266_{ter}. For the purpose of renewal of crediting period it is not necessary to obtain a new letter of approval from Parties involved.~~

~~266_{quater}. No fee is due for requests of a renewal of crediting period.~~

9.3. Request for renewal of crediting period

9.3.1. Submission of request for renewal of crediting period

266_{ter}. The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall update the PDD or PoA-DD including its generic CPA-DD part in accordance with the "CDM project standard". In doing so, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall ensure that any changes to the list of project participants in the PDD or PoA-DD have been notified to the secretariat in accordance with section 6.3 above.

266_{quater}. ~~In order to request the renewal of the crediting period, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall submit the updated PDD or PoA-DD to a DOE for its validation. For this purpose, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity may not appoint a DOE that has performed a verification for the same project activity or PoA unless the project activity is a small-scale one or the DOE is authorized by the Board to do so in accordance with paragraphs 183_{bis}–183_{quinquies} above.~~

~~266^{quinquies}.~~ If the updated PDD or PoA-DD cannot apply the baseline and monitoring methodology applied in the original PDD or PoA-DD because the registered project activity or PoA does not meet the applicability conditions of the valid version of that methodology at the time of the submission of the request for renewal of the crediting period, or, if applicable, of the consolidated methodology, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity may select another methodology or, request, through the DOE, a deviation from the methodology for the purpose of the renewal of the crediting period in accordance with section 4.6 above mutatis mutandis.

~~267.~~ The DOE, after determining that the updated PDD or PoA-DD meets all relevant requirements in the “CDM project standard” by following the relevant provisions of the “CDM validation and verification standard” and other CDM requirements, shall submit, through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website, a request for renewal of crediting period of a registered CDM project activity or PoA using the “Renewal of crediting period request form” (F CDM REN) along with the updated PDD or new PoA-DD and new generic CPA-DD, and updated validation report.

~~268.~~ For renewal of crediting period of a registered PoA every seven years after the registration of the PoA, the coordinating/managing entity shall update the eligibility criteria for inclusion of CPAs in the PoA in accordance with the “CDM project standard”, and include them in new versions of the PoA-DD and CPA-DD(s), to be validated by the DOE and approved by the Board in accordance with paragraphs 271–277 below.

~~268^{bis}.~~ For the purpose of renewal of crediting period it is not necessary to obtain a new letter of approval from the Parties involved.

~~268^{ter}.~~ The DOE, after determining that the updated PDD or PoA-DD meets all relevant requirements in the “CDM project standard” by following the relevant provisions of the “CDM validation and verification standard” and other CDM requirements, shall submit, through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website, a request for renewal of crediting period of the CDM project activity or PoA using the “Renewal of crediting period request form” (CDM-REN-FORM) together with the updated PDD or PoA-DD and a new validation report.

~~268^{quater}.~~ No fee is due for requests of renewal of crediting period.

~~269.~~ For renewal of crediting period of CPAs in a registered CDM PoA, if the DOE confirms that the information in the CPA-DD of a CPA included in the PoA complies with the latest version of the PoA and applicable requirements issues a positive validation opinion on the renewal of the crediting period of the CPA, it shall renew the crediting period of the CPA by submitting the CPA-DD to the Board by uploading it through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website. Such uploads shall be grouped and shall not occur more frequently than once per month.

~~270.~~ The CPA-DDs uploaded by the DOE will automatically have their crediting periods renewed and displayed. The crediting period of the CPA for which the DOE has uploaded the CPA-DD on the UNFCCC CDM website in accordance with paragraph 269 above will be automatically renewed after the expiration of its current crediting period and will be indicated so on the view page of the PoA. The DOE, the coordinating/managing entity and the DNA are automatically notified of the change in the status of the PoA.

~~270^{bis}.~~ For the review of erroneous renewal of crediting period of a CPA, the provisions in section 6.1.2 above shall apply.

9.3.2. Processing of request for renewal of crediting period

271. For processing of the request for renewal of crediting period, the provisions in section 5.1.2 above shall apply mutatis mutandis.

9.3.3. Requesting review of request for renewal of crediting period

272. A Party involved in the CDM project activity or PoA and/or any member of the Board may request a review of the request for renewal of crediting period within 28 days after the date of publication of the request for renewal of crediting period. If a Party involved wishes to request a review, the relevant DNA shall send the request **by e-mail to the Board, through** the secretariat, using the “Renewal of crediting period request review form” (CDM-RENR-FORM) **by official means of communication (such as a letter with recognized official letterhead and signature or an e-mail sent from an official dedicated e-mail account).** If a member of the Board wishes to request a review, he/she shall communicate the request to the Board through the secretariat, using the “Renewal of crediting period request review form” (CDM-RENR-FORM) and in accordance with appendix 2.
273. The secretariat shall acknowledge receipt of a request for review and promptly make it available to the Board.
274. A request for review shall be deemed to be received by the Board on the date it has been received by the secretariat. A request for review shall not be recognized by the Board if it is received after 5 p.m. GMT of the last day of the 28-day period following the publication of the request for **registration-renewal of crediting period.**
275. A request for review shall provide, inter alia, the reasons for the request for review based on the “CDM project standard”, “CDM validation and verification standard” or any other applicable CDM requirements.

9.3.4. Finalizing request for renewal of crediting period **if no request for review**

~~275^{bis} The next crediting period shall commence on the day immediately after the expiration of the current crediting period.~~

276. The crediting period of the registered CDM project activity or PoA shall be deemed renewed 28 days after the publication of the request for renewal of crediting period on the UNFCCC CDM website, unless a Party involved or at least three members of the Board request a review of the request for renewal of crediting period, **in which case, the crediting period is deemed renewed on the day when the Board adopted the relevant decision.**

~~276^{bis} If the notification of the intention to renew the crediting period was not received by the secretariat by 180 days prior to the date of expiration of the current crediting period, and if the date when the crediting period is deemed renewed is after the expiration of the current crediting period in accordance with paragraph 266 above, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall not be entitled to claim the issuance of CERs from the first day of the next crediting period until the last day before the crediting period is deemed renewed or until the number of days equivalent to the delay in the notification have elapsed since the notification submission deadline, whichever is earlier.~~

9.4. Review of request for renewal of crediting period

277. For reviews of the request for renewal of crediting period, the provisions in section 5.2 above shall apply mutatis mutandis.

~~278. The start date of the renewed crediting period shall be the first day after the end date of the previous crediting period, provided that the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity have complied with the notification step referred to in paragraph 262 above.~~

9.5. Withdrawal of the request for renewal of crediting period

279. At any time before the decision of the Board on the request of renewal of crediting period, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity, through the DOE, may request for withdrawal of the request for renewal of crediting period by submitting the request to the secretariat using the "Renewal of crediting period request withdrawal form" (CDM-RENEW-FORM). If the DOE requests the withdrawal after the publication of the request for renewal of crediting period, the secretariat shall mark the request for renewal of crediting period on the UNFCCC CDM website as "withdrawn".

280. For withdrawals of the request for renewal of crediting period, the provisions in section 5.3 above shall apply mutatis mutandis.

9.6. Submission of request for post-registration changes together with request for renewal of crediting period

281. The project participants or the coordinating/managing entity may combine a request for approval of any types of changes to the project activity, ~~or PoA or specific case CPA listed in paragraph 136 above~~ with the request for renewal of the crediting period, so that the changes proposed can be effective as from the first day of the next crediting period. In this case, the DOE contracted for this purpose shall submit the following documentation:

- (a) A duly completed "Post-registration changes request form" (CDM-PRC-FORM);
- (b) A duly completed "Renewal of crediting period request form" (CDM-REN-FORM);
- (c) A revised PDD, or revised PoA-DD ~~with its generic CPA-DD part~~, and specific CPA-DD (in both clean and track-change versions), as applicable;
- (d) A validation report on the changes and on the renewal of crediting period request prepared by the DOE in accordance with the "CDM validation and verification standard";
- (e) Letters of approval by the DNAs of the added host Parties in the CDM PoA, as applicable;
- (f) Supplemental documentation, as appropriate.

282. ~~If a request for approval of changes for the changes expected in the next crediting period is not combined with a request for renewal of crediting period, the latter request shall be approved by the Board before the former request may be submitted.~~

283. The ~~submission combined request~~ shall be processed in accordance with the provisions in sections 9.3 and 9.4 above, mutatis mutandis.

284. The decision of the Board shall be to:

- (a) Approve the renewal of crediting period with all requested post-registration changes;
- (b) Approve the renewal of crediting period without any of the requested post-registration changes; or
- (c) Reject the renewal of crediting period.

285. If the Board's decision is in accordance with paragraph 284(b) above, the project participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall, through the DOE, submit an updated PDD or PoA-DD and CPA-DD(s), ~~covering the changes approved by the Board,~~ and the DOE shall confirm that the PDD or the PoA-DD and CPA-DD(s) have been correctly updated.

286. No monitoring report may be published for the renewed crediting period until the DOE submits to the secretariat the updated PDD or PoA-DD and its confirmation in accordance with paragraph 285 above.

10. De-registration of project activity

10.1. Submission of request for de-registration

287. The project participants of a registered CDM project activity may submit, at anytime after the registration, through the focal point for scope (c), a request for de-registration of the project activity to the secretariat through a dedicated e-mail account made available on the UNFCCC CDM website, using the "Project activity de-registration request form" (CDM-DREG-FORM).

288. When submitting the request for de-registration, the project participants shall also submit the following:

- (a) Written agreement of all project participants on the de-registration;
- (b) Written no-objection of the DNAs of all Parties involved to the de-registration.

10.2. Processing of request for de-registration

289. The secretariat shall [as soon as possible] [within X days of receipt of the request] conduct a completeness check of the documents submitted.

290. If the secretariat, during the completeness check, identifies missing documents and/or information, it shall request the project participants by e-mail to submit the missing or revised documents and/or information. In this case, the project participants shall submit the requested documents and/or information within [X] days of receipt of the request. If the project participants do not submit the requested documents and/or information by this deadline, the secretariat shall conclude that the request submission is incomplete.

291. Upon conclusion of the completeness check, the secretariat shall notify the project participants of the conclusion of the completeness check. If the conclusion is negative

(i.e. that the request submission is incomplete), the project participants may re-submit the request for de-registration with revised documentation.

292. Upon positive conclusion of the completeness check, the secretariat shall publish the request for de-registration on the UNFCCC CDM website, and the request for de-registration shall be deemed received by the Board ~~for consideration~~.

293. The secretariat shall promptly send the request submission to the Board ~~and mark the project activity as “de-registered on the UNFCCC CDM website.”~~

10.3. Consideration by the Board

~~294. Any member of the Board may request a review of the request for de-registration within 28 days after the date of publication of the request for de-registration, providing the reasons for the request of review [which shall be based on the relevant CDM requirements].~~

~~295. If [a member of the Board requests] [at least three members of the Board request] a review of the request for de-registration, the Board shall review the request at the next Board meeting.~~

10.4. Finalizing request for de-registration

~~296. The Board shall de-register the project activity if the secretariat does not receive a request for review from [a member] [at least three members] of the Board in accordance with paragraph 294 above.~~

~~297. If the Board reviews the request for de-registration in accordance with paragraph 295 above, it shall decide, at the Board meeting for which the case is placed on the agenda, either to:~~

~~(a) De-register the project activity; or~~

~~(b) Reject the request for de-registration.~~

~~298. If the Board decides to de-register the project activity in accordance with paragraph 296 or 297(a) above, the secretariat shall mark the project activity as “de-registered” on the UNFCCC CDM website.~~

~~299. If the Board decides to reject the request for de-registration in accordance with paragraph 297(b) above, it shall provide the reasons for the rejection, which shall be based on the relevant CDM requirements. In this case, the project participants may re-submit the request with revised documentation.~~

10.5. Effects of de-registration

300. The effective date of de-registration shall be ~~[the next day of the decision by the Board in accordance with paragraph 296 or 297(a) above]~~ [the date when the secretariat received complete submission of the request for de-registration].

301. A DOE may publish a monitoring report in accordance with section 7.1 above, or submit a request for issuance in accordance with section 8.1.1 above, for the de-registered project activity for the period prior to the effective date of de-registration.

302. The secretariat, acting as the CDM registry administrator, shall forward CERs issued in respect of emission reductions or removal enhancements achieved prior to the effective date of de-registration in accordance with forwarding requests, the modalities of communication and the "CDM project standard" and this procedure.

303. A DOE shall not make any monitoring report publicly available for a period that includes any date that is on or after the effective date of de-registration. The secretariat, acting as the CDM registry administrator, shall not issue CERs for the de-registered project activity for the period from the effective date of de-registration.

304. The registration fee, even if there is any positive balance left after deduction of the share of proceeds for issued CERs for the project activity, shall not be reimbursed.

~~305. The project participants of the de-registered project activity may seek re-registration of the project activity. In this case, provisions in sections 4.35.3 above shall apply.~~

10.6. Administration period

306. During the period from the effective date of de-registration until the date that is three calendar years later:

(a) The secretariat shall communicate with project participants and Parties involved in order to assist them to settle outstanding matters in relation to the de-registered project activity, including the completion of all issuance requests and forwarding requests in respect of emission reductions or removal enhancements achieved prior to the effective date of de-registration and such other steps as are necessary to ensure the completion of outstanding matters in relation to the de-registered project activity;

(b) Each project participant may, after the effective date of de-registration, where necessary, be treated as if it were still a project participant by the Board and secretariat for the purposes of the "CDM project standard" and this procedure in order to allow the secretariat to process instructions relating to emission reductions or removal enhancements achieved prior to the effective date of de-registration from such project participant(s) in relation to the de-registered project activity;

(c) Any of the project participants of and Parties involved in the de-registered project activity may communicate with the secretariat using the e-mail address <cdm-registry@unfccc.int> for the purpose of clarifying the effect of the de-registration.

11. Re-registration of project activity

11.1. General requirements

307. A de-registered CDM project activity may be re-registered as long as the total length of the original crediting period at the initial registration (i.e. maximum 10 years if the project activity had chosen non-renewable crediting period, or maximum 21 years if the project activity had chosen renewal crediting period) has not expired.

308. The type (renewable or non-renewable), the maximum total length of the entire crediting periods and the end date of the final crediting period shall remain the same as those when the project activity was initially registered.

11.2. Submission of request for re-registration

309. The project participants of a de-registered CDM project activity wishing to re-register the project activity shall update the PDD in accordance with the “CDM project standard”, and submit it to a DOE for its validation.

310. The DOE, after determining that the updated PDD meets all relevant requirements in the “CDM project standard” by following the relevant provisions of the “CDM validation and verification standard” and other CDM requirements, shall submit, through a dedicated e-mail account made available on the UNFCCC CDM website, a request for re-registration of the de-registered project activity using “the “Project activity re-registration request form” (CDM-RREG-FORM).

311. **[Option 1 only:** If, at the time of submission of request for re-registration, it is still within the same crediting period as when the de-registration became effective, paragraphs 309 and 310 above shall not apply.¹¹ In this case, the project participants, through the focal point for scope (c), shall directly submit a request for re-registration of the project activity to the secretariat through a dedicated e-mail account made available on the UNFCCC CDM website, using the “Project activity re-registration request form” (CDM-RREG-FORM) without updating the PDD and without a new validation by a DOE]

312. When submitting the request for re-registration, **[Option 1 only:** the project participants or] the DOE shall also submit the following:

(a) Written agreement of all project participants on the re-registration;

(b) Written no-objection of the DNAs of all Parties involved in the re-registration.

313. **[Option 3:** The project participants shall pay a re-registration fee, that is equivalent to the registration fee minus any positive balance at the time of de-registration.] **[Option 4:** No fee shall be due for re-registration of the de-registered project activity.]

11.3. Processing of request for re-registration

314. For processing the request for re-registration submitted in accordance with paragraph 310 above, the provisions in section 5.1.2 above shall apply mutatis mutandis.

315. **[para 315-320 are Option 1 only:** For processing the request for re-registration submitted in accordance with paragraph 311 above, paragraphs 316–320 below shall apply.

316. The secretariat shall [as soon as possible] [within X days of receipt of the request] conduct a completeness check of the documents submitted.]

317. If the secretariat, during the completeness check, identifies missing documents and/or information, it shall request the project participants by e-mail to submit the missing or

¹¹ Project activities with non-renewable crediting period, in the context of the requirements referred in paragraphs 307 and 308, automatically fall under this category.

revised documents and/or information. In this case, the project participants shall submit the requested documents and/or information within [X] days of receipt of the request. If the project participants do not submit the requested documents and/or information by this deadline, the secretariat shall conclude that the request submission is incomplete.

318. Upon conclusion of the completeness check, the secretariat shall notify the project participants of the conclusion of the completeness check. If the conclusion is negative (i.e. that the request submission is incomplete), the project participants may re-submit the request for re-registration with revised documentation.

319. Upon positive conclusion of the completeness check, the secretariat shall publish the request for re-registration on the UNFCCC CDM website, and the request for re-registration shall be deemed received by the Board for consideration.

320. The secretariat shall promptly send the request submission to the Board.]

11.4. Requesting review of request for re-registration

321. For requesting a review of the request for re-registration, the provisions in section 5.1.3 above shall apply mutatis mutandis.

11.5. Finalizing request for re-registration if no request for review

322. For finalizing the request for re-registration if the secretariat does not receive a request for review from a Party involved or at least three members of the Board within the deadline referred to the relevant paragraph in section 5.1.3 above, the provisions in section 5.1.4 above shall apply mutatis mutandis.

11.6. Review of request for re-registration

323. For review of the request for re-registration, the provisions in section 5.2 above shall apply mutatis mutandis.

11.7. Effects of re-registration

324. A DOE may publish a monitoring report in accordance with section 7.1 above, or submit a request for issuance in accordance with section 8.1.1 above, for the re-registered project activity for the period starting from the effective date of re-registration.

325. **[Option 2 only:** For project activities with renewable crediting period, when a project activity is re-registered, a new crediting period shall start with maximum seven years of crediting period.]

Appendix 1. Fee schedule

1. Background

1. The registration fee schedule set forth in this appendix is adopted in accordance with decisions 4/CMP.1, annex II, paragraph 21; 6/CMP.1, annex, paragraph 13; 7/CMP.1, paragraph 37; 2/CMP.3, paragraph 31; and 2/CMP.5, paragraph 47.
2. This appendix supersedes contains the “Guidelines on the registration fee schedule for proposed project activities under the clean development mechanism” (EB 54 report, annex 29).

~~2. Registration fee schedule~~

3. ~~The registration fee schedule applies rules that apply to submissions of request for registration of proposed project activities and PoAs and establishes specific rules applicable to afforestation and reforestation (A/R) project activities and programmes of activities (PoAs) under the CDM.~~

2. Share of proceeds and registration fee

4. The share of proceeds to cover administrative expenses for project activities and PoAs is:
 - (a) USD 0.10 per certified emission reduction (CER) issued for the first 15,000 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent for which issuance is requested in a given calendar year;
 - (b) USD 0.20 per CER issued for any amount in excess of 15,000 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent for which issuance is requested in a given calendar year;
 - (c) No share of proceeds shall be due for project activities and PoAs hosted in least developed countries. In the case of PoAs hosted not exclusively in least developed countries, the exemption from the share of proceeds applies to the issuance of CERs for the emission reductions occurring in component project activities (CPAs) hosted in least developed countries. The application of this exemption from the share of proceeds shall be based on the status of the country on the date of the publication of the request for issuance of CERs.
5. The registration fee for a project activity shall be the share of proceeds applied to the expected average annual CERs for the proposed project activity over its crediting period, as identified in the project design document (PDD) and as validated by the designated operational entity (DOE).
6. The registration fee for a PoA shall be the share of proceeds applied to the total expected average annual CERs of the specific case CPA(s) submitted together with the request for registration of the PoA. The average annual emission reductions for each specific case CPA are calculated over its crediting period. For each CPA which is included subsequently, no registration fee is to be paid. Fees are to be paid by the coordinating/managing entity to the secretariat.

7. Upon re-submission of a request for registration directly following a determination by the secretariat that the submission is incomplete, no registration fee shall be payable unless the re-submission results in an increase in the expected average annual CERs for the proposed project activity, or for the “actual case” CPA submitted together with the request for registration of the PoA, over its crediting period. If the re-submission results in an increase in the expected average annual CERs, then the registration fee due shall be re-calculated upon re-submission. The registration fee due upon re-submission shall be the difference between the re-calculated registration fee and the registration fee previously paid.
- ~~8. For the purpose of calculating the registration fee for proposed A/R project activities or A/R PoAs, CERs shall mean the net GHG removals by sinks.~~
9. The maximum registration fee payable based on this calculation shall be USD 350,000.
10. No registration fee shall be payable for proposed project activities, or proposed PoAs with the “specific case” CPA submitted together with the request for registration of the PoA, with expected average annual CERs over its crediting period, below 15,000 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent.
11. No registration fee shall be payable for proposed project activities or PoAs hosted exclusively in least developed countries. The registration fee for PoAs hosted not exclusively in least developed countries shall be based on the sum of expected average annual CERs of specific case CPAs that are not hosted in a least developed country. The application of this exemption shall be based on the status of the country on the date of the publication of the request for registration.
12. No registration fee shall be payable until after the date of the first issuance of CERs in countries with fewer than 10 registered clean development mechanism (CDM) project activities. PoAs hosted in these countries shall also be counted towards the calculation of the 10 registered CDM project activities.¹² The application of this exemption shall be based on the number of registered CDM project activities in the country on the date of the submission of the request for registration.
13. The registration fee shall be reimbursed in full if the DOE withdraws the request for registration of the proposed project activity or PoA prior to the date when the secretariat publishes the request for registration on the UNFCCC CDM website.
14. Any portion in excess of USD 30,000 of the registration fee shall be reimbursed if the DOE withdraws the request for registration of the proposed project activity or PoA subsequent to the date when the secretariat publishes the request for registration on the UNFCCC CDM website, or if the Board rejects the request for registration of the proposed project activity or PoA. Should the registration fee be USD 30,000 or less, no reimbursement shall be made in these cases.
15. The registration fee shall be deducted from the share of proceeds due for the issuance of CERs. In effect, the registration fee is an advance payment of the share of proceeds due for the issuance of CERs likely to be achieved during the first year.

¹² PoAs hosted in more than one country will count as one CDM project activity in each of the countries where it is hosted; host Parties added to the PoA post-registration will also be considered for the calculation.

15_{bis}. No reimbursement of the registration fee shall be made in any circumstances.

3. Specific provisions for afforestation/reforestation project activities

16. For the purpose of calculating the registration fee for proposed A/R project activities or A/R PoAs, CERs shall mean the net greenhouse gas (GHG) removals by sinks. Paragraphs 17 to 19 below shall apply instead of paragraphs 4 and 6 of this appendix.

17. The share of proceeds to cover administrative expenses for A/R project activities and PoAs shall be calculated based on one of the following:

(a) If the selected approach for addressing non-permanence is Temporary CERs (tCERs), the share of proceeds is based on the difference between the tCERs for which issuance is requested for a given verification period and the highest amount of tCERs previously issued in a verification period;

(b) If the selected approach for addressing non-permanence is Long-Term CERs (lCERs), the share of proceeds is based on the difference between the lCERs for which issuance is requested for a given verification period added to the sum of all previous issuances and reversals,¹³ and the highest among the sums of the issuances and reversals since the start of the project calculated for each previous verification period.

18. The share of proceeds to cover administrative expenses for A/R project activities is due only if the amount calculated according to paragraph 16 above is positive. In that case, the share of proceeds is calculated follows:

(a) USD 0.10 for the first 15,000 t CO₂ equivalent;

(b) USD 0.20 in excess of 15,000 t CO₂ equivalent.

19. The registration fee shall be calculated based on the expected average annual net GHG removals by sinks for the project activity over its crediting period:

(a) USD 0.10 per expected average annual net GHG removals by sinks for the first 15,000 t CO₂ equivalent;

(b) USD 0.20 per expected average annual net GHG removals by sinks for any amount in excess of 15,000 t CO₂ equivalent.

¹³ All reversals mentioned are negative numbers.

Appendix 2. Requesting review and making decisions and objections regarding review assessments

1. Background

1. The purpose of this appendix is to provide the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism (hereinafter referred to as the Board) with a framework to maintain the consistency and objectivity of its decisions and rulings and to provide greater transparency to clean development mechanism (CDM) stakeholders regarding the criteria applied by the Board in deciding upon case specific matters related to registration and issuance.
2. This appendix also serves to provide direction to the secretariat and members of the Registration and Issuance Team (RIT) in performing assessments and making recommendations as required by the relevant provisions in this procedure.
3. This appendix replaces the “Guidelines for requesting a review and making decisions and objections regarding review assessments” (EB 59 report, annex 14).

2. Authorization of alternate member

4. In cases where a member of the Board is unable to carry out his or her functions for a period of time, he/she may decide to delegate the authority to request reviews, object to assessments and object to proposed rulings to his/her alternate member. This delegation of authority shall be for a defined period of time to be notified by the member to the Secretary to the Board. All Board members shall be informed of this delegation of authority via the Board listserv. To simplify the text in the following sections of this appendix, “member(s) of the Board” includes alternate members duly authorized in this manner, unless “alternate members of the Board” is explicitly mentioned.

3. Requesting a review

3.1. General

5. In accordance with paragraphs 78, 208 and 272 of this procedure, any members of the Board may request a review of any request for registration, issuance or renewal of crediting period.
6. In accordance with paragraphs 77, 207 and 271 of this procedure, the Board may be provided by the secretariat with a summary note on the request for registration, issuance or renewal of crediting period for its consideration of the request. It remains the responsibility of individual members of the Board to determine whether a request for review is appropriate.

3.2. Grounds for requesting a review

7. It is expected that members of the Board will request a review when the request for registration, issuance or renewal of crediting period would raise the concern of a reasonable reader regarding whether the proposed project activity or programme of

activity (PoA), or registered CDM project activity or PoA for the new crediting period, complies with the applicable CDM rules and requirements.

8. A request for review would imply that the information contained in the request for registration, issuance or renewal of crediting period does not demonstrate that the project activity or PoA meets the applicable CDM rules and requirements for registration, issuance or for the new crediting period, respectively. It is therefore expected that members of the Board would be specific regarding the nature of the concern and, where appropriate, include references to the source of the concern within the submitted documentation.

4. Matters to be considered in taking decisions regarding a review

4.1. General

9. In considering a request for review of request for registration, issuance or renewal of crediting period, the Board will only consider the information contained in the request for registration, issuance or renewal of crediting period, including any responses by the designated operational entity (DOE) or the project participants, a summary note prepared by the secretariat, assessment reports prepared by the secretariat and the RIT Team, and the applicable CDM rules and requirements.

4.2. Requests for registration

10. In accordance with paragraph 103 of this procedure, the Board shall, at its meeting where the case of request for registration is placed on the agenda, decide on the registration.
11. The Board shall reject the request for registration of the proposed project activity or PoA in situations where the request for registration does not contain sufficient information to demonstrate to a reasonable reader that the proposed project activity or PoA complies with the applicable CDM rules and requirements for the registration of proposed project activities or PoAs.
12. The Board shall reject the request for registration if it:
 - (a) Contains information which indicates that the proposed project activity or PoA does not comply with the applicable requirements;
 - (b) Contains information which indicates that the validation activity has not been conducted in a manner that complies with the relevant requirements of either the "CDM accreditation standard" or the "CDM validation and verification standard";
 - (c) Contains contradictory facts regarding the compliance of the proposed project activity or PoA with the applicable CDM rules and requirements;
 - (d) Does not contain sufficient facts or evidence to confirm compliance with the applicable CDM rules and requirements;
 - (e) Contains facts relevant to demonstrating compliance with an applicable CDM rule or requirement, put forward by the project participant(s) within the project design document (PDD), but without evidence regarding whether or how such facts have been validated.

13. The reason for rejection of a request for registration should be limited to the requirements specified in the request for review. In exceptional cases, the Board may reject the request for registration when the response(s) by the DOE or the project participants to the request for review raise(s) new critical concern(s) of the Board regarding whether the request for registration complies with other applicable CDM rules and requirements to register the proposed project activity or PoA. Prior to rejecting a request for registration based on exceptional circumstances, the Board may, at its prerogative, have a teleconference with the DOE and/or project participant(s) during the Board meeting at which it considers the request for registration, in an attempt to clarify the concern(s).

4.3. Requests for issuance

14. In accordance with paragraph 233 of this procedure, the Board shall, at its meeting where the case of request for issuance is placed on the agenda, decide on the issuance.
15. The Board shall reject the request for issuance in situations where the request for issuance does not contain sufficient information to demonstrate to a reasonable reader that the request for issuance complies with the applicable CDM rules and requirements for the issuance of certified emission reductions (CERs).
16. The Board shall reject the request for issuance if it:
 - (a) Contains information which indicates that the project activity or PoA has not complied with the applicable requirements for operating and monitoring registered CDM project activities or PoAs;
 - (b) Contains information which indicates that the verification activity has not been conducted in a manner that complies with the relevant requirements of either the "CDM accreditation standard" or the "CDM validation and verification standard";
 - (c) Contains contradictory facts regarding the compliance of the monitoring or operation of the CDM project activity or PoA with the applicable CDM rules and requirements;
 - (d) Does not contain sufficient facts or evidence to confirm compliance with the applicable CDM rules and requirements;
 - (e) Contains facts relevant to demonstrating compliance with an applicable CDM rule or requirement, put forward by the project participant(s) within the monitoring report, but without evidence regarding whether or how such facts have been verified.
17. The reason for rejection of a request for issuance should be limited to the requirements specified in the request for review. In exceptional cases, the Board may reject the request for issuance when the response(s) by the DOE or the project participants to the request for review raises new critical concern(s) of the Board regarding whether the request for issuance complies with other applicable CDM rules and requirements for the issuance of CERs. Prior to rejecting a request for issuance based on exceptional circumstances, the Board may, at its prerogative, have a teleconference with the DOE and/or project participant(s) during the Board meeting at which it considers the request for issuance, in an attempt to clarify the concern(s).

4.4. Requests for renewal of crediting period

18. In accordance with paragraph 103 effected by paragraph 277 of this procedure, the Board shall, at its meeting where the case of request for renewal of crediting period is placed on the agenda, decide on the renewal of crediting period.
19. The Board shall reject the request for renewal of crediting period in situations where the request for renewal of crediting period does not contain sufficient information to demonstrate to a reasonable reader that the registered CDM project activity or PoA complies with the applicable CDM rules and requirements for the registration of project activities or PoAs for the new crediting period.
20. The Board shall reject the request for renewal of crediting period if it:
 - (a) Contains information which indicates that the registered CDM project activity or PoA does not comply with the applicable requirements for the new crediting period;
 - (b) Contains information which indicates that the validation activity has not been conducted in a manner that complies with the relevant requirements of either the “CDM accreditation standard” or the “CDM validation and verification standard”;
 - (c) Contains contradictory facts regarding the compliance of the registered CDM project activity or PoA with the applicable CDM rules and requirements in the new crediting period;
 - (d) Does not contain sufficient facts or evidence to confirm compliance with the applicable CDM rules and requirements;
 - (e) Contains facts relevant to demonstrating compliance with an applicable CDM rule or requirement, put forward by the project participant(s) within the updated PDD, or new PoA design document (PoA-DD) and **its the** new generic component project activity design document (CPA-DD) **part**, but without evidence regarding whether or how such facts have been validated.
21. The reason for rejection of a request for registration should be limited to the requirements specified in the request for review. In exceptional cases, the Board may reject the request for renewal of crediting period when the response(s) by the DOE or the project participants to the request for review raise(s) new critical concern(s) of the Board regarding whether the request for renewal of crediting period complies with other applicable CDM rules and requirements to renew the crediting period of registered CDM project activities or PoAs. Prior to rejecting a request for renewal of crediting period based on exceptional circumstances, the Board may, at its prerogative, conduct a teleconference with the DOE and/or project participant(s) during the Board meeting at which it considers the request for renewal of crediting period, in an attempt to clarify the concern(s).

5. Objections to proposed decisions in assessments

22. In accordance with paragraphs 100 and 230 of this procedure, any members of the Board may object to a proposed decision contained in the assessment reports prepared by the secretariat and the RIT Team regarding the request for registration or issuance under review.

23. It is expected that members of the Board will only object to a proposed decision contained in the assessment reports prepared by the secretariat and the RIT Team in situations where both assessments:
- (a) Did not consider a fact (or set of facts) that, if considered, would result in different proposed decision;
 - (b) Contain an erroneous finding of fact (or set of facts) that, if corrected, would result in a different proposed decision;
 - (c) Contain an unreasonable interpretation of an applicable CDM rule or requirement that, if corrected, would result in a different proposed decision; or
 - (d) Contain an unreasonable application of an applicable CDM rule or requirement to the facts that, if corrected, would result in a different proposed decision.

6. Objections to proposed rulings

24. In accordance with paragraphs 108 and 240 of this procedure, any members of the Board may object to a proposed ruling prepared by the secretariat subsequent to a decision by the Board to reject a request for registration or issuance.
25. It is expected that members of the Board will only object to the proposed ruling prepared by the secretariat in the following situations:
- (a) The proposed ruling does not contain a sufficient basis or explanation for the decision contained in the ruling; and
 - (b) The ruling differs from the assessment that formed the basis of the decision. These differences include the following:
 - (i) The findings of fact;
 - (ii) The interpretation of an applicable CDM rule or requirement;
 - (iii) The application of a CDM rule or requirement as applied to the facts.

7. Consideration of review cases at Board meetings

7.1. Consideration of reviews placed on the agenda without objection

26. In accordance with paragraphs 102 and 232 of this procedure, if the proposed decisions contained in the assessment reports prepared by the secretariat and the RIT Team differ, the case shall be considered at a Board meeting.
27. The Board should apply the following process to its consideration of the case:
- (a) First, the secretariat will present whichever assessment has recommended the rejection of the proposed project activity or PoA, outlining the requirement being questioned and the facts considered in the assessment;
 - (b) Members and alternate members of the Board may seek clarifications regarding the facts and evidence contained in the relevant request for registration or issuance, including the response by the DOE or the project participants to the request for review; and the applicable requirements;

- (c) Once members of the Board have received the necessary clarifications the Chair of the Board should invite its members and alternate members to express their opinions regarding the recommendation;
- (d) On the basis of the opinions expressed the Chair of the Board shall propose to the Board either to accept the recommendation or not;
- (e) If consensus with the Chair's proposal is not achieved, the Chair of the Board may proceed to seek adoption of a decision via a vote in accordance with the "Rules of procedure of the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism".

8. Consideration of reviews placed on the agenda due to an objection

- 28. In accordance with paragraphs 101 and 231 of this procedure, if a member of the Board objects to the proposed decision contained in the assessment reports prepared by the secretariat and the RIT Team, the case shall be considered at a Board meeting.
- 29. The Board should apply the following process to its consideration of the case:
 - (a) First, the member(s) of the Board who made an objection should present the reasons for the objection, making reference to the additional facts or interpretations relied on beyond the assessments;
 - (b) Members and alternate members of the Board may seek clarifications regarding the presentation;
 - (c) The secretariat may provide any clarifications of the facts and evidence contained in the relevant request for registration or issuance, including the response by the DOE or the project participants to the request for review; and the applicable requirements;
 - (d) Once members have received the necessary clarifications the Chair of the Board should invite its members and alternate members to express their opinion regarding the objection;
 - (e) After this discussion, the Chair of the Board shall determine and propose to the Board whether the objection should be further considered;
 - (f) If consensus with the Chair's proposal is not achieved, the Chair of the Board may proceed to seek adoption of a decision via a vote in accordance with the "Rules of procedure of the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism".

9. Consideration of objections to proposed rulings at Board meetings

- 30. In accordance with paragraphs 110 and 242 of this procedure, the Board shall, at its meeting where the case of a proposed ruling is placed on the agenda, finalize the ruling.
- 31. The Board should apply the following process to its consideration of the case:
 - (a) First, the member(s) of the Board who made an objection should present the reasons for the objection, making reference to the precise areas of concern within the draft and proposing an alternative;

- (b) Members and alternate members may seek clarifications regarding the presentation;
- (c) The secretariat may provide any clarifications of a factual nature;
- (d) Once members have received the necessary clarifications the Chair of the Board should invite its members and alternate members to express their opinion regarding the objection;
- (e) After this discussion, the Chair of the Board shall determine and propose to the Board whether the objection should be accounted for in the final revision;
- (f) If the objection is upheld by the Board, the Chair of the Board shall request the secretariat to revise the ruling for adoption at the same meeting of the Board.

Appendix 3. Baseline and monitoring methodologies indicating potential accrual of negative emission reductions

1. The baseline and monitoring methodologies that indicate potential accrual of negative emission reductions and are therefore subject to conditions in the submission of requests for issuance for PoAs as referred to in paragraph 194 of this procedure are the following:
 - (a) ACM0005 Increasing the blend in cement production;
 - (b) ACM0017 Production of biodiesel for use as fuel;
 - (c) ACM0006 Consolidated methodology for electricity and heat generation from biomass;
 - (d) ACM0018 Electricity generation from biomass residues in power-only plants;
 - (e) ACM0020 Co-firing of biomass residues for heat generation and/or electricity generation in grid connected power plants;
 - (f) AM0036 Fuel switch from fossil fuels to biomass residues in heat generation equipment;
 - (g) AM0061 Methodology for rehabilitation and/or energy efficiency improvement in existing power plants;
 - (h) AM0094 Distribution of biomass based stove and/or heater for household or institutional use;
 - (i) ACM0022 Alternative waste treatment processes;
 - (j) AM0057 Avoided emissions from biomass wastes through use as feed stock in pulp and paper, cardboard, fibreboard or bio-oil production;
 - (k) AM0108 Interconnection between electricity systems for energy exchange;
 - (l) Any other methodologies that include specific provisions under the section “project activity under a programme of activities”.

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
08.0	11 November 2014	<p>Published within annex 9 to the annotated agenda of EB 81.</p> <p>Revision includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification of information to be included in prior consideration of the CDM and removal of exemption of notification of prior consideration; • Elaboration of rules for cases where various changes have occurred after the publication of the PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation; • Introduction of opportunity for direct communication for rejected cases of requests for registration, issuance and renewal of crediting period; • Introduction of process allowing withdrawal of published monitoring report; • Streamlining of the process and requirements for withdrawal and resubmission of request for issuance; • Clarification of continuity of crediting periods and consequence where notification of intention to renew the crediting period is delayed; • Introduction of process allowing combining the submission of post-registration changes and request for renewal of crediting period; • Restructuring of section on renewal of crediting period; • Introduction of de-registration and re-registration process for project activities; • Elaboration of the process for handling requests for approval of the same DOE doing both validation and verification for the same project activity or PoA; • Change of the rule for determining effective registration date; • Improvement of global and local stakeholder consultation processes; • Allowing the delayed validation of monitoring plan; • Introduction of the process for voluntary exclusion and re-inclusion of CPAs; • Changes to the rules on PoAs (more flexible batched issuance requests, increased number of specific case CPAs that may be submitted at the time of request for registration or post-registration change).
07.0	1 June 2014	<p>EB 79, Annex 5</p> <p>The document title has changed from “<i>Clean development mechanism project cycle procedure</i>” to “<i>CDM project cycle procedure</i>”. Revision also includes provisions on standardized baselines and batched issuance requests for a PoA.</p>
06.0	11 April 2014	<p>Revision to incorporate the amendment to the requirements for carbon dioxide capture and storage in CDM-EB78-A05.</p>

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
05.0	4 October 2013	Revision to incorporate the amendment to the requirements for programme of activities in CDM-EB75-A06 which includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To enable two issuance requests for the same monitoring period; To eliminate the requirement of minimum 90 days period between two issuance requests.
04.0	29 July 2013	Revision to incorporate the amendment in CDM-EB74-A11 which includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integration of clarification CDM-EB72-A06-CLAR; Clarification on the eligible post registration changes in the context of PoAs and CPAs; Clarification on the fee schedule;
03.2	1 April 2013	Editorial revision to replace the expired procedures with <i>“Procedure: Development, revision and clarification of baseline and monitoring methodologies and methodological tools”</i> (CDM-EB70-A36-PROC) in paragraphs 18, 36, 37, 54, 55, 59, and 115.
03.1	3 December 2012	Editorial changes at paragraphs 12, 14(b) and 137.
03.0	23 November 2012	EB 70, Annex 4 Revision to reflect revised requirements for PoAs.
02.0	2 March 2012	EB 66, Annex 64 Revision to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add a clarification on the necessity of publishing a revised PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation if the project participants wish to change an approved baseline and monitoring methodology applied in the PDD or PoA-DD published already; Add a provision on the extension of the validity period of the methodology applied in a request for registration for the re-submission of a request for registration, based on the related provision in the “Guidelines on completeness check of requests for registration”, which has been withdrawn; Correct or modify the titles of referred documents.
01.0	25 November 2011	EB 65, Annex 32 Initial adoption. This document, along with the “Clean development mechanism project standard” and the “Clean development mechanism validation and verification standard”, supersedes and replaces the following documents on the date when these three document above enter into force: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clean development mechanism validation and verification manual (version 01.2); Procedures for requesting post-registration changes to the start date of the crediting period (version 02.0); Procedures for modalities of communication between project participants and the Executive Board (version 01.0);

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for registration of a programme of activities as a single CDM project activity and issuance of certified emission reductions for a programme of activities (version 04.1); • Procedures for processing and reporting on validation of CDM project activities (version 03.0); • Procedures for requests to the Executive Board for deviation from an approved methodology (version 01.0); • Procedures for approval of the application of multiple methodologies to a programme of activities (version 01.0); • Procedure for requests for registration of proposed CDM project activities (version 2.0); • Procedures for review of erroneous inclusion of a CPA (version 03.0); • Procedures for withdrawal of a request for registration (version 01.0); • Procedure for review of requests for registration (version 01.2); • Procedures for renewal of the crediting period of a registered CDM project activity (version 06.0); • Making the monitoring report available to the public in accordance with § 62 of the modalities and procedures for the CDM (version 01.0); • Procedure for requests for issuance of CERs (version 01.2); • Procedures for withdrawal of a request for issuance of certified emission reductions (version 01.0); • Procedure for review of requests for issuance of CERs (version 01.3); • Procedures for notifying and requesting approval of changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD (version 01.0); • Procedures for revising monitoring plans in accordance with paragraph 57 of the modalities and procedures for the CDM (version 02.0); • Procedures for requests for deviation prior to submitting request for issuance (version 01.0); • Guidelines on the demonstration and assessment of prior consideration of the CDM (version 04.0); • Guidelines on the registration fee schedule for proposed project activities under the clean development mechanism (02.0); • Guidelines for requesting a review and making decisions and objections regarding review assessments (version 02.0); • Clarification regarding the “Procedures for registration of a programme of activities as a single CDM project activity and issuance of certified emission reductions for a programme of activities (version 01.0); • Form to submit request for revision of monitoring plan (F-CDM-REVM) (version 01.0); • Form for submission of requests for deviation prior to submitting request for issuance (F-CDM-DEV-ISS)

CDM-EB81-AA-A09

Revision of CDM project standard, validation and verification standard, and project cycle procedure

Version 04.0

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
(version 01.0).		
Decision Class: Regulatory		
Document Type: Procedure		
Business Function: Issuance, Registration		
Keywords: carbon dioxide and capture storage, crediting period, programme of activities, project activities, standardized baselines, validating and registering, verifying and certifying		