	PERFORMING VALIDATION/ VERIFICATION FUNCTIONS	Document No.	CDM-P-01d
		Version	3.1
		Date of Issue	25-02-2025

1.0	**Purpose**
	To lay down procedure for performing validation and / or verification/certification functions in accordance with the requirements specified in CMP/ CMA decisions, Validation/Verification Standards, and other relevant decisions of the Executive Board/Supervisory Body.
2.0	**Scope**
	All validation, verification/certification functions under CDM/ A6.4
3.0	**Policy & Procedure**
3.1	**General**
	a) The team leader ensures that validation and verification/certification is conducted in accordance with the requirements in UNFCCC (CMP/ CMA decisions/ Supervisory Body decisions). b) The team leader prepares a validation or verification/certification plan in form **CDM-D-28** and defines the task allocation among validation or verification/certification team members. c) For the validation or verification/certification project site visit, the team leader ensures that the following personnel, at a minimum, participate in the visit: i. The team leader ii. The team member (s) qualified in the technical area (s) of the project activity or PoA/CPA/CP being validated or verified/certified. iii. Local expert Note: where team leader him/herself has expertise in technical areas and/or local expertise, they can conduct site visits themselves. The validation/verification onsite/remote includes 1. assigning roles and responsibilities of guides and observers 2. conducting the opening meeting 3. performing document review while conducting the audit 4. collecting and verifying information 5. communicating gaps during the audit process 6. generating audit findings 7. preparing audit conclusions 8. conducting the closing meeting
3.2	**Validation for registration of projects**

	In case of CDM, PP submits the PDD / POA DD to KBS for publishing on UNFCCC website for the global stakeholder consultation within one year of the publication of the prior consideration notification on the UNFCCC website. The duration of global stakeholders for PDD/POA DD is 30 days for non-AFOLU and small scale AFOLU, 45 days for large scale AFOLU, 14 days for MR. The submission of MR shall happen 21 days prior to the onsite visit. In case of A6.4, Activity Participant (AP) submit PDD/POA DD/MR to UNFCCC directly and UNFCCC publishes draft PDD for 28 days on its website for public comments. The project/activity participant provides in PDD a summary of comments received and describes how they were taken into account.
3.2.1	The team assess the information provided by the project/activity participants using the protocol **CDMD-29 series** which covers requirements based on activity standard and validation and verification standard, where appropriate, standard auditing techniques, including but not limited to: a) Document Review, involving i. A review of data and information, ii. Cross check between the information provided in the PDD and the information from sources other than those used to determine whether the information in the PDD is reliable, using team's sectoral and 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, such as personnel with knowledge of 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) References to available information relating to projects or technologies similar to the proposed CDM/ A6.4 projects under validation. d) Review, based on the selected methodologies, the selected standardized baselines and other applied methodological regulatory documents, of the appropriateness of formulae and accuracy of the calculations. e) Sampling approach in accordance with the standard for sampling and surveys for CDM/ A6.4 mechanism as applicable, f) Will determine whether the site visit is required and if it is to be done onsite or remote. g) Site visit is mandatory to conduct an on-site inspection at validation for the proposed A6.4 project if: i. Its estimated annual average of GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals is more than 100,000 t CO2 eq or ii. There is pre-project information that is relevant to the requirements for registration of the project and may not be traceable after the implementation of the project The project is deemed to have high risk of uncertainty in terms of the achievement of GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals as estimated in the PDD, to be determined in accordance with the relevant guidance to be provided by the Supervisory Body. For other cases, it is optional to conduct an on-site inspection at validation. If the team does not conduct an on-site inspection as a means of validation, it describes the alternative means

	used and justifies that they are sufficient for the purpose of validation. If the team conducts a remote inspection (fully / partially) as an alternative means to an on-site inspection, the team will carry out the analysis in **CDM-F-30** and **CDM-F-31**. Manager V&V notifies the secretariate through the dedicated interface on the UNFCCC website of the timing of the site inspection of the proposed A6.4 project, which is to be conducted in accordance with the validation and verification standard, **no later than four weeks prior to inspection.** The inputs from the external experts in the technical area(s), local legislation, financial/ legal are received through email/ form in **CDM-D-41.**
3.2.2	**Corrective Action requests, clarification requests and forward action requests** a) If during the validation of a project activity, the team identifies issues that require further elaboration, research or expansion in order to determine whether the proposed project meets the relevant CDM/ A6.4 mechanism rules and requirements, these issues are accurately identified, formulated, discussed and concluded in the validation report by the team. These issues/ findings are issued in the Finding Form **(CDM-D-40)** as applicable. b) The team raises a corrective action request (CAR) if one of the following situations occurs: i. Mistakes have been made by the activity participants that influence the ability of the proposed project to achieve real, measurable, verifiable and additional GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals; ii. The applicable A6.4/ CDM rules and requirements have not been met; iii. There is a risk that GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals cannot be monitored or calculated. c) The team raise a clarification request (CL) if the information provided by the activity participants is insufficient or not clear to determine whether the applicable A6.4/ CDM rules and requirements have been met. d) The team raises a forward action request (FAR) if issues related to project implementation that require review during the first verification after the validation of the proposed project are identified. The team do not issue a FAR that relates to the A6.4/ CDM rules and requirements for registration of the project. e) The team resolves or "closes out" CARs and CLs only if the project/ activity participants rectify the project design and/ or the PDD or provide additional explanations or evidence that satisfies the concerns. If this is not done, the team does not submit a request for registration of the project to UNFCCC. f) The team report on all CARs, CLs and FARs in its validation report explaining the issues raised, the responses provided by the project/ activity participants, the means of validation of such responses and references to any resulting changes in the PDD or supporting documents. g) If it is found that the applied methodology is not complying with the project activity, validation team seek guidance from the A6.4/CDM Board on the acceptability of a deviation prior to the submission of a request for registration or publication of the PDD / PoA-DD in case of CDM/A6.4 project activity in accordance with guidelines. h) The team reports the results of its assessment in a draft final validation report using the latest UNFCCC templates. The validation report includes a positive validation opinion

only if the proposed project activity complies with the applicable CDM/ A6.4 rules and requirements.

i) The team submits draft final validation report, along with the supporting documents, to the Technical Review team (TR) for an independent review **CDM - D-35** formats respectively along with clint's comments if any. The technical review is undertaken as per procedure CDM-P-01e

j) Upon TR closure, the project team leader will prepare the Final Validation Report package (prepared using latest (VAL-FORM) along with other supporting documents.

k) Team Leader sends these final TR approved package documents to client for their comments and for to check if there is any commercially sensitive information. Approval on the submission package is obtained by the client.

l) Team Leader sends the final pack with TR approval email and client approval email to Manager (T&C) for final completeness check. who conducts final completeness review using respective protocol checklists **(CDMD-50)** and once complete, takes approval by Director

m) Once the director approves the final validation package, the Request for Registration is submitted to UNFCCC website by Manager (T&C).

n) In case of negative opinion, the report is submitted to activity/ project participants including the documented reasons for not complying with the relevant requirements for registration.

3.3	**Verification of implementation and monitoring**
3.3.1	a) The team assesses and determines whether the implementation and operation of the project activity, and the steps taken to report emission reductions comply with the A6.4/CDM/GHG criteria and relevant guidance. The team conducts a thorough, independent assessment of the registered project i. to determine whether the registered project has been implemented and is operation in accordance with the registered PDD. ii. Determine whether GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals have been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan. b) The team assesses both quantitative and qualitative information on GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals provided in the monitoring report. c) The team assesses whether the data collection system meets the requirements of the registered monitoring plan as per the applied methodologies including applicable tool(s) and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline. In addition to the monitoring documentation the team reviews: i. The registered PDD and the registered monitoring plan and/or changes from the registered PDD, and the corresponding validation opinion. ii. The validation report. iii. Previous verification reports, if any. iv. The applied methodologies, the applied standardized baselines and other applied methodological regulatory documents. v. The monitoring results of environmental impacts, social impacts and sustainable development co-benefits of the registered project. vi. Any other information and references relevant to the GHG emission or net GHG removals by the registered CDM/A6.4 project (e.g. IPCC reports, data on electricity generation in the national grid or laboratory analysis and national regulations). vii. In addition to reviewing the monitoring documentation, the team determines whether the project participants have addressed the FARs identified during validation or previous verification(s). d) In assessing the information, the team applies means of verification as per the protocol **CDM-D-30 series** based on validation and verification standard and using standard auditing techniques as applicable. 1. Document Review, involving: i. A review of data and information ii. A Review of registered monitoring plan, the applied methodologies, the applied standardized baselines and the other applied methodological regulatory documents, paying particular attention to the frequency of measurements, the quality of metering equipment including calibration requirements, and the quality assurance and quality control procedures; 2. Follow up actions (e.g. on-site inspection and telephone or email interviews) including: i. An assessment of the implementation and operation of the registered project as per the registered PDD or latest approved revised PDD; ii. A review of information flow 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; iv. Crosschecks between the information provided in the monitoring report and data from other sources, such as want to logbooks, inventories, purchase records or similar data sources to determine whether the information in the monitoring report is reliable; v. A check of the monitoring equipment, including calibration, performance, and observation of monitoring practices against the requirements of the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodology, the applied standard baseline, and the other applied methodological regulatory documents; vi. A review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and GHG emission reduction or net GHG removals; 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 3. Sampling approach in accordance with the standard for sampling and service for CDM/ article 6.4 activities: i. Random sampling for cases where the activity participants did not apply a sampling approach for monitoring; ii. An acceptance sampling or another sampling approach for cases where the activity participants applied a sampling approach for monitoring. e) It is mandatory to conduct an on-site inspection at verification for the registered CDM/ A6.4 project if: I. It is the first verification for the KBS with regard to this project. II. More than three years have elapsed since the last on-site inspection conducted for verification for the project; or III. The project has achieved more than 300,000 t CO2 eq of GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals since the last verification when an on-site inspection was conducted. IV. Before the site visit, the auditor plans the feasibility of the visit, checks if the audit is on a single site or multiple site or sample of sites. Audit team plans the choice of stakeholder interview based on the information to be gathered regarding baseline, social and environmental impacts, SDG goals etc. V. For other cases, it is optional to conduct an on-site inspection at verification. If team does not conduct an on-site inspection as a means of verification, it describes the alternative means used and justifies that they are sufficient for the purpose of verification. If the team conducts a remote inspection (fully / partially) as an alternative means to an on-site inspection, the team carry out the analysis in **CDM-F-30** and **CDM-F-31**. Manager V&V notifies the secretariate through the dedicated interface on the UNFCCC website of the timing of the site inspection of the proposed A6.4 project, which is to be conducted in accordance with the validation and verification standard, **no later than four weeks prior to inspection.** Manager V&V ensures that verification activities are undertaken after the publication of the monitoring report on the UNFCCC website and are used as a basis to conclude verification and submit a draft final request for issuance of ER's for independent review of TR. The inputs from the external experts in the technical area(s), local legislation, financial/ legal are received through email/ form in **CDM-D-41.**

3.3.2	**Corrective Action requests, clarification requests and forward action requests** a) If during the verification of a project activity, the team identifies issues that require further elaboration, research or expansion in order to determine whether the implementation or the operation of the registered project or the monitoring of GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals meets the relevant CDM/ A6.4 mechanism rules and requirements, these issues are accurately identified, formulated, discussed and concluded in the verification and certification report by the team. These issues/ findings are issued in the Finding Form **(CDM-D-40)** as applicable. b) The team raises a corrective action request (CAR) if one of the following situations occurs: i. Non-Compliance with the registered monitoring plan, the applied methodologies, the applied standardized baselines or the other applied methodological regulatory documents is found in monitoring and reporting, and has not been sufficiently documented by the activity participants, or if the evidence provided to prove conformity is insufficient; ii. Modifications to the implementation or operation of the registered project, or the monitoring or GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals, has not been sufficiently documented by the activity participants. iii. Mistakes have been made by the activity participants in applying assumptions, data or calculations of GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals that will impact the quantity of emission reductions or removals; iv. Issues identified in a FAR during validation or the previous verification(s) have not been resolved by the activity participants. c) The team raise a clarification request (CL) if the information provided by the activity participants is insufficient or not clear to determine whether the applicable A6.4/ CDM rules and requirements have been met. d) The team raises a forward action request (FAR) if issues related to monitoring and reporting that require attention and/ or adjustment at the next verification are identified. e) The team resolves or "closes out" CARs and CLs only if the project/ activity participants rectify the monitoring report or provide additional explanations or evidence that satisfies the concerns. If this is not done, the team does not submit a request for issuance of the project to UNFCCC. f) The team report on all CARs, CLs and FARs in its verification and certification report explaining the issues raised, the responses provided by the project/ activity participants, the means of verification of of such responses and references to any resulting changes in the monitoring report or supporting documents. g) The team reports the results of its assessment in a draft final verification report using the latest UNFCCC templates. h) The team submits draft final verification report, along with the supporting documents, to the Technical Review team (TR) for an independent review **(CDM-D-35** formats respectively and the technical review is undertaken as per procedure CDM-P-01e. i) Team Leader sends these final TR approved package to client for their comments and for to check if there is any commercially sensitive information. Approval on the submission package is obtained by the client. j) Team Leader sends the final pack with TR approval email and client approval email to Manager (T&C) for final completeness check. who conducts final completeness review using respective GHG protocol checklists **(CDM-D-50)** and once complete, takes approval by Director k) Once the Director approves the Final verification package, the request for issuance is submitted to UNFCCC secretariate by Manager (T&C).

	l) In case the opinion is negative, the activity participants are informed including the reasons for the monitoring results, as documented having been determined as not complying with the relevant requirements for issuance.
3.4	**Validation of Post Registration Changes**
3.4.1	Manager Validation & Verification ensures that to validate the post-registration changes KBS is accredited to the validation function for the specific CDM/A6.4 sectoral scope.
3.4.2	The team determines whether the changes do not require prior approval by the Board in accordance with appendix 1 of the Project standard / GHG scheme guidelines
3.4.3	Where the changes are identified by or submitted to KBS to conduct the verification, the team determines whether the changes are solely of a type(s) listed in the Activity cycle procedure. a) In such cases, the team submits the changes as part of the request for issuance in accordance with the Activity cycle procedure. b) In all other cases, the team submits the changes via the request for approval of post registration changes process of the Activity cycle procedure.
3.4.4	Where the changes are submitted to KBS prior to the commencement of verification, the team submits the changes via the request for approval of post registration changes process of the Activity cycle procedure. Team uses post registration change validation protocol **CDM-D-29** , to assess the Post registration changes in line with latest Activity standard The final opinion on the post registration changes is provided in latest CDM-PRCV-FORM available on UNFCCC website.
4.0	**RECORDS**
	KBS/CDM/R-07 Client Validation Records KBS/CDM/R-08 Client Verification Records

Revision History

Version	Reason of Change	Prepared by QM (Date)	Approved by MD (Date)
02.0	Fresh issue to align the procedure with AS Version 6.0	04-12-2014	04-12-2014
02.1	Removed obsolete documents and refined the validation/verification process in line with AS Version 7.0.	19-08-2022	19-08-2022
02.2	Update on VCS checklist information	20-02-2023	20-02-2023
02.3	Other GHG general scheme synchronized	20-03-2023	20-03-2023
02.4	Included AFLOU, group projects and detailed validation / verification opinion requirements	21-03-2023	21-03-2023
02.5	Correction in the VCS format numbers and inclusion in the procedure	31-03-2024	31-03-2024
03.0	Revision based on Article 6.4 Accreditation Standard Version 01.0.	10-09-2024	28-09-2024
3.1	Corrections to A6.4 highlighting formats	08-01-2025	25-02-2025