



**Verification and certification report form for
CDM project activities
(Version 03.0)**

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

BASIC INFORMATION

Title and UNFCCC reference number of the project activity	Accion Fraterna Biogas CDM project for rural communities in Anantapur, Andhra Pradesh. UNFCCCC Ref # 3779
Scale of the project activity	☐ Large-scale ☒ Small-scale
Version number of the verification and certification report	02
Completion date of the verification and certification report	31/03/2020
Monitoring period number and duration of this monitoring period	02 and 01/04/2017 to 31/07/2019
Version number of the monitoring report to which this report applies	03
Crediting period of the project activity corresponding to this monitoring period	31/05/2014 to 30/05/2021 (Renewable)
Project participants	ACCION FRATERNA ECOLOGY CENTRE
Host Party	India
Applied methodologies and standardized baselines	Energy Industries (renewable / non-renewable sources) AMS.I.E – “Switch from Non-Renewable Biomass for Thermal Applicable by the User” ver.4
Mandatory sectoral scopes	Sectoral Scope 1: Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources)
Conditional sectoral scopes, if applicable	Sectoral scope 13: Waste handling and disposal
Estimated amount of GHG emission reductions or GHG removals for this monitoring duration in the registered PDD	132,156 tCO ₂
Certified amount of GHG emission reductions or GHG removals for this monitoring period	18,925 tCO ₂
Name and UNFCCC reference number of the DOE	4K Earth Science Priavte. Limited. UNFCCC Ref # CDM-E-0069
Name, position and signature of the approver of the verification and certification report	S. Jagajothi Director 4K Earth Science Private Limited

SECTION A. Executive summary

4KES has been commissioned by “ACCION FRATERNA ECOLOGY CENTRE” to perform an independent verification of its registered CDM project “Accion Fraterna Biogas CDM project for rural communities in Anantapur, Andhra Pradesh”, UNFCCC Ref#3779 for the reported GHG emission reductions for the given monitoring period 01/04/2017 to 31/07/2019 (both dates included). The CDM projects must undergo independent third party verification and certification of emission reductions as the basis for issuance of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs)

The objectives of this verification exercise are, by review of objective evidence, to establish that:

- The project activity has been implemented and operated as per the registered PDD and that all physical features (technology, project equipment, and monitoring and metering equipment) of the project are in place;
- Monitoring report and other supporting documents are complete;
- The actual monitoring systems & procedures and monitoring report conforms with the requirements of the approved monitoring plan and the approved monitoring methodology;
- The data is recorded and stored as per the monitoring methodology and approved monitoring plan.

Scope:

The scope of the verification is the independent and objective review and ex post determination of the monitored reductions in GHG emission by the project activity. The verification is based on review of monitoring report, supporting information and

- (a) The registered PDD, including the monitoring plan and the corresponding validation opinion(s);
- (b) Previous verification reports, deviation requests, requests for revision of monitoring plan;
- (c) Monitoring report for the monitoring period under verification including CER calculations sheets and all supporting documents;
- (d) The applied monitoring methodology;
- (e) The applied standardized baseline (if applicable);
- (f) Relevant decisions, clarifications and guidance from the CMP and the CDM Executive Board;
- (g) All information and references relevant to the project activity's resulting in emission reductions

The project is assessed against the requirements of the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM Modalities and Procedures and related rules and guidance.

4KES has, based on the recommendations in the latest version of CDM Validation and Verification Standard, employed a rule-based approach in the verification, focusing on the identification of significant reporting risks and the reliability of project monitoring.

Description of project:

The project activity is the installation of biogas plants (digesters) of 2 m³ capacity each for single households in all Mandals¹ of Anantapur District., Andhra Pradesh, India. The biogas units is fed by cattle dung generated from the households. The biogas stoves replaces the traditional fire wood stoves used for cooking and heating purposes.

In baseline situation, households uses traditional fire wood stove which is inefficient. In the project situation the biogas stoves are used for cooking and hence completely avoiding the usage of traditional stoves which results in savings in non-renewable biomass. Thereby, it avoids the related CO₂ emission from the avoidance of non-renewable biomass in cooking. The PP planned to install 15,000 biogas units of 2 m³ capacity each for single households out of which 2991 units were commissioned.

Methodology:

4KES follows a rule based verification approach, wherein, as a first step, the contract review is undertaken as per latest version of CDM Accreditation Standard. Subsequently, after the contract is signed, the monitoring report of the project activity is made publicly available at UNFCCC website as per CDM procedures. A desk review of the project documentation is undertaken, which is followed by an onsite visit by the members of verification team in accordance with the latest version of CDM AS. The verification protocol

¹ Mandal is an administrative unit below the district consisting of a group of villages with administrative and local government functions.

CDM-VCR-FORM

is filled by the verification team that is based on standard auditing practices and version 02 of CDM VVS for Project Activity, to capture the assessment of applicable CDM requirements as per the, version 2 of CDM Project Standard for Project Activity, registered PDD, applied methodology/ies, applied standardized baseline and/or tools and recent decisions. The CDM verification protocol provides transparent means to record the observations and compliances by the verification team members and the nonconformities, if any. The CDM verification protocol is the document used by the auditors to check on the requirements as per the latest procedures made available. Following are the time line for the CDM verification under consideration..

Verification contract	04/09/2019
Publication of MR	16/09/2019
On site verification	30/10/2019 and 31/10/2019
Draft Verification Report	02/11/2019
Final Verification Report	23/03/2020

SECTION B. Verification team, technical reviewer and approver**B.1. Verification team member**

No.	Role	Type of resource	Last name	First name	Affiliation (e.g. name of central or other office of DOE or outsourced entity)	Involvement in			
						Desk/document review	On-site inspection	Interviews	Verification findings
1.	Team Leader/ Verifier/ Technical Expert	IR	Puratchikkana I	Ma Paa	Central Office	X	X	X	X

B.2. Technical reviewer and approver of the verification and certification report

No.	Role	Type of resource	Last name	First name	Affiliation (e.g. name of central or other office of DOE or outsourced entity)
1.	Technical reviewer	IR	Narendra Kumar	R	Central Office
2.	Approver	IR	S	Jagajothi	Central Office

SECTION C. Application of materiality**C.1. Consideration of materiality in planning the verification**

No.	Risk that could lead to material errors, omissions or misstatements	Assessment of the risk		Response to the risk in the verification plan and/or sampling plan
		Risk level	Justification	
1.	Transfer of data from sampling survey sheet to excel ER spreadsheet	Low	Possible human error during transfer of data to ER spreadsheets and MR	Thorough cross-check required on the transfer of data to the ER spreadsheet and MR.
2.	Wrong data	Low	It's not complicated monitoring process. Appropriate trainings are conducted for the monitoring personnel.	By means of site visit check of actual situation to sample number of households.

C.2. Consideration of materiality in conducting the verification

The prescribed thresholds for materiality, as per as per §326 of VVS for PA, version 02/12/.

Prescribed range of ERs/annum	500,000+	300,000+ to 500,000	300,000	SSC PAs	MSC PAs
Prescribed Threshold	0.5%	1.0%	2.0%	5.0%	10.0%

The identified/selected materiality threshold for the project activity under current monitoring period is 5% as project activity is small scale project activity.

	MR Version (Draft)	MR Version (Final)
Emission reductions/annum	18,925 tCO ₂ e	18,925 tCO ₂ e
Identified Threshold	5.0%	5.0%

The impact of errors observed during verification for each monitoring parameter on the emission reduction calculation is provided below:

Parameter	Verification approach	Error identified	Corrected	Within Threshold
Biogas Units Constructed	Complete data check	No error identified	NA	Yes
Number of biogas plants operating	Complete data check	No error identified	NA	Yes
Confirmation that non-renewable biomass has been substituted	Acceptance sampling	No error identified	NA	Yes
Non-usage of biogas plants	Complete data check	No error identified	NA	Yes

SECTION D. Means of verification

D.1. Desk/document review

A desk review is undertaken, involving but not limited to,

- A review of the data and information presented to verify their completeness;
- A review of the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology, paying particular attention to the frequency of measurements, the quality of metering equipment including calibration requirements, and the quality assurance and quality control procedures;
- 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.

The list of documents reviewed is included in the section 'Appendix 3' of this report.

D.2. On-site inspection

Duration of on-site inspection: 30/10/2019 to 31/10/2019				
No.	Activity performed on-site	Site location	Date	Team member
1.	Opening Meeting, Office Inspection, Verification of monitoring records, interviews and database inspection	AF Ecology Centre	30/10/2019 & 31/10/2019	Ma Paa Puratchikkana
2.	Visit to sampled of households	Beneficiary households	30/10/2019 & 31/10/2019	Ma Paa Puratchikkana

D.3. Interviews

No.	Interviewee			Date	Subject	Team member
	Last name	First name	Affiliation			
1.	Reddy	Malla	Director, AF Ecology Centre	30/10/2019	- General aspects of the project - Changes since validation / previous verification - Remaining issues from validation/ previous verification - Quality management system - Involved personnel and responsibilities - Training and practice of the operational personnel - Implementation of the monitoring plan - Monitoring data management - Involved personnel and responsibilities - Training and practice of the operational personnel - Implementation of the monitoring plan - Monitoring data management - Data uncertainty and residual risks - Procedural aspects of the Monitoring - Maintenance	Ma Paa Puratchikkana I
2.	Padmanabha	Sudha	CDM Facilitator, FCN			
	Beneficiary Name					
No	Last Name	First Name	Unit No.	Date	Subject	Team Member
1	C	Varalakshmi	23	30/10/2019	- Awareness about ownership of CERs - Working condition of bio-digester unit - SD parameters verification	Ma Paa Puratchikkana I
2	T	Rajamma	3140	30/10/2019		
3	M	Naraganamma	3142	30/10/2019		
4	S	Nandini	907	30/10/2019		
5	P	Eswaramma	3144	30/10/2019		
6	P	Yalamma	2340	30/10/2019		
7		Jampula Tulasamma	2324	30/10/2019		

8		Jampula Pullamma	2325	30/10/2019		
9	K	Ramadevi	1593	30/10/2019		
10	C	Pushpavathi	1572	30/10/2019		
11	K	Sarojamma	1594	30/10/2019		
12	A	Jayamma	1591	30/10/2019		
13	D	Chenamma	109	30/10/2019		
14		Lakshmidevi	108	30/10/2019		
15	L	Vanja	481	31/10/2019		
16	G	Chithambrma	479	31/10/2019		
17	M	Thimmakka	477	31/10/2019		
18		Santhamma	1158	31/10/2019		
19	S	Nirmala	1116	31/10/2019		
20	P	Nagalakshmi	1371	31/10/2019		
21		Ramanarayamma	3233	31/10/2019		
22		Sivamma	2851	31/10/2019		
23	P	Anasuyamma	2854	31/10/2019		
24		Varalakshmi	2855	31/10/2019		
25	L	Polamma	147	31/10/2019		

D.4. Sampling approach

During the on-site verification a sampling approach has been used by the verification team to verify the reported values for the monitored parameters as listed in section D.3 of the MR which are determined through sample survey by PP.

For the determination of DOE's acceptance sample size, verification team assumed the following factors:

1. Producer risk -5% (ie, There is 5% chance that the DOE will wrongly reject the project participants' records of acceptable quality)
2. Consumer risk -10% (ie, There is 10% chance that the DOE will wrongly accept the project participants' records of records of unacceptable quality)
3. Acceptable quality level (AQL) or the Level of Assurance- 1% (i.e. the proportion of discrepancies between the project participants' sample records and the DOE sample that are acceptable up to 1% limit)
4. Unacceptable Quality Level (UQL) – 15% (ie, the proportion of discrepancies between the project participants' sample records and DOE sample records that are unacceptable above 20% limit)

Verification team has determined acceptance sample size for all the sample survey parameters based on the standard "Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities" version 8. From the above assumed factors, the verification team determined the minimum sample size (n) as 25 and acceptance number (c) as 1. The same is intimated to PP prior to the site visit. The actual number of sample size where the acceptance survey was done given below:

Parameters	Total Population	PP's sample size	Acceptance sample size	Acceptance Number
Confirmation that non-renewable biomass of has been substituted	2991	2017-18 - 33 2018-19 - 35 2019 (April to July 2019) – 35	25	1

During site visit, verification team visited the selected sample households and interviewed the biogas plant user to check the data reported by PP. The result of the survey is given below:

Parameters	DOE Sample size	No of CME's record beyond unacceptable level	Accepted/ Rejected

Confirmation that non-renewable biomass of has been substituted	25	0	Accepted
---	----	---	----------

Verification team finds no error in the PP's survey records. Hence verification team accepts all the data determined through sample survey by PP.

D.5. Clarification requests (CLs), corrective action requests (CARs) and forward action requests (FARs) raised

Areas of verification findings	No. of CL	No. of CAR	No. of FAR
Compliance of the monitoring report with the monitoring report form	-	-	-
Compliance of the project implementation and operation with the registered PDD	1	2	-
Post-registration changes	-	-	-
Compliance of the registered monitoring plan with the methodologies including applicable tools and standardized baselines	-	-	-
Compliance of monitoring activities with the registered monitoring plan	1	1	-
Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments	-	-	-
Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions or net removals	-	-	-
Assessment of reported sustainable development co-benefits	-	-	-
Global stakeholder consultation	-	-	-
Others (please specify)	-	-	-
Total	2	3	-

SECTION E. Verification findings

E.1. Compliance of the monitoring report with the monitoring report form

Means of verification	Verification team checked the monitoring report with latest version of MR available in the UNFCCC website (ie, version 7.0) and "Instructions for filling out the monitoring report form" mentioned as attachment to Monitoring report form (version 7.0).
Findings	No CAR/CL is raised.
Conclusion	Verification team confirms that final monitoring report is completed using the latest valid version of the applicable monitoring report form/9/.

E.2. Remaining forward action requests from validation and/or previous verifications

Means of verification	The validation opinion report/4/ has posted one FAR with regards to the biogas leakage.
Findings	FAR01 raised during the validation is closed.
Conclusion	The verification team accepts the clarification provided by the PP, that the estimation of biogas leakage is not required as per methodology and registered PDD. The finding for this verification is closed.

E.3. Compliance of the project implementation and operation with the registered project design document

Means of verification	The verification team determined the conformity of the actual project activity and its operation with the validated project design document. Verification team has, by means of a desk review and an on-site visit, assessed that all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the validated PDD/3/ are in place,
------------------------------	---

	and that the project participants have operated the CDM project activity as per the validated PDD/3/ . The verification team has checked the information in the monitoring report and compared against the registered / revised PDDs. During the onsite inspection, the verification team has checked the project locations, implementation, technology applied, project equipment, and monitoring system against the information in the approved PDD. Interviews with operational personnel and households and random samplings have been carried out.
Findings	CL-01, CAR-01 & CAR-03 were raised and closed successfully
Conclusion	The verification team has reviewed the biogas units commissioning records, application forms, end user agreements/14/ and non-working & repair log records/18/. The verification team has observed at the site that all physical locations of the biogas units and found that the details are correctly matching with the monitoring report and monitoring records maintained by PP. Thus the verification team concludes that the project activity was implemented and operated as per validated PDD. The verification team, based on the site visit and document review, was able to conclude that the project activity has been commissioned and implemented as per the validated PDD/3/ and that all physical features of the project are in place. CL-01, CAR-01 & CAR-03 were closed.

E.4. Post-registration changes

E.4.1. Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents²

No temporary deviation from registered monitoring plan or monitoring methodology is sought.

E.4.2. Corrections

No corrections to project information or parameters fixed at validation

E.4.3. Changes to the start date of the crediting period

Not applicable for the 2nd monitoring period.

Earlier, the start date of the crediting period was changed from 01 Jun 2012 - 31 May 2019 to 31 May 2014 - 30 May 2021. This is due to the fact that there was a delay in the start of the project activity. The UNFCCC website was checked and confirmed that the change has been notified.

E.4.4. Inclusion of a monitoring plan

Not applicable as the PP provided the monitoring plan in registered PDD itself.

E.4.5. Permanent changes from registered monitoring plan, or permanent deviation of monitoring from the applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents

No permanent change from registered monitoring plan or monitoring methodology is sought.

E.4.6. Changes to the project design

No change in project design is sought during this verification.

² Other standards, methodologies, methodological tools and guidelines (to be) applied in accordance with the applied(selected) methodologies are collectively referred to as the other (applied) methodological regulatory documents).

E.4.7. Changes specific to afforestation and reforestation project activities

Not applicable

E.5. Compliance of the registered monitoring plan with applied methodologies, applied standardized baselines, and other applied methodological regulatory documents

Means of verification	The verification team checked compliance of project monitoring plan with the applied methodology (AMS I.E, version 04) and including applicable tools.
Findings	No CAR/CL is raised.
Conclusion	All parameters stated in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology has been fulfilled in the current monitoring report. All baseline emission parameters have been verified and found satisfactory. The discussion regarding each parameter has been elaborated in the further sections of this report. The monitoring plan as mentioned in the registered PDD is in accordance with the applied methodology. In the opinion of the verification team the monitoring report complies with the requirement of the registered PDD/3/ and applied methodologies (AMS I.E)/7/ in the context of the project activity. Thus, it conforms to the requirement VVS for PA version 2 /13/.

E.6. Compliance of monitoring activities with the registered monitoring plan**E.6.1. Data and parameters fixed ex ante or at renewal of crediting period**

Means of verification	The verification team has checked the ex-ante parameters and data stated in Section D.1 of MR and compared with section B.6.2 of the registered PDD whether all parameters fixed ex-ante for the crediting period have been applied correctly.		
	Ex-ante Parameter	Value	Consistent with the PDD/3/ & the source mentioned in it
	Rating Biogas	1.78	Yes
	B_v	3.57 tonnes/year/family	Yes
	f_{NRB, v}	91%	Yes
	NCV_{biomass}	0.015 TJ/tonne	Yes
	EF_{projected fossilfuel}	81.6 tCO ₂ /TJ	Yes
	Diversion of non-renewable biomass saved under the project activity by non-project households	0.95* B _y	Yes
Findings	No CAR/CL is raised		
Conclusion	The values of ex ante fixed parameters have been verified from the registered PDD/3/. Same has been crosschecked with the source mentioned in the PDD and found to be consistent. The verification team confirms that the values used/applied are correct and justified. Also, the ex-ante values have been correctly applied in the calculation of emission reductions.		

E.6.2. Data and parameters monitored

Means of verification	The verification team has determined whether the registered monitoring plan has been properly implemented and followed by the PP that the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the registered monitoring plan; and determined whether all parameters including project emission parameters, baseline emission parameters and leakage parameters used for emission reduction calculation stated in the registered monitoring plan are monitored or used appropriately as per the registered PDD. During the verification all monitoring parameters listed in Section D.2 of MR were compared with section B.7.1 of the registered PDD have been verified with regard to the: (i) appropriateness of the applied measurement / determination method, (ii) the correctness of the values applied for ER calculation,
------------------------------	--

	(iii) the accuracy, and applied QA/QC measures. The monitored values are assessed as follows: Biogas Units Constructed (Number of biogas units constructed): This parameter is monitored as and when a digester is commissioned/started producing gas and the same is entered into the monitoring database. The reported data is cross checked with the online monitoring solution/15/ maintained in AF Ecology Centre' office during site visit. The value reported in the monitoring report (ie, 2991) is found to be correct. Number of biogas plants operating (Number of plants operating in year (t)): PP will repair the plants as and when an issue is found by staff or reported by end user. So, PP continuously monitors the non-working days when the unit is not operational. The emission reduction will be adjusted based on the non-operational days. Hence, the number of biogas plants operating is monitored as 94.05% of 2991 units. The values were cross verified with Log book records/19/, digitized monitoring database/15/ during site visit by the verification team. Hence, the value reported for this parameter is correct. Confirmation that non-renewable biomass of B_y has been substituted (<i>Confirmation that non-renewable biomass has been substituted</i>): This parameter was monitored through stratified random sample survey. PP has conducted survey during the year 2017-18, 2018-19 & 2019 (April 2019 to July 2019) in 33, 35 and 35 households selected randomly in each year/16/. As verified from the survey result/16/, all the sample households confirm that the bio digester usage substitute non-renewable biomass used in the baseline situation. All the survey sheets/16/ are verified and found that the data mentioned in the excel sheet is correct. During the site visit verification team has done acceptance sampling survey where verification team conducted survey in 25 households (randomly selected from PP's sample population). All the data collected are consistent with PP's record/16/. No error found. Hence, the verification team confirms that the non-renewable biomass of B_y has been substituted by the project activity. Non-usage days of biogas plants (<i>Usage of non-renewable biomass in case of non-performance of biogas units</i>): Non-usage days of biogas plants are monitored daily. When the biogas unit is not working, the beneficiaries report to the village level volunteer, who in turn reports to the biogas field of the project for the repair of the unit. The date when the plant stopped working and the date when the issue is fixed are noted down in the village level breakdown log book/19/ by the staffs/volunteers and the same will be entered into monitoring solutions/15/. Verification team checked all the breakdown log records/19/ and data in the monitoring solution/15/. The entire breakdown data reported in the ER sheet/2/ was checked and found to be ok. Verification team confirms the data reported in the MR (ie, 367,401 biogas days) non-usage days is found to be correct.
Findings	CAR-02 is raised and closed successfully
Conclusion	Corresponding to the VVS V02/12/, the team confirm that the monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the registered PDD/3/. The monitoring system is in compliance with the information flow for the parameters as mentioned in monitoring plan in registered PDD/3/. All the parameters are monitored as per the frequency mentioned in the registered PDD. The monitored data for the parameters has been verified by checking the procedure for information flow and found to be complete and consistent. CAR-02 is closed.

E.6.3. Implementation of sampling plan

Means of verification	The verification team checked whether the PP has applied a sampling approach to determine the monitored values. The only parameter that is determined through sampling is '<u>Confirmation that non-renewable biomass has been substituted</u>'. It is observed that this <u>parameter is not used for emission reduction calculation</u> and just <u>used for qualitative purposes</u>.
------------------------------	---

Verification team checked the sampling approach followed for each monitoring parameters to confirm the sampling plan mentioned in the registered PDD.

PP has selected stratified sampling approach and considered each mandals as one stratum. Since the project is installed only in rural households there is no considerable difference in the economic status and cooking habits of households is expected. However, for better representation of the Mandals, PP has considered each mandals as stratum and conducted survey. This is found to be appropriate. The parameter has no bearing on emission reduction calculations.

Since the parameter of interest is the proportion parameter PP has estimated the sample size based on 90/10 confidence / precision level is calculated as per the below formula:

$$n = \frac{1.645^2 NV}{(N-1) \times 0.1^2 + 1.645^2 V}$$

Where,

$$V = \frac{SD^2}{\bar{p}^2} = \frac{\text{overall variance}}{\bar{p}^2} \text{ and } \bar{p} \text{ is the overall proportion}$$

n = sample size

N = Total number of households (At the time of survey)

Mean = Expected mean

SD = Expected standard deviation

1.645 = Represents 90% confidence required

0.1 = Represents the 10% relative precision

$$SD^2 = \frac{(g_a \times p_a(1-p_a) + (g_b \times p_b(1-p_b) + \dots + (g_k \times p_k(1-p_k))}{N}$$

$$\bar{p} = \frac{(g_a \times P_a) + (g_b \times P_b) + \dots + (g_k \times P_k)}{N}$$

Where g_i and N are as stated above and p_i is the proportion for the i^{th} group (Mandal), $i=1\dots k$.

Since the survey is conducted in the households where biogas units are in operational, the expected proportion of the parameter for "Confirmation that non-renewable biomass has been substituted" for each the stratum is 1. Hence, the sample size required is estimated to be 0.

Hence, PP has calculated the sample size based on the proportion of bio digesters in operation from stratum.

Parameter	Sample size (based on expected proportion of HH NRB substituted)	Sample size (based on proportion of digesters in operation)	Actual sample size considered for survey/1/	Is sample size adequate?
Confirmation that non-renewable biomass has been substituted	2017-18: 0	2017-18: 11	2017-18: 33	Yes
	2018-19: 0	2018-19: 13	2018-19: 35	Yes
	2019 Apr-Jul 2019) : 0	2019 Apr-Jul 2019) : 19	2019 Apr-Jul 2019) : 35	Yes

The sample size calculated based on 90/10 confidence / precision level. The sample size calculation provided in the ER calculation sheet/2/ is verified and found to be correct. The chosen minimum sample size seems to be acceptable and

	conservative. Moreover PP has considered more sample than required. The sample for each stratum is distributed based on the below formula: $n_i = \frac{g_i}{N} \times n;$ where i=1...k and k is the number of mandals in the project areas; gi is the size of the ith group (Mandal) where i=1....k; N is the population total Verification team checked calculation and found that the sample size is correctly distributed all stratum. Verification team checked the PP's survey results. From the verification of the survey results it is observed that in all the households confirms substitution of non-renewable biomass. Hence, the achieved precision is estimated as below: <table><tr><th>Sample survey</th><th>Achieved precision/2/</th><th>Is less achieved precision is <= 10%</th></tr><tr><td>2017-18</td><td>0%</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>2018-19</td><td>0%</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>2019 (Apr – July 2019)</td><td>0%</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table> Since all the sampled households confirms substitution of non-renewable biomass in all the surveys, the achieved precision level is 0% which a within the required precision level of 10%. Hence, the verification team confirms that the sample sizes considered by PP are adequate. Verification team has conducted acceptance sampling to verify the parameter monitored through sampling. The verification team calculated the minimum sample size (n) as 25 and acceptance number (c) as 1 (considering AQL - 1%, UQL - 15%, producer risk – 5% & consumer risk – 10%). Verification team has done survey in randomly in 25 numbers of households (selected from the PP's sample population) and verified the PP's survey data. However, it shall be noted that these parameters are not used for the emission reduction calculation.	Sample survey	Achieved precision/2/	Is less achieved precision is <= 10%	2017-18	0%	Yes	2018-19	0%	Yes	2019 (Apr – July 2019)	0%	Yes
Sample survey	Achieved precision/2/	Is less achieved precision is <= 10%											
2017-18	0%	Yes											
2018-19	0%	Yes											
2019 (Apr – July 2019)	0%	Yes											
Findings	CL-02 is raised and closed successfully.												
Conclusion	Verification team concludes the following: • The sample size required is calculated as per the requirements of the standard 'Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities' v8 and guidance 'Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities' v4 • The sample size considered for the parameter (which is monitored through sampling basis) is found to be adequate. • PP's sample population was selected in all the mandals proportionally based on the number units installed in the respective mandals • The sampling plan is implemented seems to be appropriate. • Through acceptance sampling, the verification team confirmed that all the data collected by PP through sample survey are correct.												

E.7. Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments

Means of verification	Not applicable as no monitoring equipments are involved.
Findings	NA
Conclusion	NA

E.8. Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions or net removals

E.8.1. Calculation of baseline GHG emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks

Means of verification	As per the methodology the emission reduction is directly calculated. Baseline & project emissions are not calculated separately. The verification team has checked whether calculations of GHG emission reduction
------------------------------	--

	calculation have been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the registered monitoring plan. In detail the following has been verified: <u>Transparency:</u> It has been checked whether the calculation of baseline emissions is fully traceable and, where used, the Excel calculation provides all calculation formulae. <u>Parameter consistency:</u> It has been checked whether all internal and external parameters and data used for the calculation are applied consistently in the monitoring report and the calculation spreadsheet. <u>Correctness:</u> It has been checked whether the applied formulae and methods for calculating baseline emissions are in accordance with the monitoring plan and the approved methodology. <u>Completeness:</u> It has been checked whether all calculations are complete and without omissions The equations applied for the determination of GHG emissions reduction is consistent with the registered PDD and applied methodology: The emission reduction is calculated using the formula: $ER_y = B_y * f_{NRB,y} * NCV_{biomass} * EF_{projected_fossilfuel}$ Emission reduction is adjusted with 0.95 factor for leakage (considering 5% leakage) as per the latest version of methodology AMS I.E, version 4) PP has submitted the emission reduction calculation in the excel sheet/2/. The calculation in the excel sheet is checked whether the calculation is in accordance with the formula given in the approved PDD/3/ and the selected methodology/7/.
Findings	No CAR/CL is raised
Conclusion	The verification team confirms the following: • The calculations of baseline GHG emissions have been carried out in accordance with the equations and methods described in the registered monitoring plan and applied methodology. • The emission factor applied is an ex-ante value valid for the fixed crediting period. • Any assumptions used in emission or removal calculations have been justified. • Appropriate emission factor and other reference values have been correctly applied. It can be confirmed that the emission reduction calculation is correct. • The ER calculation sheet/2/ provided is clear, transparent and the calculations provided in the sheet are reproducible. • Hence, the emission reduction reported in the monitoring report/1/ for the monitoring period (ie, 19,921 tCO₂e without leakage adjustment and 18,925 tCO₂e with leakage adjustment) is verified to be correct

E.8.2. Calculation of project GHG emissions or actual net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks

Means of verification	Not applicable as the emission reduction is directly calculated. No project emission is calculated. This is as per the registered PDD & selected methodology.
Findings	NA
Conclusion	NA

E.8.3. Calculation of leakage GHG emissions

Means of verification	PP has considered 5% leakage as per the latest version of the methodology (AMS I.E). As per the latest version, if PP apply 5% leakage (ie, using the adjustment factor of 0.95) then monitoring of the same is not necessary. Hence, verification team accepts the usage of adjustment factor of 0.95.
------------------------------	---

Findings	No CAR/CL was raised.
Conclusion	The PP has applied 0.95 leakage adjustment factor in emission reduction which is acceptable considering the provision in the latest version of the methodology (AMS I.E). Verification team has accepted the same. The leakage estimated in the MR (ie.,996 tCO ₂ e) is found to be correct.

E.8.4. Summary calculation of GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks

Means of verification	MR demonstrates the summary of GHG emission reductions for the monitoring period and calculated according to the applied methodologies as follows: $ER_y = BE_y - PE_y - L_y$ $= 19,921 - 0 - 996 = 18,925 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$ The ER calculation sheet and monitoring report is verified to check the calculation.
Findings	No CAR/CL is raised
Conclusion	The verification team confirms the following: - The emission reduction value reported (ie.,18,925 tCO₂e) is verified to be correct. - The summary table in the MR has been filled correctly and the values are in line with the related emissions reduction spreadsheet. - Since the monitoring period starts after 31/12/2012, the complete verified emission reductions are correctly reported under the respective column in the MR.

E.8.5. Comparison of actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks with estimates in registered PDD

Means of verification	The verification team has checked whether the MR includes a comparison of actual values of the monitoring period with the estimations in the registered PDD/3/. Section E.4 of the MR includes a comparison of the calculated actual emission reductions with the ex-ante calculated values in the registered PDD	
	Emission reduction estimated as per the approved PDD/3/	Actual emission reduction achieved as per Monitoring report/1/
	132,156 t CO ₂ e	18,925 t CO ₂ e
	The actual emission reduction achieved during the monitoring period is less than the estimation in the PDD.	
Findings	No CAR/CL is raised.	
Conclusion	The estimated emission reduction as per PDD and the actual emission reduction achieved for the monitoring period are correctly reported in the section E.5 of MR. The actual achieved emission reduction is less than the PDD estimation as only 2,991 units have been constructed and commissioned against a PDD estimate of 15,000 biogas units. Since the actual ER is less than estimated ER, hence no justification is required.	

E.8.6. Remarks on difference from estimated value in registered PDD

Means of verification	The verification team has determined the CER achieved during this monitoring period with the estimated value and reason for increase if any.
Findings	No CAR/CL is raised
Conclusion	The actual achieved emission reduction is less than the PDD estimation. Hence no justification is required.

E.8.7. Actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks during the first commitment period and the period from 1 January 2013 onwards

Means of verification	The verification team has determined the CER achieved during first commitment period and second commitment period
Findings	No CAR/CL is raised

Conclusion	Since the complete monitoring period falls after the first commitment period, the complete emission reductions are correctly reported under the respective column in the MR.
-------------------	--

E.9. Assessment of reported sustainable development co-benefits

Means of verification	Not applicable the project is not claiming any sustainable development co-benefits.
Findings	Not applicable
Conclusion	Not applicable

E.10. Global stakeholder consultation

Means of verification	This is the periodic verification, no comments received during commenting period
Findings	Not applicable
Conclusion	Not applicable

SECTION F. Internal quality control

The draft verification report prepared by team leader is reviewed by an independent technical reviewer before requesting for issuance for this verification period for the project activity to confirm the internal procedures established by 4KES are duly followed and the verification report/opinion is reached in an objective manner and complies with the applicable CDM requirements. The technical review is conducted by the technical reviewer qualified as per the 4KES procedures established for the qualification of CDM personnel as per EB guidelines.

The independent technical reviewer may approve or reject the draft verification report. The findings may be identified even at this stage, which needs to be satisfactorily resolved, before the request for issuance is submitted to UNFCCC. The final decision is taken by the Head of the DOE. The technical reviewer approves the final version of the report.

The final approval is authorized by the Director, 4KES once the report is approved by the Head/DOE Manager.

SECTION G. Verification opinion

The verification team confirms that the evidence is of sufficient quantity, appropriate quality and reliable. The reported values, notation, units and sources in the monitoring report for all the monitoring parameters have been cross checked with the emission reduction sheet and monitoring report. During the course of verification and on site visit, the data submitted by PP was cross verified with the values mentioned in the emission reduction sheet/2/ and monitoring report/1/. The procedure for data monitoring, recording, transfer and compilation was also verified and found in compliance with the monitoring plan as mentioned in the approved revised PDD/3/.

Evidences (Documents/interview/site visit) referred for verification of individual monitoring parameter and fixed parameters are defined in section E.6 above. It is confirmed by the assessment team that the reported emission reductions have been conservatively calculated. A list of referred documents for verification is also included in Appendix 3 of this report.

Based on the information seen and evaluated we confirm that the implementation of the project has resulted in 18,925 tCO₂e emission reductions during period 01/04/2017 to 31/07/2019.

SECTION H. Certification statement

4K Earth Science Private Limited has been contracted by 'M/s ACCION FRATERNA ECOLOGY CENTRE' to undertake independent verification and certification for the greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions reported from the CDM Project activity "Accion Fraterna Biogas CDM project for rural communities in Anantapur, Andhra Pradesh" and UNFCCC Reference Number 3779 for the monitoring period 01/04/2017 to 31/07/2019 (including both dates) in the Monitoring Report Version 01 (first version) dated 08/09/2019.

The verification is based on the approved PDD, revised PDD and the monitoring report for this project. Our verification approach was based on the requirements as defined under the Kyoto Protocol, Marrakech accord, as well as those defined by the CDM Executive Board.

The management of the ACCION FRATERNA ECOLOGY CENTRE is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emissions reductions on the basis set out within the project Final Monitoring Report Version 03 dated 15/03/2020. The calculation and determination of GHG emission reductions from the project is the responsibility of the management of the 'ACCION FRATERNA ECOLOGY CENTRE'. The development and maintenance of records and reporting procedures are in accordance with the Monitoring Report Version 03 dated 15/03/2020.

It is our responsibility to express an independent GHG verification opinion on the GHG emissions and on the calculation of GHG emission reductions from the project for the monitoring period 01/04/2017 to 31/07/2019 (including both dates) based on the reported emission reductions in the Final Monitoring Report Version 03 dated 15/03/2020 for the same period.

Based on an understanding of the risks associated with reporting GHG emissions data and the controls in place to mitigate these, 4KES planned and performed our work to obtain the information and explanations that we considered necessary to provide sufficient evidence for us to give reasonable assurance that this reported amount of GHG emission reductions for the period is fairly stated. 4KES confirms the following;

Reporting period: 01/04/2017 to 31/07/2019 (including both dates)

Verified and certified emission in the above reporting period:

	Amount	Unit
Baseline emissions (BE)	19,921	tCO ₂ e
Project emissions (PE)	0	tCO ₂ e
Leakage emissions (LE)	996	tCO ₂ e
Certified emission reductions (CERs)	18,925	tCO ₂ e

Appendix 1. Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Full texts
4KES	4K Earth Science Private Limited
AF	ACCION FRATERNA
BE	Baseline Emissions
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CDM EB	CDM Executive Board
CERs	Certified Emission Reductions
CH ₄	Methane
CL	Clarification Request
CO ₂ e	Carbon dioxide equivalent
COP	Conference of Parties
CMP	Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol
DNA	Designated National Authority
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
EF	Emission Factor
ERPA	Emission Reduction Purchase Agreement
ERs	Emission Reductions
FAR	Forward Action Request
FCN	Fair Climate Network
GHGs	Greenhouse Gas(es)
GWP	Global Warming Potential
HH	Household
ISO	International Organization of Standardization
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
KP	Kyoto Protocol
LE	Leakage Emissions
MR	Monitoring Report
MP	Monitoring Plan
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
PE	Project Emissions
PDD	Project Design Document
PS	Project Standard
PCP	Project Cycle Procedure
PPA	Power Purchase Agreement
QA/QC	Quality Assurance/Quality Control
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VLV	Village Level Volunteers
VVS	Validation & Verification Standard

Appendix 2. Competence of team members and technical reviewers

<u>Certificate of Competence</u>						
Name	☒ Mr. ☐ Ms.	Ma Paa Puratchikkanal				
Qualification Procedure	Fulfil the requirement as per the appointment of personnel procedure of 4KES for Validation and Verification of CDM/VCS/GS/GHG Projects.					
Appointed to work as:						
	CDM Validator/Verifier	Team Leader	Team Member	Technical Expert	Technical Reviewer	Financial Expert
Appointed	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Appointed Date	29-07-2019					
Authorized to work as Technical Expert for:						
Authorized Technical Area	Sectoral Scope		TA Code	Technical Area within the scope		
	Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources)		1.1	Thermal energy generation		
	Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources)		1.2	Renewables		
	Energy demand		3.1	Energy demand		
	Construction		6.1	Construction		
	Waste handling and disposal		13.1	Solid waste and wastewater		
	Agriculture		15.1	Agriculture		
Authorized to work as Local Expert for:						
Country/Countries	India					
Compliance check by: Anand S. R.						

<u>Certificate of Competence</u>						
Name	☒ Mr. ☐ Ms.	Narendra Kumar .R				
Qualification Procedure	Fulfil the requirement as per the appointment of personnel procedure of 4KES for Validation and Verification of CDM/VCS/GS/GHG Projects.					
Appointed to work as:						
	CDM Validator/Verifier	Team Leader	Team Member	Technical Expert	Technical Reviewer	Financial Expert
Appointed	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Appointed Date	29-07-2019					
Authorized to work as Technical Expert for:						
Authorized Technical Area	Sectoral Scope		TA Code	Technical Area within the scope		
	Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources)		1.1	Thermal energy generation		
	Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources)		1.2	Renewables		
	Energy demand		3.1	Energy demand		
	Waste handling and disposal		13.1	Solid waste and wastewater		

<i>Authorized to work as Local Expert for:</i>			
<i>Country/Countries</i>	India		
<u>Compliance check by:</u> Anand S. R.			

Appendix 3. Documents reviewed or referenced

No.	Author	Title	References to the document	Provider
1	AF Ecology centre	Monitoring Report,	Version 01, dated 08/09/2019	AF Ecology centre
	AF Ecology centre	Monitoring Report,	Version 02, dated 13/11/2019	AF Ecology centre
	AF Ecology centre	Monitoring Report,	Version 03, dated 15/03/2020	AF Ecology centre
2	AF Ecology centre	ER Calculation Sheet	Version 01, dated 08/09/2019	AF Ecology centre
	AF Ecology centre	ER Calculation Sheet	Version 02, dated 13/11/2019	AF Ecology centre
	AF Ecology centre	ER Calculation Sheet	Version 03, dated 15/03/2020	AF Ecology centre
3	AF Ecology centre	Registered PDD (PRC approved)	Version 07, 26/09/2014	AF Ecology centre
4	PJRS	Validation opinion Report	dated 19/01/2012	Publicly available
5	AF Ecology centre	Revised PDD	Version 08, dated 21/06/2017	AF Ecology centre
6	KBS Cert	1 st Verification Report	Version 02, 17/07/2017	Publicly available
7	UNFCCC	AMS.I.E – “Switch from Non-Renewable Biomass for Thermal Applications by the User”	Version 04	Publicly available
8	IPCC	1996 & 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: work book	Web Link	Publicly available
9	UNFCCC	Kyoto Protocol (1997)	Web Link	Publicly available
10	UNFCCC	Monitoring Report Form (CDM-MRFORM)	Version 07.0	Publicly available
11	UNFCCC	CDM Project Standard for project activities	Version 02	Publicly available
12	UNFCCC	Standard: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities	Version 08	Publicly available
	UNFCCC	Guidelines for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities	Version 04	Publicly available
13	UNFCCC	CDM Validation and Verification Standard	Version 02	Publicly available
14	UNFCCC	Glossary “CDM terms”	Version 10	Publicly available
15	AF Ecology centre	Biogas basic record set: - Biogas application form - End user agreement for CER ownership - Completion certificate - Online monitoring solution	-	AF Ecology centre
16	AF Ecology centre	Sample survey monitoring sheets for the year 2017-18, 2018-19 & 2019 (April to July 2019)	-	AF Ecology centre
17	AF Ecology centre	Non-project household survey sheets for the year 2017-18, 2018-19 & 2019 (April to July 2019)	-	AF Ecology centre
18	AF Ecology centre	Training Records: - Training conducted for end user - Training conducted for Mason - Training conducted for staffs Training conducted for Village Level Volunteers	-	AF Ecology centre
19	AF Ecology centre	Village level plant breakdown log sheets maintained by village level volunteers	-	AF Ecology centre

20	AF Ecology centre	Photographs and end user details for the biogas units constructed during previous monitoring period but not considered for the emission reduction during the previous monitoring periods.	-	AF Ecology centre
----	-------------------	---	---	-------------------

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

Table 1. Remaining FAR from validation and/or previous verifications

FAR ID	01	Section no.	E.2	Date: 31/10/2019
Description of FAR				
Please provide the clarification whether biogas leakage is accounted for more than 1% of the total annual ER as per the Validation FAR.				
Project participant response				Date: 13/11/2019
According to the I.E. Methodology and hence the Registered PDD, there is no estimation of biogas leakage as project emissions. Hence it is not estimated.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
-				
DOE assessment				Date: 22/01/2020
The verification team is able to conclude that the project activity has taken into account the emission reduction from replacement of non-renewable biomass with biogas, a renewable source, thus the estimation of biogas leakage is not required as per the applied methodology and registered PDD. Hence, the FAR 01 for this verification is closed.				

Table 2. CL from this verification

CL ID	01	Section no.	E.3	Date: 31/10/2019
Description of CL				
The project location is not consistently mentioned throughout the MR. In section A.1, it is mentioned that 15,000 biogas plants (digesters) for single households will be installed in 15 Mandals of Anantapur District. But in section A.2, the project location is mentioned as all mandals of Anantapur district. Clarify				
Project participant response				Date: 13/11/2019
<i>The project location is all mandals of Anantapur. This is corrected in section A.1.</i>				
Documentation provided by project participant				
<i>Revised Monitoring Report</i>				
DOE assessment				Date: 04/01/2020
The revised monitoring report has been verified and found the project locations as been revised to all mandals, which is as per the registered PDD, hence acceptable. CL01 is closed				

CL ID	02	Section no.	E.6.3	Date: 31/10/2019
Description of CL				
The sampling method followed to monitoring the parameter 'Confirmation that non-renewable biomass has been substituted' is not consistently mentioned in the MR Section D.2 of MR, it is mentioned that the parameter is monitored using stratified sampling survey. Whereas, in section D.3, it is mentioned that the parameter is monitored using simple random sampling survey. Clarify				
Project participant response				Date: 13/11/2019
<i>The parameter 'Confirmation that non-renewable biomass has been substituted' is monitored using stratified random sample survey. Details in section D.3 is corrected to be consistent with the section D.2 and registered PDD.</i>				
Documentation provided by project participant				

<i>Revised Monitoring Report</i>	
DOE assessment	Date: 04/01/2020
The parameter is monitored using stratified sample survey and each mandal is considered as one stratum. Also the sample size is now calculated by PP as per the requirements of 'Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities' v4 for stratified sampling requirement. PP has corrected details in section D.3. This is in line with registered PDD. CL02 is closed	

Table 3. CAR from this verification

CAR ID	01	Section no.	E.3	Date: 31/10/2019
Description of CAR				
<i>Complete information regarding the non operation biogas units are not provided in the MR or ER calculation.</i> <i>In section B.1 of the MR it is mentioned that about 2813 numbers of biogas units out of 2991 units are operational at the end of monitoring period. However, the operational status or list of non-operational biodigesters are not provided in the MR or ER calculation sheet.</i>				
Project participant response				Date: 13/11/2019
<i>The non-operational days for each of the unit are provided in the sheet "Non-Usage Days" of the ER Calculations Sheet. The complete information of non-operational biogas units as exported from the monitoring solution is provided as a excel sheet, the summary of which is included in the Emission Reduction Calculations Sheet for ER calculations.</i>				
Documentation provided by project participant				
<i>Emission Reduction Calculations Sheet</i>				
DOE assessment				Date: 04/01/2020
The non-operational days of the bio-digester units have been checked from the excel sheet "Non-Usage Days" of the ER Calculations Sheet." and found to be correct.. Hence CAR 01 is closed.				

CAR ID	02	Section no.	E.6.2	Date: 31/10/2019
Description of CAR				
The following documents shall be submitted for verification • End user agreement (for old units and new units constructed during the monitoring period) • Sample survey sheets & results • Monitoring database				
Project participant response				Date: 13/11/2019
<i>The following documents are submitted for verification</i> <i>End user agreements</i> <i>Sample survey sheets</i> <i>Excel sheet with the data and analysis</i> <i>Monitoring database of non-usage days of biogas units</i>				
Documentation provided by project participant				
<i>End user agreements</i> <i>Sample survey sheets</i> <i>Excel sheet with the data and analysis</i> <i>Monitoring database of non-usage days of biogas units</i>				
DOE assessment				Date: 04/01/2020

The submitted documents :
• Sample end user agreements • Sample survey sheets • Excel sheet with the data and analysis • Excel imported Monitoring database of non-usage days of biogas units
have checked and verified and found to be ok.

CAR ID	03	Section no.	E.3	Date: 02/11/2019
Description of CAR				
During site visit and interview it was observed on non-functional units and its data monitored. Please provide the details of non-functional units and the process to capture the data in the system and ER calculations.				
Project participant response				Date: 13/11/2019
The ER calculations sheet provides the details of non-functional days and is included in the calculations of Emission Reductions. The non-functional days of the units along with reasons is provided as a excel sheet. The process to capture the data in the system and ER calculations is provided in Section C of the MR.				
Documentation provided by project participant				
Monitoring database of non-usage days of biogas units				
DOE assessment				Date: 04/01/2019
The process of non-usage details of the biogas units have been checked from the section C of the MR and also the excel sheets used for computation of emission reductions, the process and the data capture is found to be agreeable. Hence, CAR 03 is closed.				

Table 4. FAR from this verification

FAR ID	Xx	Section No.		Date: DD/MM/YYYY
Description of FAR				
NA				
Project participant response				Date: DD/MM/YYYY
NA				
Documentation provided by project participant				
NA				
DOE assessment				Date: DD/MM/YYYY
NA				

- - - - -

Document information

Version	Date	Description
03.0	31 May 2019	Revision to: • Ensure consistency with version 02.0 of the “CDM validation and verification standard for project activities” (CDM-EB93-A05-STAN); • Make structural and editorial improvements.
02.1	11 January 2018	Editorial revision to correct the numbering of appendices in the instructions.
02.0	31 October 2017	Revision to align with the requirements of the “CDM validation and verification standard for project activities” (version 01.0).
01.0	23 March 2015	Initial publication.

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
Decision Class: Regulatory Document Type: Form Business Function: Issuance Keywords: project activities, verifying and certifying		