1. Resolution of Requests
2. Final validation report and opinion
Resolution of Requests
Implementation of validation

- Document Review
- Follow-up interview (Site visit)
- Draft Validation Report
- Validation Report and opinion

PPs

TPE

Develop Project Documentation

Resolution of Corrective Action Requests

不許複製（弊社の許可なく複製・転載をお断りいたします。）
Resolution of Requests

Resolve or close out requests (CARs and CLs) by modifying the PDD or adequate additional explanations and evidence by the project proponent

⇒ require further investigation of issues that are not considered or appropriately addressed in PDD.

It is responsibility of the project owner to respond to the requests in a timely manner.

If resolution of requests is not satisfactory, do not recommend the project activity for registration.
Final validation report and opinion
Implementation of validation
Final Validation Report

- Validation Report

- Summary of the validation process, conclusions;
- Applied approaches, findings, conclusions;
- Information on public inputs;
- Responses to CARs and CLs;
- A list of interviewees and documents reviewed;
Final Validation Report

- Validation Report

- Details of the validation team, technical experts, internal technical reviewers involved;

- Quality control within the team and in the validation process;

- Certificates or CVs of TPE’s validation team members, technical experts, internal technical reviewers.

- Validation opinion:
### A. Summary of validation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Validation requirements</th>
<th>No CAR or CL remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project design document form</td>
<td>The TPE determines whether the PDD was completed using the latest version of the PDD forms appropriate to the type of project and drafted in line with the Guidelines for Developing the Joint Crediting Mechanism (JCM) Project Design Document Monitoring Plan and Monitoring Report.</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project description</td>
<td>The description of the proposed JCM project in the PDD is accurate, complete, and provides comprehension of the proposed JCM project.</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of approved JCM methodology (law)</td>
<td>The project is eligible for applying applied methodology and that the applied version is valid at the time of submission of the proposed JCM project.</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emission sources and calculation of emission reductions</td>
<td>All relevant GHG emission sources covered in the methodology are addressed for the purpose of calculating project emissions and reference emissions for the proposed JCM project.</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impact assessment</td>
<td>The project participants conducted an environmental impact assessment, if required by Mongolia, in line with Mongolia’s procedures.</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local stakeholder consultation</td>
<td>The project participants have completed a local stakeholder consultation process and that due steps were taken to engage stakeholders and solicit comments for the proposed project.</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Validation opinion

- Form the basis for the **registration** of the project
  or

  Explain the reason for **non-acceptance**
  If the project is judged not to fulfil the requirements.

- **Important decision factor** for project proponents.
  To proceed or not.
A. Positive validation opinion

- The project complies with all requirements.
- All requests (CARs and CLs) presented in the draft validation report were satisfactorily resolved.

A positive validation ⇒ a request for registration
B. Negative validation opinion

When the validator cannot obtain sufficient and appropriate evidence which could confirm that all requirements are met, or where evidence show that such requirement are not met.

TPE will conclude that the project cannot be validated.
Review and issuance of validation opinion

Ensure that competent personnel different from the validation team
a) confirm that all validation activities have been completed, and
b) conclude whether or not the GHG assertion is free from material discrepancy, and whether the validation activities provide the level of assurance agreed to at the beginning of the validation process in conformity with ISO 14064-3:2006, 4.8.

ISO 14065 8.5
Facts discovered after the opinion

The validation body shall consider appropriate action if facts that could materially affect the validation opinion are discovered by the client, responsible party or GHG programme after the issuance of the validation opinion, including the following:

a) determining if the facts have been adequately disclosed in the GHG assertion;
b) considering if the validation opinion requires revision;
c) discussing the matter with the client, responsible party or GHG programme (as appropriate).

If the validation opinion requires revision, the validation body shall implement processes to issue a revised validation report and issue a revised validation opinion which specifically addresses the reason for the revision.
Any Questions?