# University of Wyoming
# GHG Internal Verification Procedure

## Overview

Verification is an objective assessment of the accuracy and completeness of reported GHG information and the conformity of this information to pre-established GHG accounting and reporting principles. Furthermore, Verification involves an assessment of the risks of material discrepancies in reported data. Discrepancies relate to differences between reported data and data generated from the proper application of the relevant standards and methodologies.

The University of Wyoming's internal verification procedure and methodology is similar to 3rd party and prepared based on the "GHG Protocol Corporate Standard". The assurance criteria for GHG verification is designed to Tier II-level verification, which is appropriate for basic reporting, and those voluntary efforts and public commitments. It assists and support the UW GHG internal verification process.

## Objective

The primary aim of University of Wyoming's GHG internal verification process is

- Increase the credibility of publicly reported emissions information and progress towards GHG targets.
- Increase the senior management and Trustee's confidence in the reported information on which to base investment and target setting decisions.
- Improve the internal accounting and reporting practices (e.g., calculation, recording and internal reporting systems, and the application of GHG accounting)

## VERIFICATION PROCESS

The internal verification process involves two key phases:

- An evaluation of whether the GHG accounting and reporting methodology has been correctly implemented.
- Identification of any material discrepancies

Each phase consists of several steps and a series of procedures. We have provided a description and explanation of each steps as follow.

**1. Develop a Verification Plan**

The first step of our internal verification process is to develop a verification plan. The plan documents the scope of the GHG verification, what we use as criteria to assess the GHG inventory, including:

- The Regulation,
- the contact information,
- working and reporting languages,
- reference documents,
- the schedule,
- high level procedures,
- the verification team,

- confidentiality requirements,
- tools and calculators,
- the report content and format, and
- document retention requirements.

**2. Risk Assessment**

The UW risk assessment is based on the risk of a material misstatement in the assertion and can be broken down in:

- Occurrence – emissions that have been recorded have occurred and pertain to the entity;
- Completeness – all emissions that should have been recorded have been recorded;
- Accuracy – the quantification of emissions has been recorded appropriately;
- Cutoff – emissions have been recorded in the correct reporting period; and
- Classification—emissions have been recorded as the proper type.

**3. Anomaly Investigation**

If a significant anomaly is detected, further investigation is warranted. At the outset, we do not assume that the anomaly is an actual error, omission or misreporting; rather, we treat it as a "red flag" that requires further and closer review. We use a variety of techniques to investigate an anomaly, but the primary technique involves interviews and inspection of records to determine if there are historical factors that may explain the anomaly. Other alternative procedures (e.g. records review, data comparison, sample and analysis) to provide sufficient and appropriate evidence.

**4. Data Flow and Management System Assessment**

An important component of assessing the risk of misreporting is understanding the data flow order and how the data are managed by each stack holders. We confirm it through interviews, inspection and observation, if required we suggest changes in data flow. We assess the data controls to determine whether their objectives, location, and frequency of recording are appropriate given the risk of misreporting at that stage in the data flow.

**5. Conformance to the Verification Criteria**

This assessment is done to determine whether each stack holders are appropriately applying the outlined assurance criteria. We conduct this assessment throughout the GHG verification; however, of particular concern is ensuring that the correct quantification methodology is applied. To ensure that the submission uses appropriate quantification methodologies, we record the quantification methodology used, the source of the quantification methodology, and whether the particular quantification methodology is acceptable.

**6. Consistency Assessment**

We compare each assertion statement with the evidence collected and assess whether it meets the assurance criteria. At this point we also evaluate any anomalies that were unexplained and other errors, omissions and misreporting for materiality. We also evaluate the qualitative aspects of the submission to ensure that the text is consistent with the evidence, is not misleading, and contains all material issues or concerns relevant to the submission. If there are any material discrepancies, the stack holder is contacted to resolve these discrepancies through revision of the assertion or the provision of additional evidence. Any material discrepancies that remain are noted in the qualifications to our statement of verification.