

IHS CY2010 Verification Report



The Climate Registry

Section 1: Overview

Date of Verification Report: 02/27/12

Member Name: IHS Inc.

Emissions Year Report Verified: 2010

Reporting Classification: Transitional Complete Historical

Member's Organizational Boundaries:

Control Only: (Financial **or** Operational)

Equity Share and Control (Financial **or** Operational)

Geographic Scope of Emissions Report:

Transitional, specify geographic boundary: 2 office sites in Englewood, CO and Washington DC; specify GHGs: CO₂, CH₄, N₂O

North American

Worldwide (including North America) Worldwide (non-North America)

Verification Body Name: Cameron-Cole, LLC

Verification Body Contact: Chris Lawless

Title: Lead Verifier

Telephone: 510-777-1858

E-mail: clawless@cameron-cole.com

Subcontractors: not applicable

Verification Team Members:

Lead Verifier: Chris Lawless

Other Verification Team Members: Mallory Andrews, Dave Butler

Independent Peer Reviewer: Dru Krupinsky

Type of Verification: Batch Streamlined Full

GHG Reporting Protocols against which Verification was Conducted:

- The Climate Registry's *General Reporting Protocol Version 1.1*, dated May 2008
- The Climate Registry's GRP Updates and Clarifications document dated 7/15/2011
- Others (specify):

GHG Verification Protocols used to Conduct the Verification:

- The Climate Registry's *General Verification Protocol Version 2.0*, dated June 2010
- The Climate Registry's GVP Updates and Clarifications document dated 5/31/2011
- Others (specify):

Total Entity-Wide Emissions Verified:

Total Scope 1 Emissions: 389.92 MT CO₂-e

388.92 CO₂ 0.04 CH₄ 0.0007 N₂O 0.00 HFCs (CO₂e) 0.00 PFCs 0.00 SF₆

Total Scope 2 Emissions: 5,302.33 MT CO₂-e

5,276.01 CO₂ 0.07 CH₄ 0.08 N₂O

Biogenic CO₂: 0.00 MT CO₂

Summary of Verification Findings:

- Verified
- Unable to Verify (include reason, e.g., "due to data errors" or "due to non-compliance with The Registry's reporting requirements): _____

Comment: *Transitional reporting of CO₂, CH₄, N₂O only (limited to direct combustion of natural gas (scope 1); and purchased electricity (scope 2) as per "Self-Defined Operational Boundary Form")*

Section 2: Verification Plan

Describe the verification plan, including the risk assessment methodologies employed and the sampling plan (either in the space below or attached separately):

Cameron-Cole has attached a copy of the Verification Plan. Cameron-Cole's risk assessment was based on the information provided by IHS, including the CRIS report, back-up calculation spreadsheets, and information provided during the kick-off call between IHS and Cameron-Cole. This risk assessment informed the Verification Sampling Plan.

The Verification Sampling Plan included a ranking of emissions sources by contribution to total CO₂e emissions, and a ranking of emissions sources with the largest calculation uncertainty.

The Verification Sampling Plan included a qualitative narrative on the uncertainty risk assessment in the following areas:

- Data acquisition equipment;
- Data sampling and frequency;
- Data processing and tracking;
- Emissions calculations;
- Data reporting; and,
- Management policies or practices in developing emissions data reports.

The Verification Sampling Plan informed the Data Request, and the Data Request was then provided to IHS. Additional Data Requests were submitted to IHS where further information was needed to provide clarification or address questions. The Verification Sampling Plan was not provided to IHS, in accordance with TCR's GVP.

Section 3: Identification of Emission Sources

List all facilities/emission sources/GHGs identified through verification activities within the geographic and organizational boundaries of the emissions report.

Facility Name/Identifier	Facility Location	Emission Source	GHG	Included in Emission Report?
Englewood, CO-Inverness	Englewood, CO	Purchased Electricity, Natural Gas	CO ₂ , CH ₄ , N ₂ O	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Washington DC-Connecticut	Washington DC	Purchased Electricity	CO ₂ , CH ₄ , N ₂ O	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Section 4: Verification Activities Log and Evaluation of Compliance

Verification Activities Check List		
Preparing for Verification	Date Achieved	
1. Bid on a Verification Contract	8/10/2011	
2. Submit Case-Specific COI Assessment Form to Registry	01/05/2012	
3. Negotiate Contract with Member	01/04/2012	
4. Notify The Registry of Planned Verification Activities	01/05/2012	
5. Conduct Kick-off Meeting With Member	01/23/2012	
6. Develop Verification Plan	01/05/2012	
Verification Activities	Yes	No
Assessing Conformance with the Registry's Requirements		
7. Is the Member a legal entity under U.S., Canadian or Mexican law?	Y	
8. Is the Member a subsidiary of any other company, and if so is the parent company also reporting to the Registry?		N
9. If the Member is submitting a transitional report, is the Member eligible to do so?	Y	
10. Are all emissions calculated using simplified estimation methodologies included in the inventory and documented as such?		N/A
11. If the answer to Question 10 is yes, are the simplified methods used appropriate, and are the results reasonable?		N/A
12. If the answer to Question 10 is yes, do the emissions estimated using these methods constitute 5% or less of the sum of an entity's Scope 1, Scope 2, and biogenic emissions from stationary and mobile combustion?		N/A
13. Have any mergers, acquisitions, or divestitures occurred during the current emissions year?		N
14. Have any activities been outsourced or insourced in the current year?		N
15. Has the Member provided all required emissions data?	Y	
16. Have you performed data triangulations where reasonable?	Y	
17. Are any discrepancies between your emissions estimates and the Member's material? If so, has the Member addressed those discrepancies and corrected the data in CRIS?		N/A
18. Has the Member assigned emissions from on-road mobile sources to the correct geographic location? (i.e. Has the Member assigned the emissions to a state/province, nation or country as opposed to a single facility location?)		
Verification Activities	Date Achieved	
Assessing Completeness of Emission Report		
19. Identify and list all Facilities in the Entity	01/23/2012	
20. Identify and list all Emission Sources (of Scope 1 Mobile, Scope 1 Stationary, Scope 1 Process, Scope 1 Fugitive, Scope 2, Direct Biogenic CO ₂ Mobile, and Direct Biogenic CO ₂ Stationary Emissions)	01/23/2012	
21. Identify and list all Fuel Types	01/23/2012	
22. Rank All Sources by Magnitude on a CO ₂ -e Basis	01/23/2012	
23. Assess Any Changes in Geographic and Organizational Boundaries	01/23/2012	

	Yes	No
24. [For Member's using the equity share approach] Does the emission report include all processes and facilities for which the Member holds an equity share? If not, why?		N/A
25. [For Member's using the financial control approach] Does the emission report include all processes and facilities under the financial control of the Member? If not, why?		N/A
26. [For Member's using the operational control approach] Does the emission report include all processes and facilities under the operational control of the Member? If not, why?		N- Transiti onal
27. Does the report include all facilities and sources of GHG emissions within the geographic boundaries of the Member? Or, if the Member is a Transitional Member, does the report include all facilities and sources within the states, provinces, and or native sovereign nations that the Transitional Member has chosen?	Y	
28. Does the report include all applicable types of GHGs from each facility and emission source within the geographic and organizational boundaries of the Member? Or, in the case of Transitional Members, does the report include all emissions of the GHGs that the Member has chosen to report (and, at a minimum, CO ₂) from each facility and emission source within the geographic and organizational boundaries of the transitional Member?	Y	
29. Has the reporting entity included all of its Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions for each facility?	Y	
30. Have the Scope 1 emissions been broken down by source type (stationary combustion, mobile combustion, fugitive and process)?	Y	
31. Have biogenic CO ₂ emissions been reported separately from the Scope 1 emissions?	Y	
32. What type of records were used as the basis for calculating emissions, and were these records appropriate?	Y – utility supplied records	
Performing Risk Assessment Based on Review of Information Systems and Controls		Date Achieved
33. Evaluate Procedures and Systems for Preparing Emission Report		01/26/2012
34. Evaluate Personnel and Training - Does the Member's management system define what is "qualified" and what constitutes "appropriate training"?		01/26/2012
35. Assess if the uncertainty associated with methodologies and management systems is more than appropriate		01/26/2012
	Yes	No
36. Are the calculation methodologies/procedures used to compute GHG emissions at the source level among those described in the General Reporting Protocol? If not, why?	Y	
37. If a non-GRP methodology has been used because the General Reporting Protocol does not provide any methodology for the particular source(s) in question, is the methodology that was used an industry standard for this source type(s)?		N/A
38. If alternative emission factors were used, did the Member establish a basis for concluding that they were more accurate than the default factors?		N/A
39. Are appropriate methods used to manage and implement entity-wide GHG emissions reporting programs? If the Member has more than one facility, is the emissions data correctly monitored?	Y	
40. Is a qualified individual responsible for managing and reporting GHG emissions?	Y	
41. Is appropriate training provided to personnel assigned to GHG emissions reporting duties? If the Member relies on external staff to perform required activities, are the contractors' qualified to undertake such work?		N/A

42. Are appropriate documents created to support and/or substantiate activities related to GHG emissions reporting activities, and is such documentation retained appropriately? For example, is such documentation maintained through reporting plans or procedures, utility bills, etc.?	Y	
43. Are appropriate mechanisms used to measure and review the effectiveness of GHG emissions reporting programs? For example, are policies, procedures, and practices evaluated and updated at appropriate intervals?	Y	
44. Does the system account for the diversity of the sources that comprise each emission category? For example, are there multiple types of vehicles and other transportation devices that require different emission estimation methodologies?	Y	
45. Do you know the diversity of GHGs emitted from each emission source category?	Y	
46. When available, has the Member used the emission factors, GWPs and standardized estimation methods in the Registry's General Reporting Protocol to calculate emissions in each source category?	Y	
a. Are the methodologies, data sources and emission factors documented and explained appropriately?	Y	
47. Does the Member's GHG management system appropriately track emissions in all of the emission source categories?	Y	
Developing a Sampling Plan		Date Achieved
48. Develop Sampling Procedures for Sources Based on Risk of Material Misstatement		01/23/2012
49. Was the overall Verification Plan and the types of facilities and their materiality considered when developing the facility visit list?	Y	
50. Were direct and indirect emissions considered separately?	Y	
	Yes	No
51. Based on the GVP v. 2.0 Section 4.3.4, have you visited an appropriate number of facilities?	Y	
Verifying Emission Estimates Against Verification Criteria		Date Achieved
52. Confirm Total Fuel Consumption		2/23/2012
53. Confirm Vehicle Miles Traveled		N/A
54. Confirm that appropriate Emission Factors are Used. If not Default Factors, ensure the Derivation and Explanation of increased Accuracy is properly Documented		2/23/2012
55. Calculate Scope 1 (Mobile, Stationary, Process & Fugitive), Scope 2, and Direct Biogenic CO ₂ (Mobile and Stationary) Based on Sampling Procedures		2/23/2012
56. Compare Estimates from Sample Calculations to Reported Emissions		2/23/2012
57. Determine if There are Any Discrepancies Between Sample Calculation and Reported Emissions		2/23/2012
58. Determine if any reporting errors have caused material misstatements		2/23/2012
	Yes	No
59. Are the reported electricity, steam, and district heating and cooling use consistent with utility bills?	Y	
60. Is the reported total stationary fuel use by fuel type consistent with the fuel use records?	Y	
61. Is the reported total consumption of fuels in motor vehicles consistent with available documentation and by vehicle type? If the entity calculates transportation emissions based on vehicle mileage, is the reported vehicle mileage consistent with vehicle mileage records?		N/A
62. Is the reported process and fugitive emissions consistent with activity data or maintenance records?		N/A
63. Are the emission factors used by the Member appropriate?	Y	
a. If Registry default factors are not used, do the alternative emission factors		

provide increased accuracy?	
b. Is the derivation and explanation of increased accuracy properly documented and reasonable?	
64. Does a sample of the Member's calculations agree with your re-calculated Scope 1 (mobile, stationary, process & fugitive), Scope 2, and Direct Biogenic CO ₂ (Mobile and Stationary) emissions estimates? Have you documented your process for determining the appropriate sampling plan?	Y
65. Are all required GHG emissions included?	Y
66. Are discrepancies between your emissions estimates and the Member's immaterial?	Y
Completing the Verification Process	Date Achieved
67. Prepare a Detailed Verification Report & Submit to Member	By 02/29/2012
68. Prepare a Verification Statement & Submit to Member	By 02/29/2012
69. Conduct Verification Meeting with Member to Discuss & Finalize Verification Report & Statement	By 02/29/2012
70. Communicate Verification findings to The Registry through CRIS	By 02/29/2012
71. Retain Relevant Verification Documents & Records	By 02/29/2012

Section 5: Findings

List all Scope 1 misstatements discovered during the verification and their magnitude at the entity level

Discrepancy	Magnitude as a Percent of Reported Scope 1 Entity-Level Emissions	Current Disposition of the Discrepancy
Natural Gas at Englewood facility counted as Purchased Heating- Scope 2	n/a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Corrected <input type="checkbox"/> Not Corrected
All Scope 1 prorating and transcription errors	-2.12%	<input type="checkbox"/> Corrected <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Corrected

Net sum of all Scope 1 discrepancies at the entity level: -2.12%

List all Scope 2 misstatements discovered during the verification and their magnitude at the entity level

Discrepancy	Magnitude as a Percent of Reported Scope 2 Entity-Level Emissions	Current Disposition of the Discrepancy
Prorating and transcription errors for Englewood, CO consumption	0.33%	<input type="checkbox"/> Corrected <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Corrected

Discrepancy	Magnitude as a Percent of Reported Scope 2 Entity-Level Emissions	Current Disposition of the Discrepancy
Electricity consumption calculated based on RSF rather than USF for Washington DC office	0.41%	<input type="checkbox"/> Corrected <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Corrected

Net sum of all Scope 2 discrepancies at the entity level: 0.74%