

6.0 Verification Statement

Client	Progressio, Unit 3, Canterbury Yard, 190A New Road North, London, N1 7BJ
Verification	The verification was performed in accordance with Part 3 of ISO14064 Standard
Responsibilities	Progressio is entirely and solely responsible for the contents of the report and the data. Waterman was solely requested to ensure that the data, and the process for gathering the data, is accurate, complete and sufficient for the scope of Progressio's activities.
Scope	Progressio is required to produce a carbon footprint as a voluntary measure for internal reporting requirements. The scope of the verification statement is limited to staff flights and London office energy consumption. The review criteria is based on the requirements of Progressio's voluntary reporting initiative and completion of outstanding issues identified in report E10739.1.1.1.TC
Method	<p>The following data was reviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• spreadsheets of London Office Staff flights for the 12 month period 01 May 2008 to 30 April 2009;• other flights for the period 01 April 2008 to 31 March 2009;• electricity data for the period 01 March 2008 to 28 February 2009; and• gas consumption data for the period 14 March 2008 to 20 March 2009;• the emissions factors and data sources for calculating the GHG emissions from these activities; <p>in addition, test-checking the underlying calculations of these spreadsheets to ensure accuracy was undertaken as well as receiving verbal confirmation cross-checked to documented procedures on how this data is gathered and reported.</p>
Assurance	Limited.
Non-Conformities	Non-conformities are errors that are not negligible errors, identified through the verification process. There were no non-conformities identified in the source data produced by Progressio.
Limitations	Progressio must produce a GHG report. Due to changes in reporting, it is not possible to benchmark this data to previous reports. This will be resolved by repeating the exercise in future years. There are no other limitations identified. Recommendations are also included in report E10739.R.1.1.1.TC
Conclusion	<p>Based on Waterman's review, there is no evidence that the GHG assertion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• is not materially correct and is not a fair representation of GHG data and information, and• has not been prepared in accordance with the Progressio's requirements for internal reporting.

Verifier



Tom Cullingford
BSc MSc IEMA
Senior Environmental Consultant
Waterman Energy, Environment & Design
47 Bank St, Sheffield, S1 2DR
Date: 04 March 2009