

	CDM: Proposed new methodology expert form (version 03) <i>(To be used by methodology experts providing desk review for a proposed new methodology)</i>
Name of expert responsible for completing and submitting this form	
Related F-CDM-NM document ID number	
<p><i>Note to those completing this form, as applicable: Please provide recommendations on the proposed new baseline and monitoring methodologies based on an assessment of annexes 3 and 4 and of their application in sections A to E of the draft CDM PDD, desk reviews and public input. Please ensure that the form is entirely filled and that arguments and expert judgements are substantiated.</i></p>	
A. Evaluation of the proposed new methodologies by desk reviewers:	
I. Evaluation of the proposed new baseline methodology:	
Title of new baseline methodology:>>	
i. Conditions under which this methodology is applicable to other potential projects (e.g. project type, region, data availability):	>>
ii. Strengths and weaknesses of the methodology:	>>
iii. Any changes needed to improve the methodology:	a. Minor changes:>>
	b. Major changes: >>
II. Evaluation of the proposed new monitoring methodology:	
Title of new monitoring methodology: >>	
i. Conditions under which this methodology is applicable to other potential projects (e.g. project type, region, data availability):	>>
ii. Strengths and weaknesses of the methodology:	>>
iii. Any changes needed to improve the methodology:	a. Minor changes:>>
	b. Major changes: >>
B. Details of the evaluation of the proposed new methodology by the desk reviewer:	
I. Proposed new baseline methodology (specify title here): >>	
(1) Short description of the methodology, including an assessment of which approach from paragraph 48 of the CDM modalities and procedures was used:	
<i>a) Describe the methodology:</i>	

>>

b) State the approach selected:

>>

c) Indicate (in summary form) why the approach selected is the most appropriate. Please provide your expert judgement on the appropriateness of the selected approach to the project category:

>>

(2) Basis for determining the baseline scenario:

a) State whether the documentation explains how the baseline scenario is to be chosen and identified:

>>

b) State the basic underlying rationale for algorithms/formulae used (e.g. marginal vs. average basis) (see also section 4 below):

>>

c) State whether the documentation explains how, through the use of the methodology, it can be demonstrated that a project activity is additional and therefore not the baseline scenario. If so, what are the tools provided by the project participants?

>>

d) State whether the basis for determining the baseline scenario and for assessing additionality is appropriate and adequate:

>>

(3) Assessment of the description of the proposed methodology and its applicability

a) State whether the methodology has been described in an adequate manner:

>>

b) State whether the proposed methodology is appropriate for the referred proposed project activity and the referred project context (described in Sections A-E of the draft CDM-PDD and submitted along with Annex 3):

>>

c) State whether the application of the methodology could result in a baseline scenario that reasonably represents the anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases that would occur in the absence of the proposed project activity.

>>

Please explain:

>>

(4) Assessment of algorithms/formulae and type of data needed:

a) State whether the description of the methodology includes algorithms and generic formulae that can be applied to other potential project activities (if not, the proposed new methodology will be considered as a project-specific methodology):

>>

b) Explain the spatial scope of data used to determine the baseline and whether the scope is appropriate:

>>

c) Explain the vintage of data used (in relation to the duration of the project crediting period) and whether the vintage of data is appropriate, indicating the period covered by the data:

>>

(5) Definition of the project boundary related to the baseline methodology:

a) State how the project boundary is defined in terms of:

i) Gases and sources

>>

ii) Physical delineation

>>

b) Indicate whether this project boundary is appropriate:

>>

(6) Key assumptions/parameters (including emission factors and activity levels) and data sources:

a) List the implicit and explicit key assumptions. Identify those, if any, which are problematic and explain:

>>

b) State whether the key assumptions are arrived at in a transparent manner:

>>

c) Give your expert judgement on whether the assumptions/parameters are adequate:

>>

d) Indicate which data sources are used and how the data are obtained (e.g. official statistics, expert judgement):

>>

e) Give your expert judgement on whether the data used are adequate, consistent, accurate and reliable:

>>

f) State possible data gaps:

>>

(7) Assessment of uncertainties:

a) State whether the methodology includes an assessment of uncertainties regarding:

i) The basis for determining the baseline scenario:

>>

ii) Algorithms/formulae:

>>

iii) Key assumptions:

>>

iv) Data:

>>

b) State whether the uncertainties presented are reasonable:

>>

(8) Leakage:

a) State how the baseline methodology addresses any potential leakage due to the project activity.

>>

b) Indicate whether the treatment for leakage is appropriate and adequate:

>>

(9) Transparency and “conservativeness”:

a) Indicate whether the baseline methodology was developed in a transparent way:

>>

b) State whether the baseline methodology is conservative:

>>

(10) Potential strengths and weaknesses of the proposed baseline methodology (please explain):

>>

(11) Other considerations, such as a description of how national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances have been taken into account (please explain):

>>

(12) Applicability of the proposed methodology across project types and regions (please indicate):

>>

(13) Any other comments:

a) State whether any other source of information (i.e. other than documentation on this proposed methodology available on the UNFCCC CDM web site) has been used by you in evaluating this methodology. If so, please provide specific references:

>>

b) Indicate any further comments:

>>

II. Proposed new monitoring methodology (specify title here): >>

In respect of the proposed new monitoring methodology, evaluate each section of annex 4 to the draft CDM PDD. Please provide your comments section by section:

(1) Brief description of new methodology:

Describe new methodology:

>>

(2) Key assumptions/parameters:

a) List the implicit and explicit key assumptions. Identify those, if any, which are problematic and explain:

>>

b) State whether the key assumptions are arrived at in a transparent manner:

>>

c) Give your expert judgement on whether the assumptions/parameters are adequate:

>>

(3) Data sources and data quality:

a) Indicate which data sources are used and how the data are obtained (e.g. official statistics, expert judgement):

>>

b) Give your expert judgement on whether the data used are adequate, consistent, accurate and reliable:

>>

c) State possible data gaps:

>>

(4) Assessment of the description of the proposed methodology and its applicability:

a) State whether the proposed methodology has been described in an adequate manner:

>>

b) State whether the proposed methodology is appropriate for the referred proposed project activity and the referred project context (described in Sections A-E of the draft CDM-PDD and submitted along with annex 4):

>>

c) State whether this proposed monitoring methodology is compatible with the proposed baseline methodology described in annex 3 of the draft CDM-PDD:

>>

(5) Leakage (please elaborate, if appropriate):

>>

(6) Quality assurance and control procedures (please explain):

>>

(7) Potential strengths and weaknesses of the proposed monitoring methodology (please explain):

>>

(8) Applicability of the proposed methodology across project types and regions (please indicate):

>>

(9) Any other comments:

a) State whether any other source of information (i.e. other than documentation on this proposed methodology available on the UNFCCC CDM web site) has been used by you in evaluating this methodology. If so, please provide specific references:

>>

b) Indicate any further comments:

>>

Signature of desk reviewer Date: / /	
Information to be completed by the secretariat	
F-CDM-NMex doc id number	
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat	
Date of transmission to the Meth Panel and EB	
Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site	