

 <p style="text-align: center;">CDM: Proposed new methodology expert form <i>(To be used by methodology experts providing desk review for a proposed new methodology)</i></p>	
Name of expert responsible for completing and submitting this form	
Related F-CDM-NM document ID number	
<p>Evaluation of the proposed new methodology: <i>Based on an assessment of the draft PDD, evaluate the proposed new baseline and /or monitoring methodologies with respect to the Annexes 3 and 4 of the CDM PDD</i></p>	
<p>New baseline methodology(ies) <i>In respect of a new baseline methodology(ies), evaluate each section of Annex 3 of the CDM-PDD. Please provide your comments below, also taking into consideration further questions in italics below:</i></p>	
Section 2. Description of the methodology	
<p>Section 2.1. General approach</p> <p><i>Is the approach selected the most appropriate (see paragraph 48 of the CDM M&P)?</i></p>	
<p>Section 2.2. Overall description</p> <p><i>Adequacy of methodology description</i> <i>Appropriateness of determining the baseline scenario proposed. Does the baseline scenario reasonably represent the anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases that would occur in the absence of the proposed project activity? Explain.</i></p>	
<p>Section 3. Key parameters/assumptions (including emission factors and activity levels) and data sources considered and used:</p> <p><i>Reliability, accuracy and adequacy of data required (e.g. your expert judgement on emission factors and activity data used)</i> <i>Key implicit and explicit assumptions (if any)</i></p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">a. Identification</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">b. Acceptability</p> <p><i>Transparency</i></p>	

Section 4. Definition of the project boundary related to the baseline methodology:

Coverage of project boundary (adequate?):

- a. *Gases and sources*
- b. *Physical delineation*

Section 5. Assessment of uncertainties:

Key implicit and explicit assumptions (if any)

- a. *Identification*
- b. *Acceptability*

Section 6. Description of how the baseline methodology addresses the calculation of baseline emissions and the determination of project additionality:

Please evaluate the proposed new methodology:

“Description of how the anthropogenic emissions of GHG by sources are reduced below those that would have occurred in the absence of the registered CDM project activity (i.e. explanation of how and why this project is additional and therefore not the baseline scenario)”

Section 7. Description of how the baseline methodology addresses any potential leakage of the project activity:

Section 8. Criteria used in developing the proposed baseline methodology, including an explanation of how the baseline methodology was developed in a transparent and conservative manner:

Section 9. Assessment of strengths and weaknesses of the baseline methodology:

Section 10. Other considerations, such as a description of how national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances have been taken into account:

In addition, please address the following aspects

Applicability of methodology across project types and regions

Any other comments

Recommendations on baseline methodology(ies):

- a. Approve methodology
 - i. Conditions under which methodology is applicable to other potential projects (e.g. project type, region, data availability, etc.)
 - ii. Minor changes suggested

- b. Not approved
 - i. Reasons for rejection
 - ii. Specify changes needed

New monitoring methodology(ies)

In respect of new monitoring methodology(ies), evaluate each section of Annex 4. Please provide your comments section by section:

Please also address the following

Applicability of methodology across project types and regions

Any other comments

Recommendations on monitoring methodology(ies)::

- a) Approve methodology
 - (i) Conditions under which methodology is applicable to other potential projects (e.g. project type, region, data availability, etc.)
 - (ii) Minor changes suggested

- b) Not approved
 - (i) Reasons for rejection
 - (ii) Specify changes needed

Cross-cutting issues

? Can the presentation of the methodology/ies be further simplified?

? Should this methodology/ies be considered as new (see paragraph 37 (e) of the CDM M&P)?

? Comparison with other relevant methodologies

? Are the methodology/ies rigorous?

Date and signature by expert

Section below to be filled by UNFCCC secretariat

F-CDM-NMex doc id number
([related F-CDM-NM ID]+ex+[id number of expert])

Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat

Date of transmission to the EB, CDM-Meth Panel

