UNFCCC	**CDM: Proposed New A/R Methodology Second Expert Form (version 01)** *(To be used by A/R methodology experts providing desk review for a proposed new A/R methodology)*

Name of expert responsible for completing and submitting this form	
Related F-CDM-AR-NM document ID number	

Note to those completing this form, as applicable: Please provide recommendations on the proposed new A/R baseline and monitoring methodologies based on an assessment of CDM-AR-NMB and CDM-AR-NMM and of their application in sections A to E of the draft CDM-AR-PDD. Please ensure that the form is entirely filled and that arguments and expert judgements are substantiated.

A. Summary of the evaluation of the proposed new A/R methodologies by desk reviewers:

I. General information on the submitted proposed new A/R methodology:

(1) Title of the new A/R baseline methodology:
>>

(2) History of submission *(to be communicated to reviewers by UNFCCC Secretariat):*
>>

Note to reviewers: if the methodology is a resubmission, please read the previous version and associated Meth Panel recommendations.

(3) Purpose of the new A/R baseline methodology (in a few sentences).
>>   " This methodology is designed for projects that ……"

(4) Suggested applicability of the proposed A/R methodology across project types and regions:

a) Please provide your assessment of the applicability of the proposed new A/R methodology under which this A/R baseline methodology applies (e.g. project type, national and regional circumstances / policies, data and resource availability, environmental conditions, past land-use and land use changes, purpose of the activity and practices). Please note that applicability conditions should refer to a project activity and not to a baseline.

>>

b) Please specify whether this methodology can be applied to other potential CDM A/R project activities (if not, then this proposed new methodology will be considered as a A/R project-specific methodology).

>>

(5) Strength / weaknesses and Changes required to improve the A/R baseline methodology:

a) Strengths and weaknesses of the A/R baseline methodology:

  i) Strengths:

  >>

  ii) Weaknesses:

  >>

b) Any changes needed to improve the A/R baseline methodology:

  i) Minor changes:

  >>

  ii) Major changes:

  >>

(6) Title of the new A/R monitoring methodology:

>>

(7) Strength / weaknesses and changes required to improve the A/R monitoring methodology:

a) *Strengths and weaknesses of the A/R baseline methodology:*

  i) *Strengths:*

  >>

  ii) *Weaknesses:*

  >>

b) *Any changes needed to improve the A/R baseline methodology:*

  i) *Minor changes:*

  >>

  ii) *Major changes:*

  >>

B. Details of the evaluation of the proposed new A/R methodology

I. Detailed recommendations on the proposed new A/R baseline methodology

In respect of the proposed new A/R baseline methodology, evaluate each section of CDM-AR-NMB. Please provide your comments section by section:

(1) Baseline scenario and eligibility of land

a) State the baseline approach selected:

>>

b) 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 A/R project type and regions/conditions:

>>

c) Explain whether the documentation provided explains how the A/R baseline scenario is to be identified and chosen (taking into account paragraph 20 and 21 of the A/R modalities and procedures).

>>

d) Explain the methodological basis for determining the baseline scenario, and *whether this basis is appropriate and adequate. and if not why?.*

>>

e) Explain whether, the methodology describes procedure for proving eligibility of land for CDM AR project activity. If yes, is the procedure adequate and appropriate and if not adequate describe the shortcomings.

>>

(2) Basis for demonstration of additionality

a) Explain whether the documentation shows how, through the use of the A/R baseline methodology, it can be demonstrated that the proposed A/R project activity is additional and therefore not the baseline scenario. If so, what are the tools provided by the project participants?

>>

b) Explain whether the basis for assessing additionality is appropriate and adequate:

>>

c) Explain how other considerations, such as national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances are taken into account:

>>

(3) Calculation / estimation of baseline net GHG removals by sinks

a) Explain how the methodology calculates / estimates baseline net GHG removals by sinks and whether the basis for calculating / estimation of baseline emissions is appropriate and adequate:
>>

b) Explain the basic underlying rationale for the choice of algorithms/formulae and /or models used for calculating / estimation of the baseline net GHG removals by sinks and the appropriateness and adequacy of the same :
>>

c) Explain whether the application of the A/R baseline methodology could result in a baseline scenario that reasonably represents the sum of the changes in carbon stocks in the carbon pools within the project boundary that would have occurred in the absence of the proposed CDM A/R project activity. (In evaluating this methodology, the expert could refer to the information contained in sections A-E of the draft CDM-AR-PDD).
>>

(4) Definition of the project boundary related to the A/R baseline methodology:

a) Assess the appropriateness and applicability of the A/R baseline methodology in relation to:
   i) Definition of the project boundary
   >>
   ii) Physical identification / delineation of the project boundary
   >>
   iii) Selection of Carbon pools / GHG gases and sinks / sources
   >>
   iv) Eligibility of land
   >>

b) Explain whether the method provided to define / identify / delineate project boundary is appropriate and adequate:
>>

(5) Assessment of the description of the proposed A/R baseline methodology and its appropriateness to the project

a) Explain whether the A/R baseline methodology has been described in an adequate manner:
>>

b) Explain 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-AR-PDD and submitted along with CDM-AR-NMB):
>>

(6) Key assumptions, parameters, formulae/algorithms, models and data sources for ex-ante actual net anthropogenic / net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks:
a) List the implicit and explicit key assumptions, parameters, formulae/algorithms, models and data sources:
>>
b) Explain whether the key assumptions/parameters are arrived at in a transparent manner:
>>
c) Explain whether the key assumptions, parameters, formula/algorithm and or models adequate? Identify those, if any, that are inadequate and explain why:
>>
d) Indicate which data sources are used (e.g. official statistics, expert judgement, proprietary data, IPCC Good Practice Guidance for LULUCF, commercial data and scientific literature). Is the data adequate to the scale of the project?

>>

e) Indicate the adequacy, consistency, accuracy and reliability of the default data used. Evaluate, to the extent possible, the quality of the data:

>>

f) State possible data gaps:

>>

(7) Assessment of uncertainties:

a) Explain whether the A/R baseline methodology includes the assessment of uncertainties regarding:

   i) If applicable, the selection of the carbon pools and the information indicating that this choice will not increase the expected net anthropogenic greenhouse gas removals by sinks:

   >>

   ii) Assumptions:

   >>

   iii) Algorithms/formulae and/or models:

   >>

   iv) Data:

   >>

b) Explain whether the A/R baseline methodology includes tools for the assessment of uncertainties. Are these tools adequate?

>>

(8) Leakage:

a) Explain how the A/R baseline methodology addresses any potential leakage due to the A/R project activity:

>>

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

>>

(9) Transparency and "conservativeness":

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

>>

b) Explain whether the A/R baseline methodology is conservative:

>>

c) Explain whether the baseline methodology is internally consistent, and if not, highlight which sections are inconsistent:

>>

(10) Any other comments:

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

>>

 b) Indicate any further comments:

 >>

II. Detailed recommendations on the proposed new A/R monitoring methodology
Evaluate each section of CDM-AR-NMM. Please provide your comments section by section:

(1) Assessment of the description of the proposed AR monitoring methodology:

a) Explain whether the proposed A/R monitoring methodology has been described in an adequate and appropriate manner:

>>

b) Explain whether this proposed A/R monitoring methodology is compatible with the proposed baseline methodology (described in the CDM-AR-NMB) and if not why?

>>

c) Explain whether the proposed A/R monitoring methodology is appropriate for the referred proposed project activity and the referred project context (described in Sections A- E of the draft CDM-AR-PDD and submitted along with CDM-AR-NMM):

>>

(2) Assessment of key assumptions/parameters:

a) List the implicit and explicit key assumptions, parameters, formulae/algorithms and models.

>>

b) Explain whether the key assumptions, parameters, formula/algorithm and/or models are adequate, and whether they have been arrived at in a transparent manner:

>>

c)   Are the key assumptions, parameters, formula/algorithm and/or models adequate? Identify those, if any, that are inadequate and explain why:

>>

(3) Assessment of key data sources and data quality:

a) Indicate which sources of data are used and how the data are obtained (e.g. official statistics, expert judgement, proprietary data, IPCC Good Practice Guidance for LULUCF, commercial data and scientific literature):

>>

b) Explain whether the data collected during the monitoring phase adequate for the estimation of the changes in the carbon pools and the emissions of greenhouse gases during the crediting period? Does the selection of the data take into account important processes of the project activity?

>>

c) Explain whether the data collected for the selection of the carbon pool transparent and verifiable? (refer to A/R Modalities and procedures, paragraph 21)

>>

d) Explain whether the frequency of recording reflect the dynamics of the processes that determine the changes in carbon stocks within the project boundary?

>>

e) Explain whether the frequency of recording reflect the dynamics of the processes that determine the emissions of greenhouse gases within the project boundary?

>>

f) Explain whether the sampling design (e.g. intensity and frequency) adequate to the accuracy level expected in the reporting?

>>

g) Explain whether the key assumptions (including default values), parameters, formulae/algorithms, data and/or models used in monitoring methodology adequate?

>>

h) Explain whether the overall plan for collection and archival adequate to successfully support the monitoring activities during the crediting period?

>>

(4) Leakage *(please list potential sources of leakage covered by the methodology and Explain whether there is any other potential source that has not been covered)*:
>>

(5) Quality assurance and control procedures:

Does the A/R monitoring methodology include such procedures? Are they adequate explain?
>>

(6) Any other comments:

a) State whether any other source of information (i.e. other than documentation on this proposed A/R 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-AR-NMex doc ID number	
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat	
Date of transmission to the A/R Working Group and EB	
Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site	