

 <b>CDM: Proposed new AR methodology assessment form</b> <i>To be used by AR WG members assessing the quality of a proposed new methodology</i> <b>(version 03)</b>			
<i>Title of proposed new AR methodology:</i>			
<i>Related F-CDM-AR-NM document ID number</i>			
<p><i>Note to the person completing this form: Please assess the quality of the submitted new methodology according to paragraph 5 of the procedures for submission and consideration for a proposed new baseline and monitoring methodology for afforestation and reforestation project activities (version 03).</i></p> <p><i>The responses to the evaluation criteria below shall be considered as substantiation to evaluate a case as 1 or 2.</i></p> <p><i>If one of the evaluation criteria below is checked as NO the documentation will be graded as 2 and is to be sent back to the project participants.</i></p> <p><i>If all the evaluation criteria below are checked as YES the documentation will be graded as 1 and shall be considered as received by the Board and be forwarded by the secretariat for consideration of the Board and the Afforestation and Reforestation Working Group.</i></p>			
<i>Evaluation of the proposed new methodologies by the A/R WG Member:</i>			
<i>No.</i>	<i>Evaluation criteria</i>	<i>YES</i>	<i>NO</i>
1.	Coverage of the CDM-AR-NM sections as outlined in the applicable guidelines?		
2.	The language is transparent, precise and unambiguous to undertake a full assessment?		
3.	The CDM-AR-NM reflects methodology-specific information and not project-specific information?		
4.	The CDM-AR-NM seems to be internally consistent, i.e. the applicability conditions, project boundary, procedure for estimation of the baseline net greenhouse gas removals by sinks, procedure for estimation of the actual net greenhouse gas removals by sinks, leakage, and monitoring section are consistent with each other?		
5.	Does the baseline methodology address the identification and selection of the most likely baseline scenario in a clear and concise way?		
6.	Calculating changes in carbon pools in the baseline scenario: are relevant formulas provided and explained?		
7.	Calculating changes in carbon pools, emissions by sources and leakage due to the project activity: are relevant formulas provided and explained?		
8.	The additionality section has clear and concise presentation of methodological steps to assess additionality and relationships between them?		
9.	Proper, clear documentation and drafting of Proposed New Methodology: Monitoring in accordance with applicable guidelines?		

10.	If it is a resubmitted C case, does it sufficiently consider all the recommendations previously given?		
11.	No other issue was identified that leads to a 2 rating?		
No.	<i>Additional information</i>		
A.	Is a similar methodology already under review / approved? (If YES, specify methodology ID number below)		
No.	<i>Comments (please provide explanations for "NO" answers, if any)</i>		
	1. . 11.		
<b>Information to be completed by the secretariat</b>			
F-CDM-AR-NMas doc id number		F-CDM-AR-NMas-ARNM00xx	
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat			