

 <p style="text-align: center;"><b>CDM: Proposed new methodology expert form - lead review (version 03)</b> (To be used by methodology lead experts providing desk review for a proposed new methodology)</p>	
Name of expert responsible for completing and submitting this form	
Related F-CDM-NM document ID number	
<p>Note to reviewers: Please provide recommendations on the proposed new baseline and monitoring methodologies based on an assessment of CDM-NM and of its application in sections A to C of the draft CDM-PDD, desk reviews and public input. Please ensure that the form is completed and that arguments and expert judgements are substantiated.</p>	
<p><b>History of submission</b> (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.  &gt;&gt;</p>	
<p><b>Title of the proposed new baseline methodology:</b>  &gt;&gt;</p>	
<b>Evaluation of the proposed new methodology by the desk reviewer</b>	
<b>A. Changes needed to improve the methodology</b>	
<p><b>(1) Outline any changes needed to improve the methodology:</b>  a) Major changes:  &gt;&gt;  b) Minor changes:  &gt;&gt;</p>	
<b>B. General information on the submitted proposed new methodology</b>	
<p><b>(1) One sentence describing the purpose of the methodology.</b>  &gt;&gt;</p>	
<p><b>(2) Summary description of the methodology.</b>  Short statements on each on how the proposed methodology: chooses the baseline scenario, demonstrates additionality, calculates baseline emissions, calculates project emissions, calculates leakage, calculates and monitors emission reductions.  Note to reviewers: this section should provide your stand-alone step-by-step summary description of the proposed new methodology. Suggested length: 1/2 page.  &gt;&gt;</p>	

**(3) Relationship with approved or pending methodologies (if applicable).**

a) Does the proposed new methodology include part of an already-approved methodology or a methodology pending approval (see recent EB reports)? If so, please briefly note the relevant methodology reference numbers (AMXXXX or ACMXXXX), titles, and parts included.

&gt;&gt;

b) In particular, is the proposed new methodology largely an amendment or extension of an approved methodology? (i.e. the methodology largely consists of expanding an approved methodology to cover additional project contexts, applicability conditions, etc., and is thus largely comprised of text from an existing methodology) If so, indicate whether the amendments or extensions are appropriate, and explain why.

&gt;&gt;

c) Indicate whether, and explain how, any other approved methodology (not noted in response to the previous question) could currently, or with minor modifications, be used to calculate emission reductions from the project activity associated with the proposed new methodology. If so, please indicate the reference number and the parts of the methodology that would need modification.

&gt;&gt;

d) Please briefly note any significant differences or inconsistencies (baseline emission calculations, leakage methods, and boundary definitions, etc.) between the proposed new methodology and already-approved methodology of similar scope.

&gt;&gt;

e) To avoid potential repetition, feel free to provide one comprehensive answer here that covers questions a) through d).

&gt;&gt;

**C. Details of the evaluation of the proposed new methodology**

Evaluate each section of CDM-NM. Please provide your comments section by section:

**(1) Applicability conditions**

a) State the applicability conditions as provided in the CDM-NM (simply copy from the submitted CDM-NM)

&gt;&gt;

b) Explain whether the proposed applicability conditions are appropriate and adequate. If not, explain required changes:

&gt;&gt;

**(2) Definition of the project boundary**

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

i) Gases and sources

&gt;&gt;

ii) Physical delineation

&gt;&gt;

b) Indicate whether this project boundary is appropriate. If not, outline required changes:

&gt;&gt;

**(3) Determining the baseline scenario and demonstrating additionality**

a) Explain the methodological basis for determining the baseline scenario, and whether this basis is appropriate and adequate. If not, outline required changes:

>>

b) Explain 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.

>>

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) Explain whether the basis for assessing additionality is appropriate and adequate. If not, outline required changes:

>>

**(4) Methodological basis for calculating baseline emissions and emission reductions**

a) Explain how the methodology calculates baseline emissions and whether the basis for calculating baseline emissions is appropriate and adequate. If not, outline required changes:

>>

b) Explain how the methodology calculates project emissions and whether the basis for calculating project emissions is appropriate and adequate. If not, outline required changes:

>>

**(5) Leakage**

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

>>

b) Indicate whether the treatment for leakage is appropriate and adequate. If not, outline required changes:

>>

**(6) Key assumptions**

a) List the implicit and explicit key assumptions and rationale for the methodology:

>>

b) Give your expert judgement on whether the assumptions are adequate. Identify those, if any, which are problematic and outline required changes:

>>

**(7) Data and parameters NOT monitored (i.e. data that is determined only once and remains fixed throughout the crediting period)**

a) Indicate for all key data and parameters which data sources or default values are used and how the data or the measurements are obtained (e.g. official statistics, expert judgement):

>>

b) Explain the vintage of data recommended (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. If not, outline required changes:

>>

c) Give your expert judgement on whether the data and the measurement procedures (if any) used are adequate, consistent, accurate and reliable. Identify those, if any, which are problematic and outline required changes:

&gt;&gt;

**d) State possible data gaps:**

&gt;&gt;

**(8) Key data and parameters monitored** (i.e. data that is determined throughout the crediting period)**a) Indicate for all key data and parameters which data sources (e.g. official statistics, expert judgement) or measurement procedures are used:**

&gt;&gt;

**b) Give your expert judgement on whether the data sources and measurement procedures (if any) used are adequate, consistent, accurate and reliable. If not, outline required changes:**

&gt;&gt;

**c) Give your expert judgement on whether the monitoring frequency for the data and parameters is appropriate. If not, outline required changes:**

&gt;&gt;

**d) Give your expert judgement on whether the QA/QC procedures are appropriate. If not, outline required changes:**

&gt;&gt;

**e) State possible data gaps:**

&gt;&gt;

**(9) Assessment of uncertainties***Provide an assessment of uncertainties given (e.g. in determining baseline scenario, data sources, key assumptions)*

&gt;&gt;

**(10) Transparency, “conservativeness” and consistency****a) Explain whether the methodology has been described in an adequate and transparent manner. If not, outline required changes:**

&gt;&gt;

**b) Explain whether the methodology is conservative, and if so, how:**

&gt;&gt;

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

&gt;&gt;

**(11) If relevant, state whether the proposed changes required for the methodology implementation on 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> crediting periods are appropriate.**

&gt;&gt;

**(12) State the baseline approach selected, indicate whether this is appropriate, and why.**

&gt;&gt;

**(13) State whether the proposed methodology is appropriate for the referred proposed project activity and the referred project context (described in Sections A - C of the draft CDM-PDD and submitted along with CDM-NM). If not, explain why:**

>>

**(14) Any other comments**

a) State which other source(s) of information (i.e. other than documentation on this proposed methodology available on the UNFCCC CDM web site) have been used by you in evaluating this methodology. Please provide specific references:

>>

b) Indicate any further comments:

>>

Signature of desk reviewer .....

Date: / /

**Information to be completed by the secretariat**

F-CDM-Nmex_3d 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	