

 CDM: Proposed new methodology assessment form (version 04) <i>(To be used by meth panel members assessing the quality of a proposed new methodology)</i>			
<i>Title of proposed new methodology:</i>			
<i>Related F-CDM-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 the “Procedures for submission and consideration of a proposed new methodology”.</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 Meth Panel.</i></p>			
<i>Evaluation of the proposed new methodologies by Meth Panel Member:</i>			
<i>No.</i>	<i>Evaluation criteria</i>	<i>YES</i>	<i>NO</i>
1.	Coverage of the CDM-NM sections as outlined in the applicable guidelines.		
2.	The language is sufficiently transparent, precise and unambiguous language of methodology enough to undertake a full assessment.		
3.	The proposed methodology reflects methodology-specific information and not project-specific information.		
4.	The baseline methodology is internally consistent i.e., the applicability conditions, project boundary, baseline emissions estimation procedure, project emission estimation procedure, leakage, and monitoring section are consistent with each other.		
5.	The baseline scenario identification has a clear and concise presentation of methodological steps to identify baseline scenario and description of baseline scenario to which the methodology is applicable. Does the baseline methodology seem to address the identification and selection of the most likely baseline scenario candidate?		
6.	The additionality section has clear and concise presentation of methodological steps to assess additionality and relationships between them.		
7.	The emission reductions calculation section has: relevant formula provided and all variables used adequately explained.		
8.	The baseline methodology is internally consistent with the monitoring methodology, which is clearly documented and draft in accordance with applicable guidelines.		
9.	If it is a resubmitted C case, all the issues raised in does it considering all the previous recommendations previously given been are addressed or in case		

	of non-addressal whether the are sufficiently/ properly proper explained. ation given by PPs.---		
10.	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. . .10.		
Information to be completed by the secretariat			
F-CDM-NMas doc id number		F-CDM-NMas-NM00xx	
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat			