




F-CDM-NMex_Second

 <p style="text-align: center;">CDM: Proposed new methodology expert form - second review (CDM Expert) (version 04) <i>(To be used by methodology lead second experts providing desk review for a proposed new methodology)</i></p>	
<i>Name of expert responsible for completing and submitting this form</i>	
<i>Related F-CDM-NM document ID number</i>	
<p><i>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.</i></p>	
<p>History of submission <i>(to be communicated to reviewers by UNFCCC Secretariat):</i> <i>Note to reviewers: If the methodology is a resubmission, please read the previous version and associated Meth Panel recommendations.</i></p>	
<p>Title of the proposed new baseline methodology:</p>	
<p>Evaluation of the proposed new methodology by the desk reviewer</p>	
<p>A. Changes needed to improve the methodology</p>	
<p>(1) Outline any changes needed to improve the methodology:</p> <p>(a) <i>Major changes:</i> >></p> <p>(b) <i>Minor changes:</i> >></p>	
<p>B. Details of the evaluation of the proposed new methodology</p>	
<p><i>Evaluate each section of CDM-NM. Please provide your comments section by section:</i></p>	
<p>(1) Applicability conditions</p> <p>(a) <i>State the applicability conditions as provided in the CDM-NM (simply copy from the submitted CDM-NM).</i> >></p> <p>(b) <i>Explain whether the proposed applicability conditions are appropriate and adequate. If not, explain required changes:</i> >></p> <p>(c) Explain whether the guidance is provided to check whether the project activity applicable</p>	

**F-CDM-NMex_Second**

under the methodology comply with the key applicability conditions of methodology. Whether such provision of guidance is needed for some of the conditions? If yes, what are the possible means to demonstrate compliance?

>>

(2) Definition of the project boundary

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

(i) Gases and sources

>>

(ii) Physical delineation

>>

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

(b) Indicate whether the project boundary adequately covers all the key components/ emissions of project activity and baseline situation. If not, which further components/ emission could be included?

>>

(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***Baseline emissions***

(a) Is the baseline situation of methodology well described?

>>

(b) Are all the necessary components of baseline scenario described under the methodology



and well covered under baseline emissions?

>>

(c) Are the baseline emission equations correct and consistent?

>>

(d) Offer comments on the conservativeness of baseline emissions.

>>

(e) Offer comments on the practical aspects of estimation of baseline emissions.

>>

(f) Are the baseline emissions under the CDM-PDD consistent with the methodology?

>>

(g) Any other comments on baseline emissions.

>>

Project emissions

(a) Is the project situation of the methodology well described?

>>

(b) Are all necessary components of the project technology described under the methodology and well covered under project emissions?

>>

(c) Are the project emission equations technically correct and consistent?

>>

(d) Offer your comments on the conservativeness of project emissions.

>>

(e) Offer comments on the practical aspects of estimation of project emissions.

>>

(f) Are the project emissions under the CDM-PDD consistent with the methodology?

>>

(g) Any other comments on project emissions.

>>

Emission reductions

Offer your comments, whether the technology referred to in the methodology can lead to emission reductions as stated in the PDD? What are the short-term or long-term risks and uncertainties associated?

~~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:~~



F-CDM-NMex_Second

~~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) Are the leakage emissions in the methodology adequate and are they conservatively calculated?~~

>>

~~(b) Are the leakage emissions under the CDM-PDD consistent with the methodology?~~

>>

~~(c) Any other comments on leakage emissions.~~

~~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:~~

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

~~(a) Explain whether the vintage (in relation to the duration of the project crediting period) of data is appropriate, indicating the period covered by the data. If not, outline required changes:~~

>>

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

>>

~~(c) Are the parameters described in the monitoring methodology consistent with the baseline emission sections? If not, state possible data gaps:~~

>>

~~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:~~



F-CDM-NMex_Second

~~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:~~

~~d) State possible data gaps:~~

(87) Key data and parameters monitored (i.e. data that is determined throughout the crediting period)

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

~~>>~~

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

~~>>~~

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

~~>>~~

~~d) Are the parameters described in the monitoring methodology consistent with the project and leakage emission sections? If not, state possible data gaps:~~

~~a) Indicate for all key data and parameters which data sources (e.g. official statistics, expert judgement) or measurement procedures are used:~~

~~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:~~

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

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

~~e) State possible data gaps:~~

(9) Assessment of uncertainties

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

(10) Transparency, “conservativeness” and consistency

~~a) Explain whether the methodology has been described in an adequate and transparent manner. If not, outline required changes:~~

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

~~c) Explain whether the methodology is internally consistent, and if not, highlight which sections~~



F-CDM-NMex_Second

are inconsistent:

(148) If relevant, state whether the proposed changes required for the methodology implementation on 2nd and 3rd crediting periods are consistent with the “Tool to assess the validity of the original/current baseline and to update the baseline at the renewal of a crediting period” which is an annex to the “Procedures for renewal of the crediting period of a registered CDM project activity”, available at the following website. https://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Procedures/reg_proc04.pdf.

If relevant, state whether the proposed changes required for the methodology implementation on 2nd and 3rd crediting periods are appropriate.

(129) 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_2d 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	



History of the document

Version	Date	Nature of revision
04	EB 52, Annex 12 12 February 2010	Revised in order to reflect the structure of the “Procedure for the submission and consideration of a proposed new baseline and monitoring methodology for large-scale CDM project activities”, as approved by the Board at its fifty-second meeting.
03	EB 25, Annex 12 28 July 2006	Revised in order to reflect the structure of the new baseline and monitoring form as approved by the Board at its twenty-fourth meeting as well as to improve the guidelines for completion of the CDM-PDD.
02	21 October 2005	Revised to add (8) on relevance of changes on 2 nd and 3 rd crediting period.
01	EB 21, Annex 5 30 September 2005	Initial adoption as F-CDM-NMex_Second. Revised to separate the form F-CDM-Nmex (version 04) into two separate forms; one for lead reviewer and, another for second reviewer. These two forms were also adjusted to take into account the current “Procedures for submission and consideration of a proposed new baseline and monitoring methodology”.
History of the document for F-CDM-Nmex		
04	04 February 2005	Minor editorial revision.
03	EB 10, Annex 3, 29 July 2003	The Board agreed on the forms.
02	---	---
01	EB 08, Annex 2, 20 March 2003	Initial adoption.
Decision Class: Regulatory		
Document Type: Form		
Business Function: Methodology		