



CDM: Proposed New Methodology
Meth Panel recommendation to the Executive Board
(version 02)

(To be used by methodology panel to make a recommendation regarding a

<i>Date of Meth Panel meeting:</i>	
<i>Related F-CDM-NM document ID number (already available to EB members)</i>	
<i>Related F-CDM-NMex document ID number(s) (electronically available to EB members)</i>	
<i>Related F-CDM-NMpu document ID number(s) (electronically available to EB members)</i>	
Final/draft [delete as appropriate] Recommendations by the Meth Panel	
<i>Recommendations on the baseline methodology: (highlight choice made)</i>	
Title of baseline methodology:>>	
<p>a. Methodology approved/Approved with minor changes as attached</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">i. Conditions under which methodology is applicable to other potential projects (e.g. project type, region, data availability, etc.) >></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">ii. Minor changes >></p>	
<p>b. Methodology may be approved, subjected to required changes</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">i. Conditions under which methodology is applicable to other potential projects (e.g. project type, region, data availability, etc.) >></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">ii. Required changes >></p> <p><i>(Project participants shall make required changes in the proposed new methodology and send it back to the Meth panel. The proposed project new methodology will be reconsidered by the Meth Panel if changes recommended are correctly prepared by project participants. The Executive Board will only consider this proposed new methodology after changes proposed are made and reconsidered by the Meth panel)</i></p>	
<p>c. Methodology not approved</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">i. Reasons for non approval >></p> <p><i>(May be resubmitted in accordance with the procedures for submission and consideration of proposed new methodologies of the Executive Board)</i></p>	

Recommendations on the monitoring methodology(ies):
Title of monitoring methodology(ies): >>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Methodology approved/Approved with minor changes as attached <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Conditions under which methodology is applicable to other potential projects (e.g. project type, region, data availability, etc.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> >> ii. Minor changes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> >>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Methodology may be approved, subjected to required changes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Conditions under which methodology is applicable to other potential projects (e.g. project type, region, data availability, etc.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> >> ii. Required changes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> >> <p><i>(Project participants shall make required changes in the proposed new methodology and send it back to the Meth panel. The proposed project new methodology will be reconsidered by the Meth Panel if changes recommended are correctly prepared by project participants. The Executive Board will only consider this proposed new methodology after changes proposed are made and reconsidered by the Meth panel)</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Methodology not approved <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Reasons for non approval <ul style="list-style-type: none"> >> <p><i>(May be resubmitted in accordance with the procedures for submission and consideration of proposed new methodologies of the Executive Board)</i></p>
Details of the evaluation of the proposed new methodology by the Meth Panel:
Section 2: New baseline methodology(ies) (specify title here):
<p>Section 2.1: Short description of methodology (including assessment of which approach was used)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>description of methodology</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> >> b) <i>approach used</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> >> c) <i>summary indication of why the approach is most appropriate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> >>
<p>Section 2.2.: Basis for determining the baseline scenario:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>Does the documentation explain how the baseline is chosen, taking into account paragraph 45(e)?</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> >> b) <i>What is the underlying rationale for algorithms/formulae (e.g. marginal vs. average etc).</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> >>

c) Does the methodology demonstrate that a project activity is additional and therefore not the baseline scenario? (if not, not approve the methodology)

>>

d) How does the methodology demonstrate that a project activity is additional and therefore not the baseline scenario?

>>

e) What is your assessment of the appropriateness and adequacy of the basis for determining the baseline scenario?

>>

Section 2.3. Assessment of methodology description

a) what is the adequacy of the methodology description?

>>

b) What is the appropriateness of the methodology to the proposed project activity and project context for which it is suggested?

>>

c) Does the baseline scenario reasonably represent the anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases that would occur in the absence of the proposed project activity? Explain.

>>

Section 2.4: Assessment of formulae/algorithms:

a) Does the methodology description include a process and generic formulae that can be applied to other potential project activities? (if not, it will be considered as a project-specific methodology that is not appropriate to use in other situations)

>>

b) What is the spatial level of data used to determine the baseline and is this level appropriate?

>>

c) What is the vintage of data (compared to the start of the project crediting period) (number of years) and is this vintage of data appropriate?

>>

Section 2.5. Definition of the project boundary related to the baseline methodology:

Coverage of project boundary:

a. Gases and sources

>>

b. Physical delineation

>>

Is this project boundary appropriate?

>>

Section 2.6: Key parameters/assumptions:

a) list the key implicit and explicit assumptions (if any)

>>

b) where are the data obtained (e.g. official statistics, expert judgement)?

>>

c) are how the key assumptions arrived at transparent?

>>

d) what is the acceptability of these assumptions? (e.g. your expert judgement on the reliability, accuracy, adequacy of the emission factors, activity data and other assumptions).

>>

<p>Section 2.7. Assessment of uncertainties: <i>Does the methodology include an assessment of uncertainties in:</i> a) <i>basis for determining the baseline scenario?</i> >> b) <i>formulae/algorithms?</i> >> c) <i>data sources and assumptions?</i> >> d) <i>are the uncertainties presented reasonable?</i> >></p>
<p>Section 2.8. Leakage a) <i>How does the baseline methodology addresses any potential leakage of the project activity?</i> >> b) <i>Is this an appropriate and adequate treatment for leakage?</i> >></p>
<p>Section 2.9. Transparency and conservativeness: a) <i>was the baseline methodology developed in a transparent way?</i> >> b) <i>Is the baseline methodology conservative?</i> >></p>
<p>Section 3. Other strengths and weaknesses of the baseline methodology: >></p>
<p>Section 4. Other considerations, such as a description of how national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances have been taken into account: >></p>
<p>Section 5. Applicability of methodology across project types and regions</p>
<p>Section 6. Any other comments a) <i>Has the approach been applied to the project appropriately?</i> >> b) <i>Other than documentation on this proposed project activity available on the UNFCCC website, has any other documentation has been used in evaluating this project, and if so, what?</i> >></p>
<p>New monitoring methodology(ies)</p>
<p><i>In respect of new monitoring methodology(ies), evaluate each section of Annex 4. Please provide your comments section by section:</i> Brief description of new methodology: <i>Description of new methodology:</i> >> <i>Assessment of whether and why this methodology is appropriate:</i> >> Data: <i>Where are the data obtained (e.g. official statistics, expert judgement)?</i> >></p>

<p>Leakage:</p> <p>>></p> <p>Assumptions used:</p> <p>a) <i>list the key implicit and explicit assumptions (if any)</i></p> <p>>></p> <p>b) <i>are how the key assumptions arrived at transparent?</i></p> <p>>></p> <p>c) <i>what is the acceptability of these assumptions? (e.g. your expert judgement on the reliability, accuracy, adequacy of the emission factors, activity data and other assumptions).</i></p> <p>>></p> <p>QA/QC procedures:</p> <p>>></p> <p>Potential strengths and weaknesses of the methodology:</p> <p>>></p> <p>Application of methodology elsewhere:</p> <p>>></p>	
<p>Please also address the following</p> <p>Applicability of methodology across project types and regions</p>	
<p>Any other comments</p>	
<p>Signature of Meth Panel Chair Date: / /</p> <p>Signature of Meth Panel Vice-Chair Date: / /</p>	
<p>F-CDM-NMmp doc id number</p>	
<p>Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat</p>	
<p>Date of transmission to the EB</p>	