CDM: Proposed new methodology - public comment form (version 02) (Available electronically on the UNFCCC CDM web site. The layout may differ from this hardcopy form)				
	/organization responsible for submitting this form			
Contact information (address, phone, e-mail)				
Related F-CDM-NM document ID number				
Based on an as the proposed ne	w baseline and /or monitoring meth	F-CDM-NMM and the draft CDM-PDD, evaluate		
Recommendations on the baseline methodology:				
Title of baseline methodology:>>				
i.	Conditions under which methodo project type, region, data availab	plogy is applicable to other potential projects (e.g. ility, etc.):		
ii.	Strengths and weaknesses of the methodology:			
iii.	Any changes needed to improve a. Minor changes: b. Major changes:	the methodology:		
Recommendatio	ons on the monitoring methodology	(ies):		
	ng methodology(ies): >>			
i.		blogy is applicable to other potential projects (e.g. illity, etc.):		
ii.	Strengths and weaknesses of th	e methodology:		
iii.	Any changes needed to improve a. Minor changes: b. Major changes:	the methodology:		
Details of the	comments on the proposed n	ew methodology:		
Section 2: Nev	v baseline methodology (<i>specify</i>	title here):		
Section 2.1: Short description of methodology (including assessment of which approach was used)				
a) description of methodology				
>> b) approach used				
>>				

Annex 3 - Report of sixth meeting of the Meth Panel F-CDM-NMpu

c) sum	mary indication of why the approach is most appropriate
>>	
	2.2.: Basis for determining the baseline scenario:
	s the documentation explain how the baseline is chosen, taking into account paragraph
>>	
b) Wha >>	t is the underlying rationale for algorithms/formulae (e.g. marginal vs. average etc).
,	s the methodology demonstrate that a project activity is additional and therefore not the e scenario?
>>	
the bas	does the methodology demonstrate that a project activity is additional and therefore not eline scenario?
,	t is your assessment of the appropriateness and adequacy of the basis for determining t e scenario?
>>	
Sectior	2.3. Assessment of methodology description
a) what >>	t is the adequacy of the methodology description?
	t is the appropriateness of the methodology to the proposed project activity and project for which it is suggested?
>>	
	s the baseline scenario reasonably represent the anthropogenic emissions by sources of ouse gases that would occur in the absence of the proposed project activity? Explain.
Sectior	2.4: Assessment of formulae/algorithms:
a) Doe to othe	s the methodology description include a process and generic formulae that can be applied r potential project activities? (if not, it will be considered as a project-specific methodology not appropriate to use in other situations)
>>	
b) Wha >>	t is the spatial level of data used to determine the baseline and is this level appropriate?
	t is the vintage of data (compared to the start of the project crediting period) (number of and is this vintage of data appropriate?
>>	
Sectior	2.5. Definition of the project boundary related to the baseline methodology:
Covera	ge of project boundary:
	a. Gases and sources
	>>
	b. Physical delineation
	>>
ls t	his project boundary appropriate?
15 1	

Annex 3 - Report of sixth meeting of the Meth Panel

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). >> Section 2.7. Assessment of uncertainties: Does the methodology include an assessment of uncertainties in: a) basis for determining the baseline scenario? >> b) formulae/algorithms? >> c) data sources and assumptions? >> d) are the uncertainties presented reasonable? >> Section 2.8. Leakage a) How does the baseline methodology addresses any potential leakage of the project activity? >> b) Is this an appropriate and adequate treatment for leakage? >> Section 2.9. Transparency and conservativeness: a) was the baseline methodology developed in a transparent way? >> b) Is the baseline methodology conservative? >> Section 3. Other strengths and weaknesses of the baseline methodology: >> Section 4. Other considerations, such as a description of how national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances have been taken into account: >>

Section 5. Applicability of methodology across project types and regions Section 6. Any other comments a) Has the approach been applied to the project appropriately? >> b) 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? >> New monitoring methodology(ies) In respect of new monitoring methodology(ies), evaluate each section of Annex 4. Please provide your comments section by section: Brief description of new methodology: Description of new methodology: >> Assessment of whether and why this methodology is appropriate: >> Data: Where are the data obtained (e.g. official statistics, expert judgement)? >> Leakage: >> Assumptions used: a) list the key implicit and explicit assumptions (if any) >> b) are how the key assumptions arrived at transparent? >> c) 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). >> QA/QC procedures: >> Potential strengths and weaknesses of the methodology. >> Application of methodology elsewhere: >> Please also address the following Applicability of methodology across project types and regions Any other comments

Signature of Meth Panel Chair					
Signature of Meth Panel Vice-Chair Date: / /					
F-CDM-NMpu doc id number					
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat					
Date of transmission to the EB					