



CDM: Proposed new AR methodology assessment form
*(To be used by AR WG members assessing the quality
of a proposed new methodology)*
(version 03.1)

Title of proposed new AR methodology:	
Related F-CDM-AR-NM document ID number	

Note to the person completing this form: Please assess the quality of the submitted new methodology according to paragraph 5 of the procedures for submission and consideration for a proposed new baseline and monitoring methodology for afforestation and reforestation project activities (version 03).

The responses to the evaluation criteria below shall be considered as substantiation to evaluate a case as 1 or 2.

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.

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 Afforestation and Reforestation Working Group.

Evaluation of the proposed new methodologies by the A/R WG Member:

No.	Evaluation criteria	YES	NO
1.	Coverage of the CDM-AR-NM sections as outlined in the applicable guidelines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	The language is transparent, precise and unambiguous to undertake a full assessment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.	The CDM-AR-NM reflects methodology-specific information and not project-specific information?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.	The CDM-AR-NM seems to be internally consistent, i.e. the applicability conditions, project boundary, procedure for estimation of the baseline net greenhouse gas removals by sinks, procedure for estimation of the actual net greenhouse gas removals by sinks, leakage, and monitoring section are consistent with each other?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.	Does the baseline methodology address the identification and selection of the most likely baseline scenario in a clear and concise way?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.	Calculating changes in carbon pools in the baseline scenario: are relevant formulas provided and explained?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.	Calculating changes in carbon pools, emissions by sources and leakage due to the project activity: are relevant formulas provided and explained?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8.	The additionality section has clear and concise presentation of methodological steps to assess additionality and relationships between them?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.	Proper, clear documentation and drafting of Proposed New Methodology: Monitoring in accordance with applicable guidelines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10.	If it is a resubmitted C case, does it sufficiently consider all the recommendations previously given?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11.	No other issue was identified that leads to a 2 rating?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

No.	Additional information		
A.	Is a similar methodology already under review / approved? (If YES, specify methodology ID number below)		
No.	Comments (please provide explanations for "NO" answers, if any)		
	1. 11.		
Information to be completed by the secretariat			
F-CDM-AR-NMas doc id number		F-CDM-AR-NMas-ARNM00xx	
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat			

History of the document

Version	Date	Nature of revision(s)
03.1	24 May 2012	Editorial changes to include new logo and other improvements.
03	EB32, Annex 19 22 Jun 2007	
02	EB23, Annex 17 3 Mar 2006	
01	EB18, Annex 05 25 Feb 2005	Initial publication.
Decision Class: Regulatory Document Type: Form Business Function: Methodology		