Assessment form for proposed new methodology for CCS CDM project activities (Version 01.0)

(To be used by CCS Working Group members assessing the quality of a proposed new methodology).

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

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".

The responses to the evaluation criteria below shall be considered as evidence for the evaluation of a case as qualified or disqualified.

Each of the ten questions below carries a score of either 0 or 1. Where a score of 1 indicates that the submission is in compliance with the requirements related to the question, and a score of 0 indicates non-compliance. If the methodology, after totalling the scores for each question, does not get a total score of 10, the documentation will be graded as "disqualified" for the consideration of the CCS Working Group and is to be sent back to the DoE/project participants. For questions that receive a score of 0, the rationale for providing this score will be included in order to provide relevant feedback to the developers of the proposed new methodology.

If the proposed new methodology receives a score of 10, the documentation will be graded as "qualified" and shall be considered as received by the Board and be forwarded by the secretariat for consideration of the Board and the CCS Working Group.

Only those methodologies, which are in compliance with the relevant CMP decisions and the EB guidelines and decisions, shall be pre-assessed.

Evaluation of the proposed new methodologies by CCS Working Group member:

No.	Evaluation criteria	Score (1 or 0)
1.	Does the proposal (PNM) cover all the CDM-CCS-NM sections as outlined in the applicable guidelines? Present the methodology steps as one might present a recipe. It should include all diagrams, algorithms, formulae, and step-by-step procedures needed to apply the methodology and validate the project activity. The completed form shall provide stand-alone replicable methodologies. For any reference to secondary documents other than those approved by CDM-EB, the documents should be made available to the CCS Working Group, indicating whether the document is public or confidential.	
	Rationale for the score "0"/ remarks:	
2.	Is the language sufficiently transparent, precise and unambiguous to undertake a full assessment? Text shall be clear and succinct, well-written, and logically sequenced. It shall describe the procedures in a manner that is sufficiently explicit to enable the methodology to be assessed by the CCS Working Group and used by methodology users. It shall be possible for projects applying the methodology to be subjected to a validation and/or verification.	
	Rationale for the score "0" / remarks:	

3.	• Is the compliance with the applicability conditions of the PNM possible to demonstrate and validate? • Are any threats to the environmental integrity[1] of the methodology identified in the applicability conditions, for which safeguards are not taken?	
	Rationale for the score "0" / remarks:	
4.	• Does the PNM cover all the GHG emission sources and types that are related to the project activities covered by the methodology? • Is the project boundary clearly defined in the PNM? • Are the components of the project activities covered by the PNM and the way they achieve emission reduction clearly described? • Is it clear whether the project activities covered by the PNM deliver services? What the services are? Are the users of the services identified?	
	Rationale for the score "0"/remarks:	
5.	Is the baseline methodology internally consistent? i.e., the baseline approach, the applicability conditions, project boundary, baseline emissions estimation approach, project emission estimation approach, leakage, and monitoring section are consistent with each other.	
	Rationale for the score "0"/remarks:	
6.	• Does the procedure for identification of baseline scenario provide a clear and concise presentation of methodological steps? • Does the PNM clearly identify the baseline scenario(s) to which the methodology is applicable? • Does the approach for baseline scenario identification include sufficient requirements to ensure that most plausible baseline scenario is selected? • Is this approach clearly applied in the underlying CDM-CCS-PDD? • Are there any threats to the environmental integrity which are not addressed by the proposed approach?	
	Rationale for the score "0"/remarks:	

[1] The environmental integrity of a CDM methodology is retained when the methodology ascertains that emission reductions achieved by project activities applying the methodology are real, permanent, measurable, verifiable and additional.

7.	• Does the approach for assessment and demonstration of additionality provide a clear and concise presentation of methodological steps? • Is the approach in line with EB guidelines for applying barriers and investment analysis? • Is this approach clearly applied in the underlying CDM-CCS-PDD? • Are there any threats to the environmental integrity which are not addressed by the proposed approach?	
	Rationale for the score "0"/remarks:	
8.	• Do the sections on baseline emissions, project emissions, leakage emissions and emission reductions contain relevant equations? • Do the equations adequately represent the underlying project activity or technology? • Are all variables used in the equations adequately described? • For each variable in the equations, is it clear whether it shall be (i) calculated, (ii) determined once and not monitored, or (iii) monitored? • Do the equations allow for accurate/conservative estimation of emission reduction? • Are there any threats to the environmental integrity which are not addressed by the proposed approach?	
	Rationale for the score "0"/remarks:	
9.	• Do the sections (i) data/parameters not to be monitored and (ii) data/parameters to be monitored cover all variables used in the equations? • Do the monitoring tables provide clear approaches to determine the parameters and apply QA/QC procedures? • Is the vintage of data clearly defined? • Are uncertainties and accuracy of instrumentation taken into account, where relevant?	
	Rationale for the score "0"/remarks:	
10.	If it is a resubmitted PNM, are all the issues raised in the previous recommendations addressed or are sufficiently/properly explained?	
	Rationale for the score "0"/remarks:	
	Total Score:	
No.	**Additional information**	
A.	Is a similar methodology already under review/approved? (If YES, specify methodology ID number below)	☐ Yes ☐ No

	Methodology ID number:	

SECTION BELOW TO BE FILLED IN BY UNFCCC SECRETARIAT	
F-CDM-CCS-NMAS doc id number:	F-CDM-CCS-NMAS-NM00xx
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC Secretariat:	

- - - - -

History of the document

Version	Date	Nature of revision(s)
01.0	24 May 2012	Initial publication.
Decision Class: Regulatory **Document Type**: Form **Business Function**: Methodology		