Expert assessment form for proposed new methodology for CCS CDM project activities - lead review (CDM expert) (Version 01.0)

(To be used by methodology lead experts providing desk review for a proposed new methodology).

Name of expert responsible for completing and submitting this form:	
Related F-CDM-CCS-NM document ID number:	

Note to reviewers: Please provide recommendations on the proposed new baseline and monitoring methodologies based on an assessment of CDM-CCS-NM and of its application in sections A to C of the draft CDM-CCS-PDD, desk reviews and public input. Please ensure that the form is completed and that arguments and expert judgements are substantiated.

History of submission: *(to be communicated to reviewers by UNFCCC Secretariat)*

Note to reviewers: if the methodology is a resubmission, please read the previous version and associated CCS Working Group recommendations.

>>

Title of the proposed new baseline and monitoring methodology:

>>

EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED NEW METHODOLOGY BY THE DESK REVIEWER

A. Changes needed to improve the methodology

(1) Outline any changes needed to improve the methodology:

(a) Major changes:

>>

(b) Minor changes:

>>

B. General information on the submitted proposed new methodology

(1) Brief description on the following:

(a) Describe what the CDM project activities using this methodology consists of.

>>

(b) Describe the services provided by the CDM project activities, if any.

>>

(c) Describe, in which component, and how the GHG emissions reduced compared to the baseline scenario.

>>

(d) Assess whether the project activity and the baseline scenario provide the same level of service.

>>

(e) Is the compliance with the applicability conditions of the CCS-NM possible to be demonstrated and validated?

>>

(2) Summary description of the methodology:

Short statements on each on how the proposed methodology: identifies and characterizes the geological storage site (GSS), chooses the baseline scenario, demonstrates additionality, calculates baseline emissions, calculates project emissions, calculates leakage, calculates and monitors emission reductions.

Note to reviewers: This section should provide your stand-alone step-by-step summary description of the proposed new methodology. Suggested length: 1/2 page.

>>

(3) Relationship with approved or pending methodologies (if applicable):

(a) Does the proposed new methodology include part of an already-approved methodology or a methodology pending approval (see recent EB reports)? If so, please briefly note the relevant methodology reference numbers (AMXXXX or ACMXXXX), titles, and parts included.

>>

(b) In particular, is the proposed new methodology largely an amendment or extension of an approved methodology? (i.e. the methodology largely consists of expanding an approved methodology to cover additional project contexts, applicability conditions, etc., and is thus largely comprised of text from an existing methodology) If so, indicate whether the amendments or extensions are appropriate, and explain why.

>>

(c) Indicate whether, and explain how, any other approved methodology (not noted in response to the previous question) could currently, or with minor modifications, be used to calculate emission reductions from the project activity associated with the proposed new methodology. If so, please indicate the reference number and the parts of the methodology that would need modification.

>>

(d) Please briefly note any significant differences or inconsistencies (baseline emission calculations, leakage methods, and boundary definitions, etc.) between the proposed new methodology and already-approved methodology of similar scope.

>>

(e) To avoid potential repetition, feel free to provide one comprehensive answer here that covers questions (a) through (d).

>>

C. Details of the evaluation of the proposed new methodology

Evaluate each section of CDM-CCS-NM. Please provide your comments section by section:

(1) Applicability conditions:

(a) State the applicability conditions as provided in the CDM-CCS-NM (simply copy from the submitted

CDM-CCS-NM).

>>

(b) Explain whether the proposed applicability conditions are appropriate and adequate. If not, explain required changes.

>>

(c) Explain whether the guidance is provided to check the compliance of key applicability conditions of methodology with the project activity. 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 the project boundary adequately covers all the key components/emissions of project activity and baseline situation. If not, what further information could be included?

>>

(3) Identification and characterization of the GSS:

(a) State how the GSS is identified and characterized.

(b) Indicate whether this procedure is appropriate. If not, outline required changes.

(4) 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.

>>

(5) Methodological basis for calculating baseline emissions and emission reductions:

Baseline emissions:

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

>>

(b) Are all the necessary components of the 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-CCS-PDD consistent with the methodology?

>>

(g) Any other comments on baseline emissions.

>>

Project emissions:

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

>>

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

>>

(c) Are the project emission equations 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-CCS-PDD consistent with the methodology?

>>

(g) Any other comments on project emissions.

Emission reductions:

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

>>

(6) Leakage:

(a) Are the leakage emissions covered under methodology adequate enough and conservatively calculated?

>>

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

>>

(c) Any other comments on leakage emissions.

>>

(7) 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.

>>

(8) 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.

>>

(9) 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>.

>>

(10) Assess the baseline approach selected, indicate whether this is appropriate, and why:

>>

(11) Assess whether the proposed methodology is appropriate for the referred proposed project activity and the referred project context (described in Sections A - C of the draft CDM-CCS-PDD and submitted along with CDM-CCS-NM). If not, explain why:

>>

(12) 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: / /

SECTION BELOW TO BE FILLED IN BY UNFCCC SECRETARIAT	
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC Secretariat:	
Date of transmission to the CCS Working Group and EB:	
Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site:	

- - - - -

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		