



**CDM Proposed new small scale methodology
expert form - review
(Version 01.1)**

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

Name of expert responsible for completing and submitting this form:

Related small scale submission number:

Note to reviewers:

Please provide recommendations on the proposed new small scale methodologies based on an assessment of the proposed methodology and of its application in sections A to C of the draft CDM-SSC-PDD, previous desk reviews (if applicable) 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 SSC WG recommendations.

>>

Title of the proposed new small scale methodology:

>>

EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED NEW SMALL SCALE METHODOLOGY BY THE DESK REVIEWER

A. Changes needed to improve the small scale methodology

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

(a) Major changes:

>>

(b) Minor changes:

>>

B. General information on the submitted proposed new small scale methodology

(1) One sentence describing the purpose of the small scale methodology:

>>

(2) Summary description of the new small scale methodology:

Short statements on how the proposed small scale methodology: 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 small scale methodology. Suggested length: 1/2 page.

>>

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

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

>>

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

>>

- (c) In particular, is the proposed new small scale methodology largely a simplification of an approved large scale methodology or a rejected proposal for a new large scale methodology? If so, indicate which methodology and why it was rejected by the EB:

>>

- (d) Indicate whether, and explain how, any other approved small scale 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 small scale methodology. If so, please indicate the reference number and the parts of the methodology that would need modification:

>>

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

>>

- (f) 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 small scale methodology

Evaluate each section of proposed new methodology. Please provide your comments section by section.

(1) Applicability conditions:

- (a) State the applicability conditions as provided in the proposed small scale methodology (*simply copy it*):

>>

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

>>

(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 this project boundary is appropriate. If not, outline required changes:

>>

(3) The baseline:

- (a) Explain the methodological basis for the proposed baseline and whether it 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:

>>

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

- (a) Explain how the methodology calculates baseline emissions and whether the basis for calculating baseline emissions is appropriate and adequate. If not, outline required changes:

>>

- (b) Explain how the methodology calculates project emissions and whether the basis for calculating project emissions is appropriate and adequate. If not, outline required changes:

>>

(5) Leakage:

- (a) State how the methodology addresses any potential leakage due to the project activity:

>>

- (b) Indicate whether the treatment for leakage is appropriate and adequate. If not, outline required changes:

>>

(6) Key assumptions:

- (a) List the implicit and explicit key assumptions and rationale for the methodology:

>>

- (b) Give your expert judgement on whether the assumptions are adequate. Identify those, if any, which are problematic and outline required changes:

>>

(7) Data and parameters NOT monitored: *(i.e. data that is determined only once and remains fixed throughout the crediting period)*

- (a) Indicate for all key data and parameters which data sources or default values are used and how the data or the measurements are obtained (e.g. official statistics, expert judgement):

>>

- (b) Explain the vintage of data recommended (in relation to the duration of the project crediting period) and whether the vintage of data is appropriate, indicating the period covered by the data. If not, outline required changes:

>>

- (c) Give your expert judgement on whether the data and the measurement procedures (if any) used are adequate, consistent, accurate and reliable. Identify those, if any, which are problematic and outline required changes:

>>

- (d) State possible data gaps:

>>

(8) Key data and parameters monitored: *(i.e. data that is determined throughout the crediting period)*

- (a) Indicate for all key data and parameters which data sources (e.g. official statistics, expert judgement) or measurement procedures are used:

>>

- (b) Give your expert judgement on whether the data sources and measurement procedures (if any) used are adequate, consistent, accurate and reliable. If not, outline required changes:

>>

- (c) Give your expert judgement on whether the monitoring frequency for the data and parameters is appropriate. If not, outline required changes:

>>

- (d) Give your expert judgement on whether the QA/QC procedures are appropriate. If not, outline required changes:

>>

- (e) State possible data gaps:

>>

(9) Assessment of uncertainties:

- Provide an assessment of uncertainties given (e.g. in determining baseline scenario, data sources, key assumptions).

>>

(10) Transparency, “conservativeness” and consistency:

- (a) Explain whether the methodology has been described in an adequate and transparent manner. If not, outline required changes:

>>

- (b) Explain whether the methodology is conservative, and if so, how:

>>

- (c) Explain whether the methodology is internally consistent, and if not, highlight which sections are inconsistent:

>>

(11) If relevant, state whether the proposed changes required for the methodology implementation on 2nd and 3rd crediting periods are appropriate:

>>

(12) State the baseline selected, indicate whether this is appropriate, and why:

>>

(13) State whether the proposed small scale methodology is appropriate for the proposed project activity and the referred project context (described in Sections A - C of the draft CDM-SSC-PDD and submitted along with the proposed methodology). If not, explain why:

>>

(14) Any other comments:

- (a) State which other source(s) of information (i.e. other than documentation on this proposed small scale methodology available on the UNFCCC CDM website) have been used by you in evaluating this small scale methodology. Please provide specific references:

>>

- (b) Indicate any further comments:

>>

Signature of desk reviewer

Date: / /

SECTION TO BE FILLED IN BY THE UNFCCC SECRETARIAT

Expert review (F-CDM-SSC-Nmexp.doc) id number:

Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat:

Date of transmission to the SSC WG:

Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM website:

History of the document

Version	Date	Nature of revision(s)
01.1	12 April 2012	Editorial changes to include new logo and other improvements.
01.0	EB 34, Annex 14 14 September 2007	Initial publication.
Decision Class: Regulatory Document Type: Form Business Function: Methodology		