



**New baseline and monitoring methodology
initial assessment form
(Version 01.0)**

INFORMATION TO BE COMPLETED BY THE SECRETARIAT

Title of proposed new methodology:

Date when initial assessment is completed:

Note for completing below:

Please assess the quality of the submitted new methodology according to the “Procedure: Development, revision and clarification of baseline and monitoring methodologies and methodological tools” (CDM-EB70-A36-PROC).

The responses to the evaluation criteria below shall be considered as evidence for the evaluation of a case as qualified or unqualified. 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 all the requirements related to the applicable evaluation criteria in each question, and a score of 0 indicates non-compliance. Please note that Question No.7 includes a specific evaluation criterion for a proposed large-scale methodology, which is only applicable to the assessment of a proposed large-scale methodology.

If the methodology submission, after totalling the scores for each question, does not receive a total score of 10, the proposed new methodology will be graded as “**unqualified**” for the consideration of the Panel/ WG. For questions that receive a score of 0, the rationale will be included in order to provide relevant feedback to the proponent of the proposed new methodology.

If the proposed new methodology receives a score of 10, the proposed new methodology will be graded as “**qualified**” and shall be assigned a unique reference number and further processed according to the procedures.

No.	Evaluation criteria	Score (1 or 0)
1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the proposed new methodology cover all the sections as outlined in the applicable guidelines? • Does the proposed new methodology reflect methodology-specific information and not project/ programme-specific information? 	
	Rationale for the score “0”:	
2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the language sufficiently transparent, precise and unambiguous to undertake a full assessment? 	
	Rationale for the score “0”:	
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the compliance with the applicability conditions of the proposed new methodology possible to demonstrate and validate? • Are there any environmental integrity¹ concerns identified in the applicability conditions of the methodology, for which safeguards are not taken? 	
	Rationale for the score “0”:	
4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the proposed new methodology cover all the GHG emission sources and types that are related to the project activities/ 	

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.

	<p>programmes of activities covered by the methodology?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the project boundary clearly defined in the proposed new methodology? • Are the components of the project activities/ programmes of activities covered by the proposed new methodology and the way they achieve emission reduction/ GHG removal by sinks clearly described? • Is it clear whether the project activities/ programmes of activities covered by the proposed new methodology deliver services comparable to the baseline? 	
	<p>Rationale for the score “0”:</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the following elements of the proposed new methodology consistent with each other: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Baseline approach; (b) Applicability conditions; (c) Project boundary; (d) Baseline emission estimation approach/procedure for estimation of the baseline net GHG removals by sinks; (e) Project emission estimation approach/ procedure for estimation of the actual net GHG removals by sinks; (f) Leakage; and (g) Monitoring methodology.. 	
	<p>Rationale for the score “0”:</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the methodological basis for the proposed baseline clear and concise? • Could the application of the methodology 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? Is it clearly described in the relevant draft PDD or PoA-DD? • Are there any environmental integrity concerns which are not addressed by the proposed approach? 	
	<p>Rationale for the score “0”:</p>	
<p>7.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the approach for assessment and demonstration of addtionality clearly described in the relevant draft PDD or PoA-DD? • Are there any threats to the environmental integrity which are not addressed by the proposed approach? <p><u>Specific evaluation criteria for a proposed large-scale methodology</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the approach for assessment and demonstration of addtionality clear and concise? 	
	<p>Rationale for the score “0”:</p>	
<p>8.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do the sections on baseline emissions/baseline net GHG removals by sinks, project emissions/actual net GHG removals by sinks, leakage emissions and emission reductions/net anthropogenic GHG removal by sinks contain relevant equations 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do the equations adequately represent the underlying project activity/ programme of activities 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/ GHG removal by sinks? Are there any threats to the environmental integrity which are not addressed by the proposed approach? 	
	Rationale for the score "0":	
9.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do the sections (i) data/parameters not to be monitored and (ii) data/parameters to be monitored cover all relevant 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":	
10.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If it is a resubmitted proposed new methodology, are all the issues raised in the previous recommendations addressed? 	
	Rationale for the score "0":	
Total Score:		
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION		
Is a similar methodology(ies) already under review/approved? <i>(If YES, specify the reference number)</i>		

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
01.0	13 June 2013	<p>Initial publication.</p> <p>This document supersedes and replaces the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Proposed new methodology assessment form (F-CDM-NMas) (Version 05.1);• Proposed new AR methodology assessment form (F-CDM-AR-NMas) (Version 03.1);• Assessment form for proposed new methodology for CCS CDM project activities (F-CDM-CCS-NMAS) (Version 01.0).

Decision Class: Regulatory
Document Type: Form
Business Function: Methodology
Keywords: approving methodologies and tools, new methodology
